

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. Robert Vernon Lee, O28882, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as The Adjutant General, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3036.

Chaplain (Brig. Gen.) Frank Alden Tobey, O41693, United States Army, for appointment as Chief of Chaplains, United States Army, as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3036, 3442, and 3447.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

Gen. Willard Gordon Wyman, O12356, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), to be general.

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Bruce Cooper Clarke, O16068, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), to be general.

Brig. Gen. Paul Arthur Mayo, O18621, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Finance, United States Army, as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3036, 3442, and 3447.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3307:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Raymond Wiley Curtis, O16784, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edward Gilbert Farrand, O16788, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Richard Hutchison, O16796, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Bertram Arthur Holtzworth, O16804, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Olaf Helgesen Kyster, Jr., O16830, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Jordan Verbeck, O16852, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ralph Wise Zwicker, O16878, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Raymond Earle Bell, O16897, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. David William Traub, O17110, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Garrison Barkley Coverdale, O17148, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Paul Amos Gavan, O17169, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Samuel Leslie Myers, O17180, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Mattingly Breckinridge, O17210, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Wilhelm Paul Johnson, O17229, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Carl Ferdinand Fritzsche, O17234, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas Lilley Sherburne, Jr., O17293, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Henry Wienecke, O41569, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

ADDITIONAL CONFIRMATIONS IN THE ARMY

The nominations of Karl B. Anderson, Jr., and 381 other officers for promotion in the Regular Army, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 27, 1958, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Karl B. Anderson, Jr., which is shown on page 9592, and ending with the name of Morton E. Wolverton, which is shown on page 9593.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the United States Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10, United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Terence P. Finnegan, 18703A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, chaplain.

To be brigadier general

Col. Robert P. Taylor, 18737A, Regular Air Force, chaplain.

ADDITIONAL CONFIRMATIONS IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations of Col. Peter R. Moody, 8884A, and Col. William T. Woodyard, 4827A, to be permanent professors in the United States Air Force Academy, and the nominations of Robert R. Renfro and 733 other officers, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 7, 1958, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Peter R. Moody, which is shown on page 8253, and ending with the name of Daryl E. Tonini, which is shown on page 8256.

The nominations of Myrl D. Stiles and 1,671 other persons for promotion in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate May 29, 1958, and may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Myrl D. Stiles, which is shown on page 9846, and ending with the name of John J. McCambridge, which is shown on page 9852.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Adm. Felix B. Stump, United States Navy; to be placed on the retired list with the rank of admiral under the provisions of title 10 United States Code, section 5233.

Vice Adm. James S. Russell, United States Navy; to be Vice Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5085.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Vice Adm. James S. Russell, United States Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, he was nominated to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of admiral while so serving.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Edmund T. Woodriddle, United States Navy; when retired, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of vice admiral in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

The nominations of Franz Euler III, and 735 other officers, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 13, 1958, and may be found in full in the Sen-

ate Proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Franz Euler III, which is shown on page 8581, and ending with the name of Darrel K. Pastrell, which is shown on page 8583.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Kenneth E. Martin and 279 other officers for appointment in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 27, 1958, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Kenneth E. Martin, which is shown on page 9593, and ending with the name of William E. Irwin, which occurs on page 9594.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 40:21: *He giveth power to the faint, and to them that have no might He increaseth strength.*

Almighty God, our gracious benefactor, Thou art the light of the hearts that seek Thee, and the life of the souls that love Thee, and the strength of the minds that know Thee.

Grant that throughout this entire day we may walk in closest communion with Thee and receive that joy which comes from service.

May we be strengthened by Thy grace and always look up unto Thee, whence cometh our help, as we encounter hard tasks and heavy responsibilities.

Inspire us to be the messengers of comfort and cheer, eager to share with needy humanity the blessings which Thou dost bestow upon us so abundantly.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 3910. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; and

S. 3974. An act to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuse in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 846. An act for the establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the outdoor recreation resources of the public lands and

other land and water areas of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12540) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from amendments of the Senate numbered 2 and 3 to the bill (H. R. 10589) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes."

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Tuesday, June 17, 1958, he did on that day sign the following enrolled bills of the Senate:

S. 734. An act to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 3093. An act to extend for an additional period of 2 years the authority to regulate exports contained in the Export Control Act of 1949.

STATE, JUSTICE, JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 12428) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ROONEY, PRESTON, SIKES, MAGNUSON, CANNON, COUDERT, BOW, CLEVINGER, and TABER.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND OUTER SPACE ACT OF 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 12575) to provide for research into problems of flight within and outside the earth's atmosphere, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McCORMACK, BROOKS

of Louisiana, HAYS of Arkansas, O'BRIEN of New York, METCALF, McDONOUGH, FULTON, KEATING, and FORD.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

The SPEAKER of the House of Representatives presided.

At 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and Members of the United States Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort His Excellency the President of the Republic of the Philippines into the Chamber, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McCORMACK; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. GORDON; and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CHIPERFIELD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the Committee of Escort the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

The Doorkeeper announced the following guests, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them:

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

At 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced His Excellency, the President of the Republic of the Philippines.

His Excellency, the President of the Republic of the Philippines, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress: I have had the great pleasure many times in the past of presenting distinguished guests to the assembled Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in this Chamber, but I have never had an occasion when I felt more honored or more proud than in the duty I am privileged to perform at this time of presenting to you a soldier, a statesman, a patriot, the President of a new

country that was brought into existence without the firing of a gun, but by mutual understanding of the United States of America and the Philippine Islands, a people which have carried on in such fashion as to justify every hope we had that they were capable of establishing a stable and serviceable government, the President of that great republic, the Republic of the Philippines. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY CARLOS F. GARCIA, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

President GARCIA. Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, and honorable Members of the United States Congress, from the bottom of my heart I thank you for this high honor you have accorded me by inviting me to speak to the great American Nation through its Congress. I come here on behalf of the Filipino people, your best friends in Asia, who live in the faith that the heart of this great American Nation has for them a soft spot. [Applause.] I speak for 23 million Filipinos who renew the vow that we stand by this great Nation, the United States of America, as long as her leadership of the Free World continues to be nobly dedicated to the supreme cause of world freedom and peace. [Applause.]

In pledging help to the friends of freedom everywhere to achieve their own security and well-being, the United States, through President Eisenhower, said, "Recognizing economic health as an indispensable basis of military strength and the Free World's peace, you shall strive to foster everywhere and to practice yourselves policies that encourage productivity and profitable trade." On this state visit of mine to your grand country, thanks to the hospitality of your great President and people, I hope to avail myself of the magnificent opportunity to exchange with you renewed pledges of Philippine-American solidarity on the basis of equality, mutuality of interest, and identity of ideals. This is also an opportunity to reiterate the resolve that we the Filipino people, within the limits of our capabilities, will assume our just burden in the common defense of freedom and in the common pursuit of peace. [Applause.]

Twelve years ago, on July 4, 1946, you granted us the precious boon for which we had longed and fought through almost four centuries: our independence. You gave it not by compulsion, but by a voluntary sovereign act. You gave it as free men and as champions of freedom and in just recognition of the fact that we deserved it, and were willing to assume its tremendous responsibilities. With our cities and Provinces buried at the time under the ruin and rubble of the world's most devastating war, with the national economic structure wrecked by 4 years of ruthless enemy occupation, with our industries despoiled and destroyed, and our agriculture neglected, we nevertheless gladly accepted the responsibilities of independent nationhood. We then believed, as we still do, that with freedom and independence as

our instrumentality and with the courage and determination of our people as our inspiration, we could build again what had been destroyed, we could restore what had been lost, and we could establish a regime of justice, liberty and democracy.

We in the Philippines like to believe that in our 12 years of independent national existence, we have proved to the world that we have not betrayed America's trust and confidence. We like to believe that we have shown that your 50 years of arduous and altruistic effort to help us prepare for our independence were neither fruitless nor wasted. We like to believe that the thousands of American soldiers who fought with us in Bataan, Corregidor, Leyte, and other hallowed places did not fight or die in vain. [Applause.] We like to believe that the financial assistance you have given for our country's reconstruction and rehabilitation after the war bespoke the gratitude of the American Nation to the Filipinos who were confronted with the double task of building the foundations of the Philippine Republic and at the same time rebuilding what had been destroyed during a war fought for a common cause. We think that in 12 years we have, with your assistance and inspiration, successfully completed the task of reconstruction and restoration.

Now as we start a new chapter in the unending work of nation building we face another great challenge, namely, the building of a national economy capable of affording down to the humblest citizen of a democratic Philippines economic well-being, social security, and stability. We are determined to succeed in this task. Only then shall we be able to establish the validity of our claim in Asia that the product of 50 years of Philippine-American collaboration is a democracy that offers to its people the reality of a free and abundant life. [Applause.] We shall have proved that freedom means the building up of human dignity, that democracy means more productivity on the farm and in the factory and more harmony and contentment in the home; that liberty means the utilization of our national resources and the full employment of our manpower for the enrichment of our lives and the winning of peace and contentment. By our success in this endeavor, we hope to be able to demonstrate to the world that not communism, but democracy, which stimulates productivity of the mind, the heart, and the hand, is the answer to the needs of the hungry and the prayers of the oppressed in Asia. [Applause.] That democracy, which is founded upon the eternal verities, is the answer to the spiritual wants of 1 billion Asians, as it is the answer to the material wants of more than half of mankind.

In this great task we ask for your understanding, your encouragement and your assistance—not your charity. We need your faith. We seek from you the strength to make our country an effective force for democracy in Asia. The historic role of the United States in Asia, in my humble view, is far from completed. It is true that by the grant of Philippine independence you have started

a libertarian cycle of far-reaching consequences, resulting in the independence of other Asian countries, like India, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, and lately, Malaya. And I would add that this cycle, which has rolled on irresistibly into Africa, will not be completed until every nation of the world shall have become free and independent. [Applause.]

Nevertheless, may I be permitted to suggest that the logic of events and the dynamics of history will not permit the United States of America, the recognized leader of the Free World, to stop there. She led triumphantly the forces of freedom in two world wars. She gave the best of her gallant youth to redeem the cause of liberty, held captive in the hands of the oppressor. She has given billions of dollars of her substance to help break down the ramparts of poverty, ignorance, and disease, and to clear the way for a better world. But when these battles have been won, destiny yet calls on America to continue leading the forces of freedom and democracy in the battle for a universal peace founded upon justice, liberty and economic security. The last war taught us to reject isolationism as a national policy. It compelled us to accept the principle of the fundamental unity of the human race—the brotherhood of man. The peace and freedom of Asia, where one-half of humanity lives, is therefore unavoidably the concern of the Free World of which the United States of America is the acknowledged leader. Asia must therefore be won for democracy. She must be won for peace. To that end, Asia should be helped to develop a political, economic and social climate in which freedom and peace can flourish. Asia, the birthplace of the greatest religions of the earth, must not be allowed by the folly of passive indifference to fall under the control of a godless ideology. [Applause.] Asia, with her thirst for capital and modern technology must be won to the conviction that democracy can lead her out of the depths of poverty to the heights of fulfillment. She must be convinced that the democratic ideology which contains the eternal truths preached by Christ and other great religious leaders, prophets and poets is, in modern times, the ideology, that can best satisfy her deep spiritual longings. [Applause.]

In the fields of commerce, industry, agriculture, art, and science, the Asians should be led to the conviction, not by words but by deeds, that human dignity and human freedom are the highest interests of democracy everywhere; that democracy is the sworn foe of oppression, intolerance, social injustice, and economic insecurity everywhere; and that democracy stands squarely on the principle that the state was created for man and not man for the state. These being the very principles upon which American democracy stands, it is difficult to conceive that her leadership coupled with understanding and helpful and imaginative policies, should fail to win the heart of 1 billion Asians whose deepest longings are freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom to grow and develop in peace, and freedom to lift

themselves up from abasement of the body and the spirit. [Applause.]

The Filipinos happen to have a culture that is an amalgam of the best in the Asian, Latin, and Anglo-American cultures. It is the only country in southeast Asia where the overwhelming majority of the people profess the Christian faith. By geography and racial affinity we are of the East, and by culture we are of the West. Our jurisprudence is a confluence of Asian, Latin, and Anglo-American jurisprudences. The greatest of our writers wrote in Spanish, Tagalog, and other vernaculars, and the modern ones in English. Thus, the breadth and depth of our culture, its varied and multilateral quality, permits us to claim, without being immodest, a fair understanding of both the East and the West and to become a bridge of understanding between the two. This is a role which we would be happy to perform in the higher interests of the Free World and in the service of world peace.

No one, therefore, should underestimate the tremendous impact upon the Asian peoples of the Philippines' success in establishing among its people a real, substantial, and effective democracy as envisaged by Jefferson and Lincoln, and by our own Rizal and Mabini. On the other hand, no one should discount the possibility that the failure of democracy in the Philippines might prove to be a fatal setback to the expanding frontiers of democracy in Asia.

If you will bear with me for a while, may I be allowed to present to you in bold strokes a picture of the political and economic conditions in my country. The 23 million Filipinos are closely and affectionately attached to you in warm friendship, for you have lived with us for more than half a century and have left imperishable influences on our history, politics, economics, and culture. We fought side by side with you when the fortunes of war were at the lowest ebb, and ever after. We never wavered in loyalty, not even under the fire and sword of a ruthless enemy. [Applause.] Our veterans who survived after risking their all have unflinching faith that America will always remember their devotion and they are confident that Congress will ever be mindful of their interests. While Bataan and Corregidor were fought by armies, the Philippine resistance movement was fought by the masses of our people. During our association of nearly half a century, you inspired our people with the immortal principles of your Declaration of Independence. You gave us both the letter and the spirit of your Constitution. The political thinking and practices of our people bear the deep imprint of American political institutions and usages. Our democratic way of life has been enriched and vitalized by your own. Thus, when under the dynamic leadership of President Magsaysay, we quelled the Communist-inspired Huk rebellion and outlawed communism in the Philippines under a law signed by me last year, we acted under the inspiration of our spirit of 1896 not less than under your spirit of 1776. [Applause.]

The English language is the official language of the Philippines and will so remain indefinitely. It is one of the cultural bonds that bind our country to America and to the English-speaking world. American culture has cut a deep swath in our own. Even now, the English-language newspapers in the Philippines continue to be the favorite newspapers of Filipino readers. Side by side with the development of the indigenous culture, we appreciate more and more American art and literature. Your cultural legacy now forms part of the soul of the Philippine nation.

The economic bond between our two countries is equally important. The biggest market for our foreign trade is the United States to which we sell 52 percent of our exports and from which we buy 55 percent of our imports. The Philippines occupies the 11th rank among the foreign markets for American products. Your total investments in the Philippines amount to \$250 million and is thus the biggest foreign investment in the Philippines. Under the so-called parity amendment to our constitution, Americans enjoy the same rights as Filipinos to develop the natural resources of the country and to establish public utilities. We have not given this privilege to any other foreigner. No other country in the world has given it to you. For that reason, the biggest power companies and mining companies in the Philippines up to now are American-owned. American investors come in slowly, but they keep coming. American capital and Philippine labor have harmonious relations. Both our elite and our labor force come from 21 universities, 352 colleges, and 31,000 public and private schools in all of which the democratic ideology is accepted and communism rejected by free choice.

So, I venture to submit my considered view that long after government-to-government treaties are made and unmade, long after agreements are emptied of meaning, long after covenants expire, this people-to-people relation between Filipinos and Americans will endure through the surging centuries of time. [Applause.] These, ladies and gentlemen, are some of the priceless, intangible stakes in our wedded national destinies.

I said awhile ago that our task of reconstruction and restoration is over. We have accomplished that with generous American aid. But now we are starting the more difficult task of building a national economy that will afford the humblest citizen of the country a fair share of the comforts and conveniences of modern civilized life, a fair assurance of continuous employment of our manpower, and a fair measure of economic security and stability for all. Our natural resources in land, mines, forests, marine and hydroelectric power potential are vast and the greatest part of them are yet untapped. Our potential production of rubber, cotton, rice, corn and other cereals, and minerals is unlimited. Our actual production of copra, hemp, and sugar is limited only by the demand of the world market. Some of the world's biggest deposits of nickel, iron,

copper, and other minerals are found in the Philippines. We are hopeful that someday the tremendous efforts of exploration for oil conducted by American companies will yield the expected results. These, in short, are the vast potentialities of my country.

But I must be frank with you and say that our economic situation leaves much to be desired. We are far from our economic goals. To exploit the vast natural resources I have referred to, we lack the capital and in certain cases, the know-how. Our balance of payments in our international trade has been unfavorable in the postwar years. It is true that we have increased our exports from \$263.4 millions in 1947 to \$428.9 millions in 1957. But our imports have increased faster, from \$511.1 millions in 1947 to \$614.6 millions in 1957. It is also true that from 1953 up to the present, pursuant to our industrialization program, we have established with very little foreign borrowing more than 800 new industries. But we are encountering difficulties in providing the dollar requirements of these new industries in machinery, spare parts and raw materials which have to be imported. This has strained our international reserves. We have extensive irrigation projects to bolster our food production. We have also big harbor improvement projects, especially for Manila, to provide port facilities for a growing foreign and domestic trade. We have power development projects to cope with the rapidly expanding industrialization program in the Manila area, Visayas and Mindanao. But principally, we want to realize thereby our ambitious but necessary program of rural electrification by which we hope to stimulate home and cottage industries in the rural areas; bring to our countryside the blessings of newspapers, movies, radio and television and other modern urban conveniences and facilities; improve the living standards of our rural folk, and brighten up their social and economic outlook. But these can no longer be financed with our own resources alone. To finance these development projects, we therefore need foreign capital and credit.

These are some of the urgent and economic problems we have in our country. So much of our working capital has been invested in the building of the projects and industries we have so far undertaken that refinancing has become imperative. We have progressed halfway toward our objective; we cannot turn back. We need strength to take us to the legitimate goal which we believe we can reach with the assistance of our friends.

Lastly, may I express a parting thought as a tribute to this great American nation by borrowing the words of one of its greatest Presidents, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He said:

The state of this Nation is good—the heart of this Nation is sound—the spirit of this Nation is strong—the faith of this Nation is eternal.

[Applause.]

The Philippines, your loyal friend and ally, appeals to that heart, to that spirit, and to that faith of this Nation.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m., His Excellency the President of the Philippines, accompanied by the Committee of Escort, retired from the Chamber.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Members of the President's Cabinet.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

PROCEEDINGS DURING RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings that transpired during the recess be printed in the Record at this point.

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

There was no objection.

DEFICIT INFLATION SPENDING

Mr. HIESTAND. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days and weeks, the press has carried numerous reports of comments of many responsible private citizens and Government officials, including Members of Congress, who have called attention to the grave financial crisis facing our Nation. Estimates range from \$3 billion to \$4 billion in deficit spending for the fiscal year ending the 30th of this month, and from \$10 billion to \$14 billion for fiscal 1959.

Even if the most optimistic of these estimates proves correct, it will mean hardship, if not tragedy, for the millions of our citizens who live on more or less fixed incomes.

When we dump deficit dollars into the American economic stream by Federal spending, we are undermining our currency and forcing inflation. Therein lies the tragedy for our fixed-income people. Inflation is invisible taxation in its most vicious form. By Government deficit-inflation spending, we are reversing the ancient, though not necessarily honorable, practice of "soaking the rich" and are embarking on a course for-ordained to "soak the poor." It is ironic that most of the advocates of the huge spending

programs that will bring this about, claim to be working for the little man. They are destroying the little-man class of American citizen; and are creating in his place an American peasant class, property-less people who will never be able to accumulate anything because of Government inflation-taxation.

EVIL MACHINATIONS OF COMMUNISM

Mr. DEROUNIAN. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court, in its actions on Monday, June 16, on the matter of three passport cases, has further tied the hands of our Government in any effort to protect the people from the evil machinations of communism.

Now those persons, untrue to the principles of freedom and democracy on which our Government is founded, but American citizens nevertheless, may, under the protection of the American flag, travel the world over denouncing us if they will and furthering the causes of communism.

Monday was another day of victory for communism.

I do not believe the Congress can stand idly by and watch our laws be rendered so ineffectual as to actually aid those who would belittle and destroy our democracy. To do so is not in defense of freedom.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the grounds upon which he raises the question of special privilege.

Mr. CANNON. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Thursday a letter is printed denying the veracity of certain statements which I had made in a speech on the floor.

The SPEAKER. What is the language that the gentleman objects to?

Mr. CANNON. He refers to the material which I gave on the floor as a lie.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized.

UNPUBLISHED HISTORY

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, during the Second World War a Subcommittee on Appropriations withheld for something like 3 years information on the development of the atomic bomb until it was completed. From the beginning of the Second World War a similar subcommittee likewise has withheld mention of a report on the bombing of Pearl Harbor.

The subcommittee, consisting of Engel, of Michigan; Snyder, of Pennsylvania; Kerr, of North Carolina; Taber, of New York; and Cannon, of Missouri were informed by the FBI that the enemy was kept advised of local conditions in Hawaii by Japanese tradesmen who communi-

cated by various methods, including display of colored blankets and sheets hung on a clothesline visible from the ocean.

On the suggestion of these local nationals, the attack was timed for Sunday morning, as weekend festivities usually left a part of the Armed Forces with a hangover and correspondingly reduced efficiency. On this particular Saturday evening an elaborate dinner was given by a wealthy American heiress from which six high-ranking officers were carried home. This may account in some respect for the slowness with which the defense forces rallied from the attack. Although the Japanese command had expected to lose a third of their striking force, the loss was negligible. The report says:

The reported sighting of a submarine periscope at 3:42 a. m. on the morning of December 7, in close proximity to Pearl Harbor, even though not verified, should have put the entire Navy command on the qui vive, and when at 6:40 a. m. the presence of a submarine was definitely established the entire Navy command should have been on full alert.

Admiral Smith, Chief of Staff to Admiral Kimmel, said he did not get the information as to the probable location from which the Japanese carriers launched the attack for some 2 days. Notwithstanding the Army radar plotted the withdrawal of the Japanese force to the north after the attack, this vital information was not employed following the raid in searches for the raiders. Witnesses before the investigating committee attributed this lethargy to faulty liaison and a "complete failure in integration of Army-Navy effort." They also testified that while numerous officers of the Army and Navy attended social functions at various points on the island, there was no evidence of excessive drinking by any officer of either service on that night. At another hearing it was testified that "except for a negligible number" the use of intoxicating liquor on the preceding evening did not affect their efficiency. But the very fact that it was considered necessary to emphasize this testimony naturally gives rise to some doubt.

It was also testified that the commanding general, Hawaiian Department, and the commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet were both guests at dinners away from their posts of command that evening, but returned to their quarters at an early hour. FBI handed to the intelligence officers of the 2 commanders urgent notes warning of imminent attack and were informed that 1 of them reprimanded his valet for bothering him with official matters at such a time and the other placed the envelope in his pocket unopened and apparently did not read it until after the attack.

It was the most disastrous defeat in the history of American arms. Three thousand men and a large part of the United States Navy were lost and a crushing blow was dealt American prestige throughout the world.

Investigations started immediately and continued at intervals for years. Within 2 weeks the Roberts Commission, headed by Associate Justice Rob-

erts, of the Supreme Court, was calling witnesses—Admiral Kimmel returned with a stenographer and revised the transcript. Then came the Hart investigation, headed by Admiral Hart—in which Admiral Kimmel declined to participate. He had already edited the transcript in the first investigation and apparently did not want the record complicated by irrelevant facts. And after the passage of nearly 3 years, when the catastrophe had drifted into a hazy background and the indignation of the Nation was somewhat mollified by the hard-fought success of our armed services in the Pacific and European theaters, obliging friends got through a Congressional resolution under which a Naval Court of Inquiry and an Army Pearl Harbor Board instituted inquiries under 3 admirals and 3 generals respectively.

In this inquiry the three admirals who conducted the naval inquiry were, in effect, trying not only Admiral Kimmel but they were by the same rule trying the system, trying the institution under which they had been reared and in which they expected to live the remainder of their official lives, and of course they found him as blameless as the driven snow. He had done absolutely nothing he should not have done. And he had done everything that he should have done, before, during and after the conflagration. The finding of the court of inquiry was so absurd, such a travesty of justice, that Secretary of the Navy Forrestal indignantly assembled an impartial commission under Adm. H. Kent Hewitt, and Secretary of War Stimson convened a similar commission in his department, under Henry W. Clausen, both of which contributed to the factual history of the Pearl Harbor disaster.

But the conflicting testimony and the general dissatisfaction of the Nation had by this time rendered an authoritative overall investigation imperative, and on July 20, 1946, the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack, consisting of 5 Members of the House and 5 Members of the Senate, under the chairmanship of Senator Alben W. Barkley, later Vice President, and the vice chairmanship of the late beloved Jere Cooper, issued a final report.

The outstanding feature in these long drawn-out investigations was the astounding conflicts in testimony and the irresponsibility of evidence submitted by high ranking personnel of both the Navy and the Army. Witnesses reversed and reversed testimony given in former investigations. Admiral Kimmel himself says in his book, "Admiral Kimmel's Own Story of Pearl Harbor," that witnesses who testified before the Hewitt board changed testimony they had previously sworn to.

In addressing the Senate on September 6, 1945, Senator Barkley declared that the reports on Pearl Harbor by the Roberts Commission, by the Army Pearl Harbor Board, the Navy Court of Inquiry, and other authorities, are confusing and conflicting, when compared to one another, and to some extent contain

contradictions and inconsistencies within themselves." The final report of the joint committee states:

The Navy court exonerated Admiral Kimmel.

But it goes on to say:

The affidavits and testimony at the further investigations contain many instances where witnesses gave evidence materially different from that which they had previously sworn to before the Army board and Navy court. Again, before this committee, these same witnesses further changed their testimony from that sworn to twice previously, or pleaded lapses of memory.

Added to the disgust of the country at these whitewash proceedings was the clamorous demand to know how a position so admirably defended as Pearl Harbor, with every facility, submarine nets, radar, sonar, planes and ships of the line, could be approached both by land and sea by such extensive armaments without detection. The debacle was all the more inexplicable in view of the fact that both commanders had been repeatedly warned and were continuously alerted.

It was my misfortune recently to have to call attention here on the floor to Pearl Harbor and its lessons, in the hope that another such situation might be avoided by providing for better cooperation and coordination of forces through unification of command. In the course of my remarks, I referred to the report by FBI to our subcommittee in December of 1941. In response to those remarks, Admiral Kimmel has sent me and other Members of the House a letter in which he takes issue with my statement that—

A subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations held hearings in which it was testified that at the time of the attack the naval commander, Admiral Kimmel, and the Army commander, General Short, were not even on speaking terms. And the exhaustive investigations by the committee, appointed by the President, and by the joint committee of the House and Senate, showed that, although both had been repeatedly alerted over a period of weeks prior to the attack, they did not confer on the matter at any time.

In confirmation of his replication, he cites the discredited findings of the three admirals which made the investigation by the joint committee necessary:

Admiral Kimmel and Lieutenant General Short were personal friends. They met frequently, both socially and officially. Their relations were cordial and cooperative in every respect and, in general, this is true as regards their subordinates. They frequently conferred with each other on official matters of common interest, but invariably did so when messages were received by either which had any bearing on the development of the United States-Japanese situation or on their general plans in preparing for war. Each was mindful of his own responsibility and the responsibilities vested in the other. Each was informed of measures being undertaken by the other to a degree sufficient for all practical purposes.

It is significant that it was found necessary in an inquiry of this character to stress the claim that the naval commander and the military commander were friends. What else would be expected of ranking officers of the United

States forces in anticipation of war? Why was it necessary to emphasize it?

It was necessary because there was general knowledge that they were not on friendly terms. Admiral Kimmel himself says in his own book, "My relations with General Short, which were once the subject of considerable confusion in the public mind, have now been clarified." They were clarified when both were before courts of inquiry and all but life itself depended on their convincing the world that they had been friends when they should have been friends. But the Roberts Commission report says, "During a period of 10 days preceding the Japanese attack, the responsible commanders held no conference directed to a discussion of the meaning of the warnings and orders sent them, and failed to collaborate and to coordinate defensive measures which should be taken pursuant to the orders received." And again:

Neither of them informed himself of the measures and dispositions taken by the other.

The report of the joint committee says—in reference to the testimony of the two that they played golf together and dined together—that was what they testified—"but they did not get together on official business in such a manner as to insure that each possessed the same knowledge of the situation as the other and to effect coordination and integration of their efforts."

And again:

That Admiral Kimmel was completely oblivious of what the Army was really doing evinces the ineffectiveness of the liaison that was maintained by the Navy in the Army operations section.

And finally, the joint Congressional committee concludes:

The claim of a satisfactory relationship for practical purposes is not substantiated.

The joint committee explains:

The whole story of discussions during 1941 with respect to unity of command is a picture of jealous adherence to departmental prerogatives and unwillingness to make concessions in the interest of both the Army and the Navy. The same comment is applicable to the near dispute between Admiral Kimmel and General Short as to which of them should command Wake and Midway when the marines were replaced by soldiers. It is proper to suggest that had both the commanding officers in Hawaii been less concerned between November 27 and December 7 about preserving their individual prerogatives with respect to Wake and Midway and more concerned about working together to defend the Hawaiian coastal frontier in the light of the warnings they had received, the defensive situation confronting the Japanese on the morning of December 7 might well have been entirely different.

And Admiral Kimmel, in response to my statement that he had been repeatedly alerted, insists that he was not informed and not notified, and so forth.

When Admiral Kimmel accepted command at Pearl Harbor he is certain to have realized he was taking over an advanced and exposed post. Pearl Harbor had been regarded for years as a potential target for enemy action.

In January 1941, Admiral Stark, in appointing him as commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, wrote:

I realize fully the enormous responsibility placed on your shoulders in one of the most critical periods in our history, and where the Navy more than any other branch of the Government is likely to have to bear the brunt.

In my humble opinion we may wake up any day with some mines deposited on our front doorstep or with some of our ships bombed.

Prophetic words. No more concise or specific warning could have been given under the circumstances. In March 1941, Captain Zacharias told Admiral Kimmel that should war between the United States and Japan eventuate, it would begin with an attack on the Pacific Fleet, without declaration of war, and on a Sunday morning. And Admiral Stark wrote to the same effect on April 1.

The Roberts Commission found and reported that messages and orders over a period of weeks prior to the attack warned that "hostilities were momentarily possible." "The warnings indicated war and war only."

On February 1, the Secretary of War forwarded to Admiral Kimmel a dispatch from the American Ambassador at Tokyo as follows:

The Peruvian Minister has informed a member of my staff that he has heard from many sources, including a Japanese source, that in any event of trouble breaking out between the United States and Japan, the Japanese intend to make a surprise attack against Pearl Harbor, with all their strength and employing all their equipment.

On February 7, the Secretary of the Navy wrote to Admiral Kimmel:

In replying to your letter of January 24, regarding the possibility of surprise attack upon the fleet of the naval base at Pearl Harbor, I wish to express complete concurrence as to the importance of this matter and the urgency of our making every possible preparation to meet such a hostile effort.

On July 19, Admiral Kimmel was advised of an intercepted Japanese dispatch reading:

Will crush resistance if offered and set up martial law.

And on October 16:

The resignation of the Japanese Cabinet has created a grave situation. You will take due precaution. Acknowledge.

On November 24, Admiral Kimmel received the following message marked for action:

Chances of favorable outcome of negotiations with Japan very doubtful. A surprise aggressive movement in any direction is a possibility.

The committee comments that no action appears to have been taken by Admiral Kimmel pursuant to these dispatches.

November 25 Admiral Stark cabled:

I have been in constant touch with Mr. Hull and it was only after a long talk with him that I sent the message to you a day or two ago showing the gravity of the situation. He confirms it all in today's meeting, as did the President. Neither would be surprised over a Japanese surprise attack. From many

angles an attack on the Philippines would be the most embarrassing thing that could happen to us.

On November 27, Admiral Kimmel received a message beginning with the words:

This dispatch is to be considered a war warning.

The committee commented in its report:

Every naval officer who has testified on the subject stated that never before in his naval experience had he ever seen a dispatch containing the words "war warning."

Admiral Kimmel testified that never before in his some 40 years as a naval officer had he seen these words employed in an official dispatch. The dispatch continued:

Negotiations with Japan looking to stabilization of conditions in the Pacific have ceased and an aggressive move by Japan is expected within the next few days. The time for training for a prospective eventuality has passed. The eventuality, war, is at hand.

Simultaneously, a warning was sent to General Short concerning prospect of hostile action at any moment signed by General Marshall—a command directive.

A dispatch to Admiral Kimmel dated November 28, concluded:

Be prepared to carry out tasks assigned in WPL 46 so far as they apply to Japan in case hostilities occur.

While Admiral Kimmel and General Short conferred formally on November 27, December 1, 2, and 3 according to the Roberts' Commission report, their conferences related to the dispute between them as to which would command in Wake and Midway. They did not then or subsequently hold any conferences specifically directed to the meaning and significance of the warning messages received by both.

The burning of official papers is traditionally the last step before hostilities start. On December 3 the special FBI agent at Honolulu gave notice that the Japanese consul general in Honolulu was burning his papers. Simultaneously he notified Director J. Edgar Hoover in Washington.

On December 3, Admiral Kimmel was supplied with the following information:

Instructions were sent yesterday to Japanese diplomatic and consular posts to destroy most of their codes and ciphers at once and to destroy all important, confidential and secret documents.

On December 6, the Chief of Naval Operations sent a dispatch to Admiral Kimmel authorizing him to order destruction of American papers in the Pacific islands.

The joint committee reported:

Admiral Kimmel could not have been unaware of the meaning of code destruction and the Japanese reputation for surprise action. He should have been vigilant. He owed this to his position as commander of the fleet.

Said Senator Ferguson in a minority report:

Admiral Kimmel failed in the performance of this obligation.

Admiral Kimmel insists he was on friendly relations with General Short.

Although he received significant information on four different occasions between December 1 and December 6, concerning the destruction of codes and confidential documents in Japanese diplomatic establishments, as well as in his own outlying possessions, he failed to convey that information to General Short.

The joint committee reports:

No conferences were held by Admiral Kimmel and General Short between December 3 and the attack.

Admiral Kimmel insisted that not only was he on the most intimate terms with General Short, but also that "this was true as regards their subordinates."

But Admiral Bellinger stated that between November 27 and December 7 he did not confer with the Army Air Force commander, General Martin, regarding long-range reconnaissance. In other words, there were no discussions during this critical period between the two officers responsible for the air arms of the Navy and Army in Hawaii. And the vast cloud of Japanese planes attacked undetected and destroyed both fleet and airplane forces.

The joint committee comments:

There is no substantial evidence of any specific discussions between Admiral Kimmel and members of his staff on or after receipt of the war warnings—concerning the advisability or practicability of distant reconnaissance from Oahu.

The committee adds:

The picture presented by radio intelligence was among the most significant information relating to when and, to a degree, where the Japanese would possibly attack.

And no one, reading the headlines in the local newspapers alone could have failed to appreciate the increasing tenseness of the situation and the signs of rapidly approaching war. For example the Honolulu Advertiser carried the following headlines:

November 7, 1941: "Japan Ready to Act Unless Tension Ceases."

November 13, 1941: "Tokyo Radio Asserts War Is Already On."

November 14, 1941: "Japanese Confident of Naval Victory."

Other local newspapers carried headlines of similar import. All these newspapers were daily delivered to both Navy and Army offices.

The joint Congressional committee report sums up the situation:

From a review of dispatches and correspondence sent Admiral Kimmel it is concluded that he was fully informed concerning the progress and deterioration of relations with Japan and was amply warned of the imminence of war with that nation.

He would have been summarily court-martialed but for the fact, as explained, in the Additional Views by Mr. Keefe, that such proceedings would have been impossible without the disclosure of military secrets.

Three thousand American servicemen died that morning without a chance. A great fleet and a mighty air force were wiped out. How many thousands died on the battlefields that followed and

how many billions of dollars have been taken from American taxpayers as a result, are matters of conjecture.

AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR, AND PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3910) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert—

"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

"Josias River, Maine: House Document No. 377, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$258,400.

"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, 74th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,678,000;

"Baltimore Harbor and channels, Maryland: 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;

"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;

"Fort Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex.: House Document No. 361, 86th Congress, 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 \$101,000;

"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;

"Fort Washington Harbor, Wis.: House Document No. 446, 83d Congress, at an estimated Federal cost of \$2,181,000: *Provided*, That local interests shall contribute 30 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. 486, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$859,000;

"Irondequoit Bay, N. Y.: House Document No. 332, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,938,000;

"Santa Cruz Harbor, Santa Cruz, Calif.: House Document No. 357, 85th Congress, 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 \$5,476,800;

"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 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 waterhyacinth, 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 underway of \$1,350,000 annually for 5 years, of which 70 percent, presently estimated at \$945,000, shall be borne by the United States and 30 percent, presently estimated at \$405,000, 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 30 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 St. 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 fur-*

ther, 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 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 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 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 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 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 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.

"Tashmoo Pond, Martha's Vineyard, Mass.

"Sachem's Head Harbor at Guilford, Conn.

"Poquonock River at Groton, Conn.

"Water route from Albany, N. Y., into Lake Champlain, N. Y. and Vt., including the advisability of modifying existing Federal and State improvements, with due consideration of ultimate connection with the St. Lawrence River in Canada.

"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.

"Currloman 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.

"Streams and harbor facilities and needs thereof 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.

"Trinity River, Tex.

"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 1958.'

"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 interests 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 Federal cost of \$10,480,000 and at an estimated Federal cost of maintenance and operation of \$55,000 annually: *Provided*, That in lieu of the local cooperation recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 59, 85th Congress, local interests (a) contribute 30 percent of the first cost of the project, said 30 percent being presently estimated at \$5,160,000, including the value of lands, easements, and rights-of-way; (b) contribute the capitalized value of annual maintenance and operation for the main harbor barrier presently estimated at \$1,560,000; (c) hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; and (d) maintain and operate all the works except the main harbor barrier after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

"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 Federal cost of \$11,550,000: *Provided*, That in lieu of the local cooperation recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 230, 85th Congress, local interests (a) contribute 30 percent of the first cost of the project, said 30 percent being presently estimated at \$4,950,000, including the value of lands, easements, and rights-of-way; (b) hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; and (c) maintain and operate the improvements after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

"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 acts 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.

"Susquehanna River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the North Branch of the Susquehanna River, N. Y. and Pa., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 394, 84th Congress, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$30 million for partial accomplishment of that plan.

"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 as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 186, 85th Congress, and is further modified to include the following:

"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 \$19,311,000: *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 \$1,473,000 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 \$35,674,000 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 Greenville Harbor, Miss., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Mississippi River Commission, dated April 26, 1957, at an estimated cost of \$2,530,000.

"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.

"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 be required to pay \$300,000 as the total cost of the project attributable to increase in net returns from higher utilization of the downstream valley lands.

"Red-Ouachita River Basin

"The general plan for flood control on Red River, Tex., Okla., Ark., and La., below Denison Dam, Tex. and Okla., 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., except as follows:

"(1) All flood-control and land-enhancement benefits shall be nonreimbursable.

"(2) Penstocks or other facilities, to provide for future power installations, shall be provided in the reservoirs to be constructed above the Millwood Reservoir.

"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 Federal cost of \$5,662,000: *Provided*, That in lieu of the local cooperation recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 347, 85th Congress, local interests (a) contribute 30 percent of the first cost of the project, said 30 percent being presently estimated at \$2,427,000, including the cost of lands, easements, and rights-of-way; (b) contribute, at their option, the additional cost of providing ramps in lieu of closure structures presently estimated at \$200,000; (c) hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; and (d) maintain and operate all the works after completion.

"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 \$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 that penstocks or other facilities, to provide for future power installations, shall be provided in the Lone Rock Reservoir.

"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 Engi-

neers in House Document No. 224, 85th Congress, at an estimated Federal cost of \$1,791,200.

"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 \$3,102,700.

"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: *Provided*, That if the reservoir is used for water conservation, such use shall be in accord with title III of this act.

"The project for the Kaskaskia River, Ill., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 232, 85th Congress, 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 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, a reasonable amount 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: *Provided*, That the distribution of such power shall not be inconsistent with the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

"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 (1) the Saint 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; (2) Fort Pierre, S. Dak., sewer facilities not exceeding \$120,000, and water facilities not exceeding \$25,000; and (3) the city of Pierre, S. Dak., sewer facilities not exceeding \$210,000; and the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Corps of Engineers, is further authorized and directed to pay to the Chamberlain Water Co., Chamberlain, S. Dak., as reimbursement for removal expenses, not to exceed \$5,000, under the provisions of Public Law 534, 82d Congress: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to provide the sums necessary to carry out the provisions of this paragraph 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 \$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 Coring and Mitchell Valleys, Nebraska, 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, Nebraska, 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 \$5,917,000: *Provided*, That in lieu of the cash contribution recommended by the Chief of Engineers, local interests contribute in cash, the sum of \$286,000, in addition to other items of local cooperation.

"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 the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River at Williamson, W. Va., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 105, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$625,000.

"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 project for flood control, and other purposes, in the Turtle Creek Basin, Pa., is hereby authorized substantially

in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 390, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$13,417,000.

"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 August 18, 1941, 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 22, 1936, 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 Willam-

ette 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.

"The preparation of detailed plans for the Bruce Eddy Dam and Reservoir on the North Fork of the Clearwater River, Idaho, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 51, 84th Congress, is hereby authorized at an estimated cost of \$1,200,000.

"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 (Talketna), 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 \$64,900.

"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 1955 (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) 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. 206. 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:

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

"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 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.

"Pascedero 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, Territory of Hawaii.

"Sec. 207. 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. 208. 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. 209. Title II may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1958."

"TITLE III—WATER SUPPLY

"Sec. 301. (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, irrigation, or multiple-purpose projects.

"(b) In carrying out the policy set forth in this section, it is hereby provided that storage may 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 rea-

sonable value thereof may be taken into account in estimating the economic value of the entire project: *Provided*, That before construction or modification of any project including water supply provisions is initiated, State or local interests shall agree to pay for the cost of such provisions on the basis that all authorized purposes served by the project shall share equitably in the benefits of multiple-purpose construction as determined by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Interior as the case may be: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 30 percent of the total estimated cost of any project may be allocated to anticipated future demands where States or local interests give reasonable assurances that they will contract for the use of storage for anticipated future demands within a period of time which will permit paying out the costs allocated to water supply within the life of the project: *And provided further*, That the entire amount of the construction costs, including interest during construction, allocated to water supply shall be repaid within the life of the project, but in no event to exceed 50 years after the project is first used for the storage of water for water supply purposes, except that (1) no payment need be made with respect to storage for future water supply until such supply is first used, and (2) 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. 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.

"(c) 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. 837), as amended and extended, or the provisions of section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902 (32 Stat. 390), nor shall any storage provided under the provisions of this section be operated in such manner as to adversely affect the lawful uses of the water.

"(d) Modifications of a reservoir project heretofore authorized, surveyed, planned, or constructed to include storage as provided in subsection (b), which would seriously affect the purposes for which the project was authorized, surveyed, planned, or constructed, or which would involve major structural or operational changes shall be made only upon the approval of Congress as now provided by law.

"Sec. 302. Title III may be cited as the "Water Supply Act of 1958."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay tribute to the members of the Committee on Public Works on both sides of the aisle for the very fine and faithful and hard work and attention they have given this bill. Especially would I like to pay

tribute and express appreciation to the senior member of the committee on the minority side, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] for his very thorough and wholehearted consideration.

This bill comes to you, Mr. Speaker, with but about three or possibly four very minor differences, so minor that I am hopeful that there will be no trouble in securing a signature to this bill after the conference.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, this bill does not contain one bit of benefit for the vast area which I represent, but I am in accord with what it purports to do and intend to support it wholeheartedly. However, I do have one question which I should like to propound to the author of the bill. I should like to ask the author of the bill and chairman of the subcommittee handling this legislation one question with respect to the language in subsection (c) of section 301 which states that the storage authorized for municipal and industrial water shall not be operated in such manner as to adversely affect the lawful uses of the water. I am pleased to see that language included and I interpret this language as protecting all uses of water for which rights have been initiated or perfected under the laws of the several States. I would like to ask the subcommittee chairman if my interpretation of this language is correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I am glad to say that the interpretation given the language by the distinguished gentleman is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the kind comments of the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS]. I, too, want to pay my respects to the majority side as well as to the minority Members and to our staff for the tremendous work that they have done in this particular legislation over a period of nearly 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 12955, which is now before the House, for consideration is a compromise River and Harbor and Flood Control bill, containing authorizations that substantially follow the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers, and the Bureau of the Budget. Hence the bill now more closely adheres to established policy with respect to the approval of Navigation, beach erosion, and flood control projects. The President, in his veto message, stressed the point that S. 497 departed from this policy in too many instances and the Committee has worked diligently to meet the President's objections and be in conformity with the law.

Section 202 of the River and Harbor and Flood Control Act of 1954 declares it to be the policy of Congress that—

No project or any modification not authorized, of a project for flood control or rivers and harbors, shall be authorized by the Congress unless a report for such project or modification has been previously sub-

mitted by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in conformity with existing law.

There has been a genuine spirit of compromise and the minority has worked along with the majority to attain a bill that may meet with the President's approval and we of the minority go along with H. R. 12955 with this end in view.

When S. 497, the bill which was vetoed by the President, was reported to the House it carried 18 projects amounting to more than \$300 million to which the minority objected on the basis of adverse recommendations by the Chief of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget as follows, and therefore was not in conformity with the law:

Project and estimated project costs

Title I—Rivers and Harbors:	
LaQuinta Channel, Tex.....	\$954,000
Water-hyacinth control.....	1,502,500
Title II—Flood Control:	
Mohawk River at Rome, N. Y.....	240,000
Hendry County, Fla.....	3,172,000
Tombigbee River Basin, Ala. and Miss.....	19,199,000
White River Backwater, Ark. Boeuf, Tensas, and Bayou Macon, Ark.....	2,380,000
Greenville Harbor, Miss.....	1,212,000
Red-Ouachita River Basin, Ark. and Okla., Millwood and alternatives.....	2,530,000
White River Basin, Gilbert and Lone Rock Reservoirs, Ark.....	109,480,000
Pecos River at Carlsbad, N. Mex.....	57,000,000
Rio Grande at Socorro, N. Mex.....	\$2,066,000
Saylorville Reservoir, Iowa.....	3,152,000
Kaskaskia River, Ill.....	44,500,000
Saline River and tributaries, Ill.....	23,000,000
Oahe Dam, S. Dak., damages.....	5,970,000
Buchanan Reservoir, Calif.....	42,000
Hidden Reservoir, Calif.....	10,900,000
Hidden Reservoir, Calif.....	12,500,000
Grand total.....	303,359,500

¹ Costs for 5-year program.

² S. 497 as reported fails to make provision for cost of modifications of Corps of Engineers report estimated by the Corps of Engineers at \$56,245,000.

³ S. 497 as reported provides for authorization of additional features in White River Basin costing \$57,000,000 which is the amount added to the basin authorization.

Prior to reporting S. 497 the minority members of the Committee on Public Works had succeeded in either amending or deleting a number of other projects subject to the same objections.

The President, in his veto of S. 497, sustained the position taken by the minority.

H. R. 12955 definitely modifies the project authorizations in controversy to make the bill an acceptable compromise. With reservations with respect to the White River Basin, Saline River, Ill., and items which may be resolved in conference, the minority feels that the authorizations in H. R. 12955 have been brought into substantial conformity with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget and, in general, meet objections heretofore expressed by the minority.

It has been the constant objective of the minority to bring all authorizations

into conformity with procedures heretofore established by Congress for the consideration and approval of river and harbor, beach erosion, and flood-control projects.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I join in the remarks made by the distinguished ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

I support this bill, having myself introduced H. R. 12235, which has the same objective of getting action on the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors bill which has lain dormant since the President's veto of S. 497 on April 15 of this year. This action adheres to the ground rules laid down in the President's veto message requiring a uniform standard to be applied to all public works projects, calling for fiscal responsibility in such projects and cutting out the pork in the bill.

My bill would have accomplished this, as does the present bill, in that this bill conforms to the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget and the Army Engineers it brings into conformity those 18 projects to which the minority objected in their presentation on the floor during debate of S. 497 and in the minority report on the bill. Thus, the objections of the minority to the total of \$303,359,500 authorization as contained in those 18 projects has substantially been complied with. I believe that the President will sign this bill in that his veto objections are being met to a greater extent than in any vetoed bill within my recollection.

Thus, the pork has been trimmed from the bill and uniform standards have been observed. Two minor exceptions, referred to in the minority views on page 2 of the report, are taken to the bill by the minority. They relate to Lone Rock Reservoir in that the minority believes that the installation of penstocks should be discretionary with the Army engineers and, relating to Saline River, where a dispute over the amount of local contributions involved only the difference between \$5,917,000 and \$5,272,000 in Federal cost.

Incidentally, on the floor during the debate of S. 497, I stated repeatedly that I hope that the majority would agree to the minority amendments, thus bringing the bill into conformity with the Bureau of the Budget and Army engineers reports, and thus making acceptable to the President. I regret that every effort to acquire this conformity—a concept wholly accepted in the present bill—was repeatedly beaten down. As examples: My position on Millwood during debate on S. 497 was sustained, as appears in the report on this bill on page 91 where it is stated: "The committee, after careful consideration, has deleted the provision which would authorize Sherwood Reservoir, thus bringing the project to be authorized into accord with that recommended by the Chief of Engineers"; and my position on the Gilbert and Lone Rock Reservoirs acknowledging the lack of economic justification under established standards for judging same. On

the water-hyacinth matter on which I introduced an amendment during consideration of S. 497, this bill conforms within a few dollars to that amendment, providing for a 70-percent Federal participation, which was agreed to by the Bureau of the Budget and which I announced on the floor that at that time I thought they would agree to because it was a newly authorized type of program and an amount that conforms to other programs such as hurricane protection and beach erosion where Federal contribution is 70 percent.

The urgency of this bill at this time is evidenced by the fact that there are some six basin authorizations that have run out of money authorization, they include the central and southern flood control in Florida, and the \$5,250,000 contained in the public works appropriation bill soon to come up on the floor. As is the case in the other five, they would be of little value for authorization for spending must precede the funds. Thus these basins would be at a standstill without this bill. Also some other 10 projects included in this authorization bill which were also contained in the appropriation bill could not go forward—and likely would be subject to a point of order without the passage of this bill preceding the appropriations bill.

As I see it the urgency of the situation has forced this omnibus authorization bill out and I am glad that a sound bill will at last pass the House after 4 years of effort on the part of many of us to see a law passed that can become law.

This authorization bill contains the following projects in Florida:

- Palm Beach County, \$222,500.
 - Port Everglades Harbor, \$6,683,000.
 - Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami—maintenance.
 - Escambia River, \$61,000.
 - Hendry County, \$3,172,000.
 - Central and southern flood control, \$40 million.
 - Included in water hyacinth program—surveys authorized, \$5,063,000.
 - Little Gasparilla Pass, Charlotte County.
 - Frenchmans Creek, Pinellas County, Bayport, streams and harbor facilities.
 - Lynhaven Bayou Channel into North Bay.
 - Apalachee Bay small boat channel to Panacea.
 - Dredged channel, Sunshine Skyway, Tampa Bay.
 - To determine feasibility of freshwater lake, Tampa Bay.
 - Apalachicola River cutoff at Wewa-hitchka.
 - Apalachicola River vicinity of Bristol.
 - Streams in vicinity of Gulfport.
 - Mills Creek.
 - Streams in Seminole County.
 - Streams in Brevard County.
 - Gulfport Harbor.
- The appropriations bill, which is to follow this afternoon, H. R. 12858, and which has been held up pending the passage of the pending authorization bill, contains the following projects in Florida:
- Central and southern Florida, \$5,260,000.

Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River, \$135,000.

Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami, \$1,100,000.

Tampa Harbor: 34-foot channel, \$2,950,000.

I am glad to see the legislative logjam broken so that the many good projects that have been at a standstill because of lack of action on the omnibus Public Works Authorization bill can go forward on a sound, responsible and carefully studied basis.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3910. This omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill is a compromise resulting from a long series of meetings on the part of members of the Public Works Committee. It is a bill which we have hopes that the President will sign.

It is urgent that this bill be passed during the present session of Congress. There are many areas in urgent need of flood control. In the State of California, for example, construction on the Los Angeles River Basin project and on the Kaweah and Tule River Basins projects will be brought to a standstill unless this authorization legislation is passed promptly.

It would be a tragedy if this Congress failed to take action to provide assistance to the many areas both in California and in the rest of the country which have suffered flood damage. In the State of California a very serious flood occurred in April 1958. I am particularly pleased that H. R. 12955 contains an authorization of \$166,683,200 in California projects. These projects are urgently needed and will provide employment to many workers who are having difficulty in finding employment at the present time.

Every California project included in this bill has been approved by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, by the United States Army Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, by the Secretary of the Army, by the Budget Bureau, and by the State of California.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Members on both sides of the aisle. This is a highly controversial subject and the fact that we have worked it out to the point where I think it can finally become law is a matter for congratulations. The legislation is an absolute necessity. There are some continuing authorizations for valley improvements throughout the United States in this bill that must be extended. So I urge the Members of the Congress to support the bill in its entirety.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, many residents in Indiana will be pleased that the House Public Works Committee has reported H. R. 12955, the omnibus rivers and harbors bill. Indiana has been visited only recently with the most disastrous floods that have been experienced in our State for 45 years. The estimated damages for this one year will total many times the cost of the recommended expenditures for flood control provided in this bill.

The committee also is to be complimented for presenting a clean bill, one that contains no unapproved projects. The President quite properly vetoed two previous measures because too many of these unapproved projects had been included. This bill has the appearances of one that will receive the President's approval.

The floods of the Wabash, Mississinewa, Salamonie and White Rivers in Indiana and most especially in the 5th Congressional District have ruined thousands of acres of farm crops and damaged millions of dollars worth of homes and household furniture.

My office has been receiving many plaintive pleas for assistance from these stricken homes. This measure includes authorization for projects that are designed to avert similar disasters in the future.

The measure from the Senate, S. 3910, is comparable to H. R. 12955 and for this reason the Senate bill is supported.

It is hoped that the provisions for reimbursement of relocated and dispossessed individuals will be strengthened. It seems only just that those who suffer losses from relocations created by these projects should be repaid in a manner comparable at least to the benefits accruing to others in the area. I shall support such legislation.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I know that the Bridgeport Harbor item is in this bill. May I ask the gentleman, are there any beach erosion projects in this authorization bill?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. MORANO. Is the item for beach erosion in my District that was in the previous bill also in this bill?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I would have to look it up, but I am of the definite opinion that the exact wording of the previous bill is carried over into this bill.

Mr. MORANO. I find the item at the bottom of page 8 and the top of page 9:

Connecticut shoreline, areas 8 and 11, Saugatuck River to Byram River.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Indiana [Mrs. HARDEN].

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add to the report just made to the House by my good friend and colleague, the Honorable JOHN V. BEAMER of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District.

My own Sixth District in west-central Indiana has again taken a beating from Mother Nature, with new flood records being set throughout the Wabash Valley in what has now seemingly become an every-year occurrence.

But the storied Wabash was not the only offending river this June, for the White River again overflowed its banks and wreaked havoc all along its course in central Indiana. Hamilton County, in my District, was badly hit and damage estimates are at the \$2 million mark. Even worse conditions occurred upstream in the Anderson vicinity.

Sixth District communities along the Wabash suffered tremendous damage, with West Terre Haute getting the heaviest blow as a broken levee inundated half the community. Thousands of acres of rich valley farmland flooded and farmers in many cases may be unable to make any kind of crop this season, since the water drains out so slowly.

In a statement made yesterday, I called for a comprehensive flood control program for the Wabash River Basin. The Senate last night authorized three giant reservoir projects in the Upper Wabash, near Peru, Huntington, and Wabash. The House today is considering the same authorizations. All three projects have been long sought by the Indiana Flood Control Commission and by my good friend and colleague, the Hon. JOHN BEAMER, of the Fifth District.

Eventual construction of these reservoirs will lessen the chance of floods such as we experienced this month, a year ago, and in years past. But they will not do the whole job. Other reservoirs are needed.

I have asked the Army Engineers to speed up survey work on three other Wabash Basin reservoirs—near Attica, Lafayette, and Turkey Run State Park. All three have the approval of our State's flood control commission.

Two portions of the Wabash reservoir system already are either in being or under construction. The Cagles Mill Reservoir in Putnam County was completed about 5 years ago, and construction work is now under way on the Mansfield project in Parke County.

So we are making some progress—with two of the necessary reservoirs either completed or under way, three others authorized by Congress and with survey work progressing on the remainder. In time—and work of this sort takes a great deal of time, since we must compete for funds with all the other States of the Union—the Wabash Basin flood problem will have been solved.

Now to the White River. Flood control engineers do not believe a reservoir system such as planned for the Wabash is suitable on the White. They propose, instead, the building of levees on river turns, stabilization of river banks, deep-

ening and changing of stream channels and constant clearing of debris.

New State legislation may be sought from the Indiana Legislature by the flood control commission. It would prohibit any type of building in the plain of the stream; that is in the natural overflow area of the river at floodstage. Golf courses, recreational areas, picnic groves, and similar public-use areas would be encouraged in the river plain. Thus the river would retain its natural overflow width area, while recreational usage of the area would be promoted and encouraged.

Federal help is necessary in the building of reservoirs such as those necessary or programed for the Wabash. State and local funds might solve the White River problem.

In any event, both rivers present problems which must be solved, and solved soon.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. May I inquire of the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee, about this matter: I notice that in this bill, besides authorizing certain projects, we have extended to the Corps of Engineers certain authority in connection with the construction of such projects. I am referring particularly to section 111 of the bill. That authority would affect several projects in my part of Kansas because reservoirs are being constructed that are inundating several communities. There are other subjects related to community problems that are not covered in section 111, and several of us have individual bills relating to these matters. Are we to take it from the inclusion of section 111 and the exclusion of these other items that no further consideration will be given to them?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. There is a special section having to do with navigation and relocation. It is a special section, section 111.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H. R. 12955, the new omnibus flood control bill offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, Representative CLIFF DAVIS, in the belief that it is the best possible legislation that can be developed under the existing circumstances.

Since the President has vetoed two bills in this field, I think great progress has been made in sustaining the position of the Congress in regard to many of these items in dispute. By withdrawing their objections to 10 of the projects and accepting minor modifications in a number of others, the Bureau of the Budget and the administration have made clear how tenuous their position was in the veto message on S. 497.

I think the most noteworthy change in the position of the Bureau of the Budget has to do with the White River backwater project and the Boeuf-Tensas

projects in Arkansas. I am glad that the Bureau of the Budget has seen fit to accept the traditional policy in regard to local contributions for projects within the lower Mississippi Valley. This policy was first adopted in 1928 and has been carried forward through successive flood control bills since that time. The only objections raised to it have been those in recent years through interpretations made by the Bureau of the Budget.

The Bureau of the Budget's acceptance of this policy will make it possible for new and badly needed work to be authorized in the future in the Lower Mississippi Valley under terms that can be met by the people in the area.

The bill before us includes the authorization of a modified form of the project for harbor and river improvements at Greenville, Miss. I have reluctantly agreed to accept the proposed modification contained in the bill, even though it involves a local contribution far greater than that for similar harbor projects on the Mississippi River. The sharpest contrast involves the harbors at Memphis, Tenn., and Vicksburg, Miss., those closest to Greenville. There is no equity in a proposal that would require local contributions at Greenville at a rate far in excess of similar projects in the same geographic area.

At the proper time I shall offer a proposal to modify the requirements in regard to the Greenville Harbor to make them more in keeping with similar requirements for other harbor projects.

I am very pleased by the fact that the Committee on Public Works, despite the various modifications that have been made in this bill, has insisted upon its prerogative of having some voice in the determination of what projects shall be authorized and under what conditions. I believe that the conferees will be insistent upon the same points when they go to conference.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the omnibus public works bill, S. 3910, as amended. This action today marks what I hope is the end of a long series of similar efforts on the part of the Congress to write such a bill and to have it signed by the President.

I have had projects in the various unsuccessful measures and still have them in the one which we are about to vote on. All are meritorious and there has never been any question of their adoption in committee and in the House.

Over all of the long months of effort I have been impressed with the patience and consideration of the two subcommittee chairmen directly involved in my projects. These are the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK]. To them goes my profound admiration and my thanks in behalf of myself and my people.

My thanks, too, to the members of the staff who have likewise been so extremely patient with my inquiries.

The example of these gentlemen is one which sets a high mark for all the rest of us to strive for.

I trust the bill will pass without a dissenting vote and that this time it will be signed by the President.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity of congratulating the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS], chairman of our subcommittee, and the other members of the Committee on Public Works for their diligent efforts in bringing this omnibus public works bill to the floor. We have labored long and hard in the committee over the past 3½ years only to be disappointed by 2 Presidential vetoes.

I want to particularly thank the members of the Committee on Public Works for allowing my request to include in the bill, the Saline River project in southern Illinois. The project is one of the President's so-called objectionable projects due to a disagreement over the amount of local cash contribution required. The Bureau of the Budget recommended a local cash contribution of \$930,000 in addition to other items of local participation. Due to coal mine closures and other economic factors, a great number of people have been forced to leave our area. Those remaining absolutely are not able to carry out this project under the provisions recommended by the President.

Mr. Chairman, there is no use authorizing a project that can never be built. The House has done its duty in recognizing the inability of the people to pay. The bill as passed by the other body contains language recommended by the President which is the larger amount of local cash contribution, therefore, I hope that the conferees will be able to go along with the action taken by the House. I am indeed grateful to those who have seen our need and are willing to do something about it. In closing I want to commend our excellent staff on the Public Works Committee, including Mrs. Beiter, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Brennan, and Mr. McConnell.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity to support H. R. 12955 today because it includes a project which is important to residents of the Ninth District of Wisconsin. I refer to the Eau Galle River flood control project as outlined in Senate Document No. 52, 84th Congress, 1st session, and as provided for in my bill, H. R. 6959, introduced in 1955.

There has been no question raised about the need for this particular project. The Corps of Engineers thoroughly surveyed the proposal and approved it. Their knowledge of the situation dates back 15 years. They have recommended adoption of the project at an estimated cost of \$6,901,600.

Headwaters of the Eau Galle River form near Woodville, Wis., in St. Croix County to the north of Spring Valley. The Eau Galle flows 50 miles southeast to its junction with the Chippewa River and it has a drainage basin of about 230 square miles with about 90 percent of the area being made up of farms which average about 140 acres in size.

The city of Spring Valley is located in western Wisconsin in the narrow valley of the Eau Galle River between steep limestone bluffs at a point where the Mines and Burghardt Creeks join the Eau Galle River.

Spring rains and thawing speed the worst flood conditions in the spring and serious floods in the past have occurred when a high crest on the Eau Galle River has merged with the two small creeks at Spring Valley. Eau Galle floods are generally quick and destructive and are associated with periods of rapid snow-melt or rainstorms of above normal intensity. River stages which normally fluctuate within a range of about 5 feet may rise 10 to 15 feet in a few hours and recede almost as quickly. The fact that the river hits its peak so quickly cuts the margin of time that Spring Valley residents have in which to take emergency measures to control the flooding or avoid its dangers.

Flood records dating back to 1894 tell of damages to roads, bridges, homes, and business places. One death is directly attributed to the flood of 1934 and two deaths are linked indirectly to the disastrous flood of September 1942.

It should be pointed out that this project has been pending since October 28, 1941, and that its need was evident even before the disastrous floods of 1942.

The problem is too great for the residents of the area to handle without Federal assistance. After the July flood in 1938 the channel through Spring Valley was deepened and widened by local interests but the levee was washed out in September of the same year. World War II halted action on flood control measures. Although the original survey was a review of flood conditions of the entire Chippewa River and its tributaries, the Eau Galle project is the only part which has received approval on all levels.

The Department of the Army, the Bureau of the Budget, the Wisconsin State Planning Board, the Interior Department, the Department of Agriculture—all Federal and State agencies involved in any way with the proposed flood control project, concur in the views or have no objection to the project.

J. S. Bragdon, chairman of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, summarized the situation well when he noted that the "Board concludes that the evaluated benefits in conjunction with the intangible benefits such as the prevention of the loss of life, removal of the hazards of epidemics, and the enhancement of the general welfare and security of the inhabitants are sufficient to justify the construction of the improvements."

This worthwhile project has been too long delayed. I hope that this legislation will receive the approval it deserves.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN].

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the newly revised version of the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill. I believe that the Committee on Public Works deserves the appreciation of every Member of Congress for their patient and painstaking attention to this all-important bill. I am pleased to note that the bill contains authorization of \$200 million for prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin. I am also gratified to note that the committee has seen fit to accept an amendment which I have offered to this section of the bill.

Previously, the committee accepted an amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from South Dakota, Senator CASE, which provides "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, a reasonable amount of public power as may be determined by the Secretary of Interior shall be made available for use in the State where such dam is constructed." At my suggestion, the committee accepted a further provision which reads as follows:

Provided, That the distribution of such power shall not be inconsistent with the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

The purpose of my provision is to make sure that we do not, under the power reservation clause mentioned above, jeopardize the operation of the time-honored Federal preference clause contained in section 5 of the Federal Flood Control Act of 1944.

Mr. Speaker, more than half a century ago, Theodore Roosevelt saw the necessity of protecting the public interest in Federal river projects. Largely through his leadership, the Reclamation Act of 1906 provided that public bodies should have first claim on electric power generated by dams built with Federal tax funds. The theory behind this provision was that the dams belong to the people who finance them through their tax funds and that because of this public investment, publicly owned groups should be first considered for benefits before such benefits were made available to private groups who would in turn sell the benefits for private profit. This same principle was extended to rural electric cooperatives in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933. It was again repeated in the preference clause in the Federal Flood Control Act of 1944.

It is very important that in our efforts to give special consideration to a State because such State provides the site for a Federal dam, we do not abrogate the public interest as set forth in the preference clause. For that reason, I am deeply gratified that the Committee on Public Works has seen fit to recommend to the House that my amendment be accepted. I want to thank the chairman of this committee and the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle who have agreed to this farsighted provision. I hope that if the House today approves the bill as

recommended by the great Committee on Public Works, the provision mentioned above will be sustained in the resulting conference committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am also delighted to note that the bill before us contains worthwhile provisions authorizing funds for the construction of sewer facilities for the St. Joseph's Indian School at Chamberlain, S. Dak.; sewer facilities and water facilities for the cities of Fort Pierre and Pierre; and compensation for removal expenses for the Chamberlain Water Co.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the omnibus authorization bill, H. R. 12955, contains projects that are very vital to Florida, and I urge that this legislation be adopted. Included in the bill is an additional authorization for the Central and Southern Florida Flood Control District in the sum of \$40 million, necessary for the orderly and necessary continuation of work for this project. The cost-sharing basis for this project is changed in this bill to concur with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers as contained in House Document 186 of the 85th Congress. The governing board of the Central and Southern Florida Flood Control District has sent me the following telegram as evidence of their acceptance of this cost-sharing basis:

At the suggestion of our Congressional delegation all board members were contacted and they have indicated their willingness to accept cost-sharing recommendations of the Corps of Engineers contained in its report of May 1957 for all elements of the central and southern Florida flood control project except the first phase in anticipation of increased appropriations and continued cooperation of the Corps of Engineers. We have been assured of the cooperation of Governor Collins in obtaining necessary concurrence of other affected agencies of the State of Florida.

kindest regards.

W. H. HITT, Chairman.

With this additional authorization, it is hoped that the work necessary for the central and southern Florida flood control project may be continued and be brought to a rapid conclusion so that Florida, as well as the Nation, might benefit from its completion.

Even though this project is not completed, great savings have already accrued to Florida. The major flood which resulted in authorization of this project occurred in 1947. A substantial amount of work has been done on the project in the 8 years since construction was initiated in January of 1950. However, we still have a long way to go to provide protection against devastating floods to the residents of the 17-county flood control district. After the October 1956 flood experiences, the January 1957 flooding by rainfall and attendant damages, the Corps of Engineers reported that project works, the levees, and pumping stations of the Everglades agricultural area were responsible for reducing the damage by at least \$7.5 million. Also, more devastating rainfalls and flooding

occurred in January 1958, and as a result of completed works located in the afflicted areas, savings in damages prevented from flooding this year were estimated at \$38 million.

When this project is completed it is anticipated that even greater savings will accrue to this area and will result in widespread benefits.

Included in this authorization bill is an authorization for a modification of Port Everglades Harbor, which is greatly needed. It was added by a special committee amendment to the previous omnibus bill which was vetoed, and it was my pleasure to be able to speed up the report on this project through channels so that it could be included in the omnibus bill.

Also in this bill which will affect the Sixth District are Palm Beach beach erosion project, additional flood control project in Hendry County to provide a canal and dike system, authorization for the Corps of Engineers to make a preliminary examination and survey of Little Gasparilla Pass, Charlotte County, in the interest of possible navigation improvements.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I think it would simplify matters if I asked unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the Record, on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I am voting for this bill most reluctantly, because I consider it marks a surrender of the legitimate and proper authority of the Congress to a power-hungry Bureau of the Budget. I am voting for it because it appears to be the only way we can get a start on urgently needed public works for the protection of the people of the United States.

This bill eliminates two vital and urgently needed flood control projects in my District, although this House and the Senate have twice voted to authorize them, and the President, acting on the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, has twice vetoed them. These are the Hidden Dam on the Fresno River, and the Buchanan Dam on the Chowchilla River. How long must these people cry for aid? How long must they continue to suffer tragic floods, as they have in 1950, in 1952, in 1955 and again this year, while 3,000 miles away, little, short-sighted men sit securely in their budget offices and quibble over what Federal agency should build the dams which would save them?

I want this House to know that the Bureau of the Budget is seeking to apply rules and requirements in my District of California which are not applied anywhere else in the United States. This is the real reason we cannot get approval of projects which have been thoroughly studied by the Corps of Engineers and which amply meet and surpass all requirements of engineering and economic feasibility and have cost-benefit ratios far higher than required. These projects are endorsed and recommended by the responsible officials of

the Corps of Engineers and I challenge anyone to demonstrate they are not good projects. The people to be benefited by water conservation stand ready to pay for it and the legislation would require them to assume their obligation before these projects could be built.

I am not going to take this usurpation of authority by the Bureau of the Budget lying down and I sincerely hope the Committee on Public Works and Members of this House will not surrender to the Bureau of the Budget the duties and responsibilities the people of the United States have directed that the Congress exercise. I serve notice here and now that I am going to ask for hearings and a thorough airing of the policies sought to be enforced by the Bureau of the Budget, and the President, which are continuing to bar the Congress from authorization of these projects. I am going to ask that the cards be laid on the table and that the Bureau of the Budget publicly justify its discrimination against the Central Valley area of California.

In voting for the committee's recommendation today and permitting it to be considered by consent, I am trying to avoid a dog in the manger attitude which would deny protection urgently needed by other areas, but I am appealing to the committee to fully look into the reasons and justification for denial of equally needed protection to the people of the District I represent.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Chairman CLIFFORD DAVIS is to be congratulated on a job well done. A battle that has raged for 4 years is about to come to an end.

No one who did not participate in this stubborn controversy will ever realize how much patient persuasion and hard work went into this compromise public works authorization bill.

All combatants have retreated in varying degrees. Of the 30 projects objected to in the vetoed bill covering 153 projects, the executive departments changed their minds on 18. Congress has changed its mind on 8. Four are still in dispute; but surely, now that we are this close to 100 percent agreement, the House-Senate conferees can work out a compromise on these last 4.

I have sweated through this controversy not only as a member of the Public Works Committee but as a Member vitally interested in additional authorization for Table Rock Dam in Taney County, Mo.

This multi-million-dollar project is nearing completion. Final contract-lettings on timber-clearing and Shell Knob bridge should have been held before now. Adequate money has been or is about to be appropriated. But the contracts have not been let or cannot be let because the Corps of Engineers have exhausted their legal authority for expending funds on the White River Basin.

Earlier this year, our Public Works Committee originated and Congress passed an omnibus public works authorization bill which included new authority for Table Rock to finish the project.

Our committee gave careful consideration to each and every project requested

by the Corps of Engineers and the people of various areas. We heard all the pertinent facts on each one.

We approved those projects that we felt were justified; and we kicked out the ones we felt were not justified.

We thought we had done a sensible, workmanlike job—not a perfect job, but a good job. We finally okayed and sent to the President a bill approving 153 navigation and flood control projects as meritorious and worthy of Government appropriation, whenever Congress and the President might see fit to build them. The President objected to 30 of the 153 projects and vetoed the bill. And some have claimed that the veto saved the taxpayers some money.

The truth is that it was not and is not a money bill. Now, John Q. Citizen could be easily misled on this. It is natural to think, when you read in the paper that Congress passed a multi-billion-dollar public works authorization bill, you think that this means the projects will be built, and billions will be spent.

Of course, that isn't true. Some \$10 billion worth of public works projects are on the books today that are authorized but may never be built. Only money bills—appropriation bills—guarantee that a project will be built.

This bill and the bill that was vetoed will neither cost taxpayers nor save taxpayers a dime, per se. The President and his Budget Director do not have to build one single project included in this bill. They can leave it out of the annual budget, and they can refuse to build it even if Congress appropriates the money.

Presidents and Congresses have often argued about public works appropriation bills; but arguments over authorization bills—just giving a stamp of approval to certain public works projects—are rare.

Whatever number of projects are approved, the President has an item veto in fact, if not in name. So, in a very real sense, the blood, sweat, and tears that have been shed over this bill could have been better shed over more life-and-death matters.

As recently as 1 week ago, the whole thing looked hopeless. Table Rock completion and the completion of other projects seemed doomed to delays and uncertainty.

Tempers were flaring and positions were inflexible on certain items in this bill. But patience and a will to compromise prevailed. Both sides demonstrated good judgment.

Now, it looks as if we might get a public works authorization bill; and I hope sincerely that the President will sign it, even though reluctantly.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see the Public Works Committee of the House bring this bill, H. R. 12955, to the House today in practically unanimous agreement.

This bill authorizes a number of projects throughout the United States, all of which have been carefully considered by the committee, and all of which, when completed, will make a great contribution to the conservation of our soil; to the increase of hydroelectric power; to

navigation and water commerce by the improvement of water transportation on our inland waterways and harbors.

I am glad to note the bill authorizes the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Kaskaskia River Basin, which includes a dam at Shelbyville, Ill., and six levees along the river between Cowder and Vandalia, Ill., and the local protection project at New Athens, Ill., in addition to the Carlyle Dam, at Carlyle, Ill., that was authorized in 1933 and has now reached the construction stage.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to estimate the benefits that will come to the entire Kaskaskia River Basin when this project is completed. Because of the abundance of water it will assure, it will attract industry that will employ many thousands of people for an area of 50 miles around in addition to the water supply it will furnish for cities, towns, and villages, and, in addition, the great recreational facilities which should attract hundreds of thousands of people annually. It should contribute greatly to the entire economy of this section of the State.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that at long last the Committee on Public Works has reported out an omnibus rivers and harbors and flood-control bill which the President can conscientiously sign. H. R. 12955, the bill now under consideration, contains the Floyd River, Iowa, flood control project, which is of vital importance to my District in northwest Iowa. This project is fully authorized and approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget in the estimated cost of \$3,060,000. The project was included in two previous omnibus bills which were vetoed on account of the many unauthorized projects contained therein. Now our efforts are bearing fruition in the passage of the bill today. I sincerely hope that the needed appropriation will now be forthcoming without delay so work on the project can actually commence.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the committee on including under section 112 the authorization for the Secretary of the Army to make a survey of the feasibility of a deep-water route from Albany, N. Y., into Lake Champlain, N. Y., and Vermont in order to connect our great harbor of New York with the St. Lawrence River and thus with the St. Lawrence Seaway in Canada. This provision incorporates my bill, House Joint Resolution 519, into this general rivers and harbors authorization. I hope it will lead to tremendously improved business in New York Harbor and thus to a stronger and better economy for all of New York City and State, as well as Canada and the States surrounding the Great Lakes and Lake Champlain. Though in wording this is but a small section of this bill, I believe it is the monumental achievement of the bill and crowns my efforts of the past year with success. This dredged waterway, which would connect the port of New York and the Great Lakes, would enable ships using the St. Lawrence Seaway to save over 1,000 miles. But, what is most important to my community of

Brooklyn, it would bring increased shipping with the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway rather than decreased shipping. I am tremendously proud to have brought this legislation to the attention of the House.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am very much pleased H. R. 12955 includes a project authorizing the transfer of the now obsolete Illinois and Mississippi Canal—commonly known as the Hennepin Canal—to the State of Illinois.

The canal, approximately 75 miles long with a right-of-way of 300 feet contains approximately 1,000 acres of water and 208 miles of shoreline. When it was proposed to abandon this canal in 1951 the State of Illinois was extremely interested in obtaining this area for recreational purposes.

In 1954 the State of Illinois amended its constitution to permit the use of State funds for the development of this property and enacted the necessary legislation under which these properties could be accepted by the State.

On two occasions the Congress approved this transfer in an omnibus rivers and harbors bill. Both times the bills were vetoed by the President. It is my understanding the omnibus bill now before us has been modified along the lines suggested by the President and I am hopeful it will receive his approval.

This project will create a recreational area for probably one-half million people living within easy access, and will provide excellent fishing facilities, swimming, boating, picnic grounds, and so forth.

It will also preserve the splendid facilities along the shores of Lake Sinissippi which is an integral part of this canal system.

Certainly rather than to abandon the project but to permit the continued use of this facility under State sponsorship is preferable to the course of action which would result in a needless loss of such a valuable asset.

I am also pleased that in this bill there are plans for flood control in the Rock and Green River Basin. It authorizes the protection of certain flood areas by the construction of levees through Federal and local participation. This will do much to protect the agriculture land, towns, railroads, and highways located in this area against serious flood damage.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I realize I shall be in the minority in voting against this bill that will cost the taxpayers an additional billion and a half dollars. As I understand it there is something in it for almost everybody. I think it can be classed as a pork barrel bill. I am sure many of the items are important and should be approved at the proper time. Why not wait until the House has a chance to look them over? Here you are today considering a bill introduced yesterday and approving today under allowing only 40 minutes for debate and without amendment. Is it not authorizing spending money at a pretty high speed?

I am advised Congress has already authorized projects, that will cost—if built—between six and nine billion dollars. Putting it another way, projects

which are already authorized will require more than 20 years to complete them.

In view of our tremendous debt, and considering the big expenditures ahead of us, why not let this measure go over for another year, at least? Then take a look at the situation later on. Let us not obligate our Government for another \$1.5 billion at this time.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I support H. R. 12955, which is a bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and similar purposes. It is, by and large, a good bill. America has waited 4 long years now for a rivers and harbors and flood control bill. In the meantime, the Congress has passed two bills, both of which have been vetoed by the President.

All of us want to see a strong and dynamic America. A strong America is a growing America. In order for America to grow, she must develop her natural, and her human resources.

In the 10 years that I have been in Congress, I feel that the Congress has been rather conservative in authorizing new projects, and most careful and conservative in building those already authorized. As a matter of fact, I think we have been too conservative in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, we are living in an age in which water assumes a greater importance each year that we live. Water requirements for domestic and industrial and commercial projects are growing very rapidly. I think in the future we are going to have to speed up the development of our waterways and our water resources. At the same time, I think we are going to have to take a second, and, eventually, even a third look at specific waterways.

The time has come when we must make the maximum use of all our existing waterways. The pressure upon us to do so will grow each year from here on.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS], the chairman, and indeed all the members of the Public Works Committee, for the kind and sympathetic consideration they have given the Tombigbee tributaries project in this bill. They have, heretofore on two separate occasions, given it complete and thorough study and consideration, and now the committee itself is thoroughly familiar with the project, and with its potential, and with the ability of the local people or interests to shoulder the responsibilities which the project places upon them. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] has given this project most serious consideration and study over the period of the past several years since it has been before the Congress, and especially I want to bespeak the thanks and appreciation of myself and of those whom I represent to Mr. JONES.

This Tombigbee tributaries project is a \$19 million project. Some 22 streams, most of them small, are involved. These streams course through an agricultural area in Alabama and Mississippi which

is far from well-to-do, and I want to say frankly to the committee that there remains in my mind some considerable doubt as to the ability of the local interests to raise the \$1,473,000 which the bill in effect assesses against them.

In the light of proportion, and on the basis of comparison, I think the committee has been very fair and considerate, yet I do want the Members of the House to know that there remains great doubt in my mind as to the ability of the people involved to raise the amount of the local contribution.

This Tombigbee tributaries project has been directly before the Congress for nearly 20 years. The late, great, Speaker William B. Bankhead, who at that time represented the District which I am today privileged to represent, was interested in this project.

The three principal tributary streams that lie in Alabama are the Buttahatchee, the Luxapallila, and the Sipsey. These streams are in great need of clearing of the banks, snagging, the construction of cutoffs, and the enlargement of their mouths so as to cut down the annual average flood damage done by their floods which averages \$352,000 per year.

The floods which I speak of are making the area of Alabama drained by these streams proportionately poorer each year.

The passage of this bill will authorize the construction of this important project. Once authorized, it will give local interests and the Federal Government a guideline to work toward that will be helpful in concentrating and conserving our efforts all the way around.

This is a most important project to the people whom I have the privilege to represent. It is a project that they have read about, and worked for, and dreamed about for many years. As their representative, I want to urge that this bill be promptly passed.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I am on record as opposing the Milford and Perry projects included in the bill in the hearings before the Public Works Committee as far back as 1947. The Milford project is more than just another reservoir in my District, this is a reservoir that if built would inundate my own home, most of my land, my hometown, and quite a substantial portion of the fertile land of my home county of Clay.

I further feel that the landowners directly affected by the project have had even worse treatment to date than is the usual experience in one of these projects. By that I mean the project was first authorized in 1936 as a part of a long-range flood control and water conservation plan. This was usual procedure. Then in 1938, it was deauthorized and the Harlan County Reservoir in Nebraska was authorized in lieu of the Milford project. This seemed to settle the matter until the Harlan project was virtually completed, then reauthorization of Milford was asked by the Corps of Engineers. This sought-for reauthorization was granted by the Congress in 1954, before I was a Member.

It is in this preconstruction, but authorized status that I feel Congress has not fully assumed their responsibility. As soon as a project is authorized, all the land contained within the project limits immediately acquires a "cloud on its title," so to speak, and the value of any improvements located therein immediately depreciates.

There is also the natural factor of neglect of improvements that enters in. This can be a longstanding accumulative damage as it has been in the case of Milford and by the time the property is acquired by purchase or condemnation, a certain degree of property right has depreciated out of the improvements. This situation also applies to Perry Dam. This is especially true when a town is involved, such as is the case in this incident, my hometown of Wakefield. In a sense it is the depriving of property without due process of law. In fairness to the property owner all land should be appraised and acquired at the time of authorization, or at the time that planning money is first made available to respective Government agencies.

The City Council of the City of Wakefield has gone on record that they are opposed to Milford Dam, but whatever action is to be taken, it is not to the best interests of the property owners in the reservoir area to delay it.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this omnibus rivers and harbors bill and will vote for it. This legislation is a compromise on the bill passed by the House on March 11 and vetoed by the President on April 15. Some of the projects that were objectionable to the President in the original bill have been deleted from this legislation while others have been modified. As I said in my remarks before the House on March 11, I am particularly interested in one project contained in this bill, the authorization for the construction of the Littleville Reservoir on the Middle Branch of the Westfield River in Massachusetts. I filed a bill, H. R. 94, for the authorization of this project which is vitally needed for the prosecution of the comprehensive flood control plan for the Connecticut River Basin. I hope that this bill passes today and that a conference will soon work out differences with the Senate bill passed last night so that the compromise legislation can be sent to the President for his signature.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this bill, as I believe it is good legislation. The projects in the bill have been thoroughly screened by the Public Works Committee and they have unanimously agreed to its provisions. While it is true that work on most of them cannot be started for some time, yet getting the authorization agreed to is a basic step we must take before appropriations can be made and the work undertaken.

I am particularly interested in the Yaquina project in Lincoln County, Oreg., which has the complete approval of all parties concerned. It has been approved by the Budget Bureau, the

Army Engineers, and three times by the House committee.

The Yaquina project has been in this bill each of the two times it has been previously before the House and is of course in the bill.

There is no question about its merits, and favorable action should be taken on it as well as the other projects in the bill today.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the chairman and members of the Committee on Public Works for their reasoned but expeditious action in reporting a substitute omnibus public works bill in the form of H. R. 12955. I heartily support its prompt passage.

The proposal repeats the proposal contained in the two earlier omnibus bills, which were vetoed by the President, providing an additional \$28 million authorization for Success and Terminus dams to be located within my Congressional District. I know that I bespeak the sentiments of the people of Tulare and Kings Counties in saying that I feel the utmost gratitude toward the committee for this favorable action on a matter of local interest.

These projects in places will prevent vast property damage and relieve potential human suffering. The provision of this authorization means that it is only a matter of a relative short time before they will be in place.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the committee for the workmanlike manner in which they have improved this bill. It is a vast improvement over the hodgepodge measure which President Eisenhower wisely vetoed earlier in the year. Many of the unjustified projects have been eliminated and the provisions for others have been tightened up considerably.

Included in this measure is provision for certain improvements in Irondequoit Bay, N. Y., which lies in my Congressional District. This is a project which has gained the approval of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget, and has the requisite backing of local interests. The action of the committee in eliminating much of the fat from the vetoed rivers and harbors bill improves immeasurably chances for the dream of an improved Irondequoit Bay becoming a reality.

Mr. Speaker, it is not a perfect bill before us but certainly a much better one. I feel very confident that unless the other body insists on including too many unwarranted projects in the final measure, it will be signed by the President.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a porkless omnibus rivers and harbors bill has long been the ambition of the minority members of the House Committee on Public Works. Because few of us are experts in the field of engineering and even fewer of us are registered qualified civil engineers, we have to depend upon the opinions of experts to reach many of our decisions in committee.

Previously, the advice of these experts was ignored. In many of the projects included in the original omnibus rivers and harbors bill vetoed by the President, there were either no engineering reports available for the proposed construction

or else there was serious doubt in the minds of our people in the Bureau of the Budget as to the financial feasibility of such new construction.

Few of us would attempt to build a building without plans and approval of those plans. Few of us would attempt to construct an addition to our own homes without first determining whether we had the funds to build the addition and whether the plans we had prepared were engineeringly sound and worthwhile.

Yet the majority members of the House Committee on Public Works were asking the Federal Government to undertake just such a program on a multimillion and multibillion-dollar level.

All we of the minority were asking for was prior approval of the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget that the proposals put forth to our committee were engineeringly sound and financially beneficial to the area involved and the people of the United States.

The President has twice been forced to veto public works omnibus bills because of the many objectionable projects included. It is supposed to be Congress' job—particularly that of the House of Representatives—to act as a watchdog over Federal funds to see that they are spent wisely and in the best interests of our Nation. But we have found ourselves in the peculiar position for the last 4 years of having our President forced into the position of watchdog over our Federal coffers.

Sometimes in the midst of million- and billion-dollar appropriation and authorization bills, it is easy to forget that every penny of the money for the projects approved by Congress must be paid for out of the pocketbooks of our constituents. No one has denied that paying Federal taxes is a painful process, especially in these days of high-living costs. But the task of extracting huge volumes of money from our citizens becomes doubly painful when these people—the good citizens of our Nation—are aware that the expense is uncalled for and unnecessary.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 3910, with an amendment?

Mr. MCGREGOR. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 374, nays 17, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]
YEAS—374

Abernethy	Barden	Bolling
Adair	Baring	Bolton
Addonizio	Barrett	Bonner
Albert	Bass, N. H.	Bosch
Alexander	Bass, Tenn.	Boykin
Allen, Calif.	Bates	Boyle
Allen, Ill.	Baumhart	Bray
Anderson, Mont.	Beamer	Breeding
Andrews	Becker	Brooks, La.
Anfuso	Beckworth	Brooks, Tex.
Arendis	Belcher	Broomfield
Ashley	Bennett, Fla.	Brown, Ga.
Ashmore	Bennett, Mich.	Brown, Mo.
Aspinall	Bentley	Brown, Ohio
Auchincloss	Berry	Brownson
Avery	Betts	Broyhill
Bailey	Blatnik	Budge
Baker	Blitch	Burdick
Baldwin	Boggs	Burleson
	Boland	Bush

Byrd	Henderson
Byrne, Ill.	Herlong
Byrne, Pa.	Heselton
Byrnes, Wis.	Hess
Canfield	Hiestand
Cannon	Hill
Carnahan	Hillings
Cederberg	Hoeven
Chamberlain	Hollifield
Chelf	Holland
Chenoweth	Holmes
Chiperfield	Holt
Christopher	Holtzman
Church	Horan
Clark	Hosmer
Clevenger	Huddleston
Coad	Hull
Coffin	Hyde
Collier	Ikard
Colmer	Jackson
Cooley	James
Corbett	Jarman
Coudert	Jennings
Cramer	Jensen
Cretella	Johansen
Cunningham, Iowa	Johnson
Cunningham, Nebr.	Jones, Ala.
Curtin	Jones, Mo.
Curtis, Mass.	Judd
Curtis, Mo.	Karsten
Dague	Kean
Davis, Tenn.	Kearns
Dawson, Ill.	Keating
Dawson, Utah	Kee
Delaney	Kelly, N. Y.
Dellay	Keogh
Dennison	Kilgore
Dent	King
Denton	Kirwan
Derounian	Kitchin
Devereux	Kluczynski
Diggs	Knox
Dingell	Knutson
Dixon	Lafore
Dollinger	Laird
Donohue	Lane
Dooley	Lankford
Dorn, N. Y.	LeCompte
Dorn, S. C.	Lennon
Dowdy	Lesinski
Doyle	Libonati
Durham	Lipscomb
Dwyer	Loser
Edmondson	McCormack
Elliott	McCulloch
Everett	McDonough
Evins	McFall
Fallon	McGovern
Farbsteln	McGregor
Fascell	McIntire
Felghan	McIntosh
Fenton	McMillan
Fino	Macdonald
Flood	Machrowicz
Flynt	Mack, Ill.
Fogarty	Mack, Wash.
Forand	Madden
Ford	Magnuson
Forrester	Mahon
Fountain	Maillard
Frazier	Martin
Frelinghuysen	Mathews
Friedel	May
Fulton	Meader
Garmatz	Metcalf
Gary	Michel
Gathings	Miller, Calif.
Gavin	Miller, Nebr.
George	Miller, N. Y.
Glenn	Mills
Gordon	Minshall
Granahan	Mitchell
Grant	Montoya
Gray	Moore
Green, Oreg.	Morano
Green, Pa.	Morgan
Griffin	Morrison
Griffiths	Moss
Gubser	Multer
Hagen	Mumma
Hale	Murray
Haley	Natcher
Halleck	Nicholson
Hardy	Nimtz
Harris	Nix
Harrison, Nebr.	Norblad
Haskell	Norrell
Hays, Ark.	O'Brien, Ill.
Hays, Ohio	O'Brien, N. Y.
Healey	O'Hara, Ill.
Hébert	O'Konski
Hemphill	O'Neill
	Osmers
	Ostertag
	Passman
	Patman

Patterson	Pelly
Perkins	Perkins
Pfost	Philbin
Philbin	Pilcher
Poage	Polk
Porter	Porter
Powell	Price
Prouty	Prouty
Quile	Rabaut
Rabaut	Ray
Reed	Reed
Reuss	Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Ariz.	Rhodes, Pa.
Rhodes, Pa.	Riehlman
Riehlman	Riley
Riley	Roberts
Roberts	Robeson, Va.
Robeson, Va.	Robison, N. Y.
Robison, N. Y.	Robison, Ky.
Rodino	Rodino
Rogers, Colo.	Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Fla.	Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Mass.	Rogers, Tex.
Rogers, Tex.	Rooney
Rooney	Roosevelt
Roosevelt	Rutherford
Rutherford	Santangelo
Santangelo	Saund
Saund	Saylor
Saylor	Schenck
Schenck	Schwengel
Schwengel	Scott, N. C.
Scott, N. C.	Scott, Pa.
Scott, Pa.	Scrivner
Scrivner	Scudder
Scudder	Seely-Brown
Seely-Brown	Selden
Selden	Sheehan
Sheehan	Shelley
Shelley	Sheppard
Sheppard	Sieminski
Sieminski	Sikes
Sikes	Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Ill.	Sisk
Sisk	Smith, Calif.
Smith, Calif.	Smith, Kans.
Smith, Kans.	Smith, Miss.
Smith, Miss.	Smith, Va.
Smith, Va.	Spence
Spence	Springer
Springer	Stagers
Stagers	Steed
Steed	Sullivan
Sullivan	Talle
Talle	Taylor
Taylor	Teague, Calif.
Teague, Calif.	Teague, Tex.
Teague, Tex.	Teller
Teller	Tewes
Tewes	Thomas
Thomas	Thompson, La.
Thompson, La.	Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, N. J.	Thompson, Tex.
Thompson, Tex.	Thomson, Wyo.
Thomson, Wyo.	Thoinberry
Thoinberry	Tollefson
Tollefson	Trimble
Trimble	Udall
Udall	Ullman
Ullman	Utt
Utt	Vanik
Vanik	Van Pelt
Van Pelt	Van Zandt
Van Zandt	Vinson
Vinson	Vorys
Vorys	Vursell
Vursell	Wainwright
Wainwright	Walter
Walter	Watts
Watts	Weaver
Weaver	Westland
Westland	Whitener
Whitener	Whitten
Whitten	Widnall
Widnall	Wier
Wier	Wigglesworth
Wigglesworth	Williams, N. Y.
Williams, N. Y.	Willis
Willis	Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Calif.	Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Ind.	Winstead
Winstead	Withrow
Withrow	Wright
Wright	Young
Young	Zablocki
Zablocki	Zelenko

NAYS—17

Abbt	Harrison, Va.
Alger	Harvey
Andersen	Jonas
H. Carl	Kilburn
Bow	Marshall
Gross	Mason

NOT VOTING—39

Ayres	Kilday	Radwan
Buckley	Krueger	Rains
Celler	Landrum	Reece, Tenn.
Davis, Ga.	Latham	Rivers
Dies	McCarthy	Sadlak
Eberharter	McVey	Scherer
Engle	Morrow	Shuford
Fisher	Miller, Md.	Simpson, Pa.
Gregory	Morris	Stauffer
Gwinn	Moulder	Tuck
Hoffman	Neal	Williams, Miss.
Jenkins	O'Hara, Minn.	Wolverton
Kearney	Preston	Yates

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Yates with Mr. Wolverton.
Mr. Preston with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Neal.
Mr. Engle with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Tuck with Mr. Stauffer.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Miller of Maryland.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Morris with Mr. McVey.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Krueger.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Morrow.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. KILBURN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A similar House bill (H. R. 12955) was laid on the table.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on the House amendment and ask for a conference with the Senate on the bill just passed and that the Speaker appoint conferees.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DAVIS of Tennessee, BLATNIK, JONES of Alabama, MCGREGOR, and MACK of Washington.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12948) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 12948, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, this is the annual appropriation bill to finance the activities of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1959. The bill, as approved by the committee, recommends a total appropriation of \$203,276,100, which is a reduction of \$11,877,400 in the estimates.

There are two major categories of expenses in the bill. The first is operating expenses. The committee considered a budget estimate of \$171,700,500 for this purpose and recommends \$168,902,000, a reduction of \$2,798,500 in the estimates but an increase of \$9,067,520 above 1958 appropriations. The second category of expense is capital outlay and the budget estimate is \$43,453,000. The committee has approved \$34,374,100, a reduction of \$9,078,900 in the estimates and a reduction of \$4,242,900 below 1958 appropriations. In summary, the committee has recommended a reduction in the total estimates of approximately 5½ percent and an increase of approximately 2½ percent above 1958 appropriations.

The only Federal funds in the bill are the Federal payments to the various funds of the District and the table on page 1 of the report gives a summary of our recommendations. The Federal payments to the water and sewage funds are for the costs of such services rendered by the District to Federal installations. The Federal payment to the highway fund is authorized by Public Law 731 of the 84th Congress and is to reimburse the District for funds expended in constructing the East Capitol Street highway—railroad grade separation. On the payment to the water fund, we went over the budget by \$200,000 and that is the amount necessary—with a little reserve for contingencies—to finance the present estimate of cost of \$516,000 for a fish ladder on the Little Falls Dam on the Potomac River. This amount is in addition to a Federal payment of \$200,000 and an appropriation of \$150,000 from the District of Columbia water fund, both of which were made in fiscal year 1957. The fishway will provide an additional 8 to 10 miles of river area for spawning purposes and, according to testimony, would increase the commercial fishery value by as much as \$200,000 annually.

The controversial item in the bill, if I may so label it, is the Federal payment to the general fund. The current authorized annual payment is \$23 million but the way the legislation was written sev-

eral years ago, the District could ask for the authorized but unappropriated payment of prior fiscal years. Therefore, they asked for \$25 million this year. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$20 million. Even with this reduction of \$5 million in the Federal payment, the District still will have a surplus in the general fund of over \$3 million at the end of fiscal year 1959.

In addition, the committee has authorized the District to borrow from the Federal Treasury for capital outlay purposes the budget estimate of \$8,600,000, of which \$5.5 million is a loan to the highway fund and \$3.1 million is a loan to the water fund. These are interest-bearing loans of approximately 3 percent and are used only as needed to assist in financing the construction of highways and the expansion and improvement of the District's water system.

The table at the end of the report indicates that only 6 items in the bill received the budget estimate and that 26 items received a reduction in the estimate.

However, just about every item in the bill received an increase above last year. There are only two items that received a reduction below last year's appropriations as a result of committee action. These two are: the Office of Civil Defense and the Washington aqueduct.

Most of the increases allowed were justified, in our minds, because of increased workload, for mandatory reasons such as staffing for new buildings and Civil Service Commission reclassification of positions, and in some instances for improvements in services. I shall mention only a few of these increases.

One of the biggest increases allowed, \$2.5 million, is for the public schools. This item in particular fits all three categories of justification. The significant decision of the committee was not to allow a reduction in the pupil-teacher ratio until additional classrooms are constructed. For the past several years, the committee has been allowing the full budget request for additional teachers to handle the increasing pupil population, which is about 111,000 this year. In addition, in the past 2 years, the Congress has allowed funds for employing additional teachers to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio. Each year the ratio has been reduced, the number of part-time or half-day sessions has increased. The committee does not believe that part-time classes are beneficial to the education of a child in his most formative years. However, it is sympathetic to the public school system of education and it realizes the need for additional classrooms. In marking up the bill—especially the public school construction program—the committee took that need into consideration and recommended an unbudgeted \$1.1 million for 4 projects for planning and for constructing an additional 71 classrooms for which the budget requested funds for the acquisition of the 4 school sites only.

Another major item of increase is \$2.75 million for the Department of Public Health. As you may recall, the committee made an investigation of this

Department last year which pointed up several major deficiencies. Several of these deficiencies were administrative in nature and the Department is making substantial progress in overcoming them. Some of the areas in the Department that were woefully weak needed financial assistance. The committee is well aware of this financial need, particularly at D. C. General, and has recommended an increase of \$2.75 million over 1958 funds to assist this Department to more adequately meet the health needs of the District government.

The third major item of increase above 1958 funding is \$1.8 million for the Department of Public Welfare. Of this increase, \$1.3 million is for the public assistance activity and is to finance an increasing number of recipients of public assistance funds and to increase the amount of the individual grant. The average monthly number of cases receiving public assistance has grown from 7,025 in 1953 to 9,512 cases in 1958. For fiscal year 1959 the estimate is 10,400 cases.

During the month of April the total caseload by type of assistance is as follows:

Type:	Cases
Old-age assistance.....	3,109
Aid to dependent children.....	3,029
Aid to the blind.....	237
Aid to the totally disabled.....	2,432
General public assistance.....	1,061

Parenthetically, the category showing the biggest increase in caseload has been the program for aid to dependent children which has grown from 2,113 cases in July 1956 to 3,029 cases in April of this year.

A portion of the increase approved for this public assistance activity is for increasing the amount of the individual grant. The following table shows the present and proposed public assistance maximum grants by typical family composition:

	Present	Proposed
1 adult living alone.....	\$77.19	\$82.82
2 adults living together.....	112.88	119.24
Family of 3 persons.....	134.46	148.30
Family of 4 persons.....	146.91	172.27
Family of 6 persons.....	185.09	222.36

Comparing this proposed District of Columbia grant of \$172.27 for a family of 4 persons, I find that Detroit would pay \$218.05, Alexandria would pay \$159.50, and Baltimore would pay \$132.

The balance of the increase allowed for this Department, \$501,000, is for financing increased population and improving services rendered at the various welfare institutions under the jurisdiction of the Department.

The fourth major increase over 1958 funds is \$2.5 million for public building construction. However, this is a net reduction of \$3.9 million in the budget estimate. The committee, the Commissioners, and the joint fiscal subcommittee of the legislative committees joined together in achieving this reduction. As you know, the Congress recently passed H. R. 12377 which authorized a revised construction program for the District.

In its consideration of the legislation the joint subcommittee deleted items from the program which were already in the 1959 budget and the committee has gone along with their recommendations in each instance. In some cases, the Commissioners offered reductions as the construction program would not be able to use all the funds as originally contemplated by the budget. And the committee has made several reductions on its own initiative and these reductions are explained on pages 15 and 16 of the report.

In summary, I would say that this is a good bill. While the estimates have been reduced, I do not believe any department or agency in the bill has suffered. After all, every item in the bill with the exception of the Office of Civil Defense and Washington Aqueduct, either received the budget estimate or an actual increase in funds above what they had in fiscal year 1958. Therefore, I say again, this is a good bill and I urge your support of the committee in its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has consumed 16 minutes.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to add first my compliments to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] on the splendid job he did in interrogating witnesses and in justifying such expenditures as we provide in this bill. I have served on this subcommittee, perhaps longer than any other Member. I think we have come up with one of the best bills for financing the District of Columbia government since I have been a Member. It is thorough in every respect.

The committee has been attempting to equalize the burden of the District of Columbia government between the citizens of the District and the Federal Government. We realize the Government does have a responsibility to help support the District government in view of property owned and the protection from the District government. I have generally stood for greater Federal contributions because I realize it is a considerable Federal responsibility and our Capital City. It should be a model city.

However, I do not think it is the entire responsibility of the Federal Government.

Just this morning I had an experience which was quite startling. I had occasion to have a lock repaired on my car. I drove to a locksmith on North Capitol Street. It was necessary for me to drive back in the alley. I wish every Member of Congress would drive through that alley. When you see slums of that sort existing within a few blocks of our Capitol, you realize that something needs to be done. I especially want to call this to the attention of the District Department of Health. There were dead rats and other dead animals lying in the alley. I counted 15 or 20 beer cans for each milk bottle that I saw out in the back yards. There were broken bottles. It was a mess. It is a shame to have a situation like that in the Capital City.

We have been trying to equalize the tax load so that we can have adequate assessments on property values for the

District. That reassessment will be finished within a short time, and then I believe we can arrive at what we feel is a comparable tax load for the citizens of the District as compared with those in Virginia and Maryland.

It is quite understandable for District folks to pull the leg of Uncle Sam for all the money they can get. Everyone does. But I feel the committee adequately conveyed to the witnesses that some of the ills are not going to be cured simply by money. If we had listened and been sold on some of the testimony presented to the committee, we would have been led to feel that any trouble was due to lack of money. Certainly that is not the case.

Money alone is not going to give the Nation's Capital the finest schools. Money alone is not going to give us the finest Police Department. I think we do have a very satisfactory Police Department, one of the best. We think our schools are improving. We hope by use of the standardized tests, properly administered, comparing those with the national norms, we can determine where our schools are with the rest of the Nation. We are satisfied with the Fire Department. We called attention to the shortcomings at the zoo, scene of a very serious casualty recently.

As our chairman said, we provided money for a fish ladder. We made a recommendation to people in nearby Maryland and Virginia, sportsmen and other sports-minded people, to prevail upon their States to cooperate and provide \$650,000, of which \$400,000 comes from the Federal Government, for a fish ladder. A fish ladder alone is not going to make better fishing.

Fish must go up the river to spawn. I think I am fair in saying that we reluctantly went along with that recommendation, because we wanted to provide a spawning ground for the fish. However, there are no fishing laws governing the lower Potomac. There is no season on these prize fish to spawn. They go up the river, and that is where these real fishermen are catching fish by the ton.

Unless we get cooperation with those States in passing laws governing fishing in the Potomac, the fish ladder is going to do little good.

I must pay my respects to one fine gentleman who appeared before the committee in behalf of a reduced budget. He is our Veterans' Service Officer for the District, Colonel Leonard. We have been cutting Colonel Leonard's appropriation every year for a number of years until it seemed that he could not continue operating if we cut him further. At one time he even came up and offered to take a small reduction. If any of you have ever had occasion to call Colonel Leonard, to assist you with some problems concerning veterans, I know you have received excellent cooperation.

I just had to say those few words in behalf of Colonel Leonard in view of the fine work he has done in helping us achieve a balanced budget.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that is all I care to say.

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

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any money in this bill for a stadium, or is any provision made for a stadium? Is there anything in this bill pertaining to a stadium in the District of Columbia?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. There are no funds provided in this bill for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on District of Columbia of the Committee on Appropriations once again brings to the floor of the House for your approval the annual District of Columbia appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1959.

It has been a pleasure serving with our subcommittee chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], and the other members of this committee. We were ably assisted by Francis Merrill, our staff assistant.

The District of Columbia program will be financed by the Federal payment, Federal loan authorization and District of Columbia revenue.

The bill before us today contains a Federal contribution of \$20 million to the general fund, \$431,600 to the highway fund, \$1,732,000 to the water fund, and \$697,000 to the sanitary sewage works fund.

The Federal payment to the District from 1924 to 1957 has ranged from \$4,539,295 to \$20 million. The budget for the District of Columbia during this period has increased from \$23,923,754 to the amount recommended in this bill of \$203,276,100.

This bill provides operating expenses totaling \$168,902,000 and further provides capital outlay of \$34,374,100.

The District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1959 provides operating expenses in the sum of \$382,000 for the executive office; \$4,700,000 for the Department of General Administration; \$650,000 for the Office of Corporation Counsel; \$1,400,000 for regulatory agencies; \$299,000 for the Department of Occupations and Professions; \$39,758,000 for the public schools; \$2,140,000 for the Public Library; \$2,250,000 for the Recreation Department; \$18,460,000 for the Metropolitan Police; \$9,187,000 for the Fire Department; \$97,000 for the Department of Veterans' Affairs; \$80,000 for the Office of Civil Defense; \$215,000 for the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation; \$4,953,000 for the courts; \$20,505,000 for the Department of Public Health; \$5,437,000 for the Department of Corrections; \$15,000,000 for the Department of Public Welfare; \$2,135,000 for the Department of Buildings and Grounds; \$180,000 for the Office of Surveyor; \$2,000,000 for the Department of Licenses and Inspections; \$7,484,000 for the Department of Highways; \$1,465,000 for the Department of Vehicles and Traffic; \$310,000 for the Motor Vehicle Parking Agency; \$13,590,000 for the De-

partment of Sanitary Engineering; \$2,322,000 for the Washington Aqueduct; \$155,000 for the National Guard; \$2,850,000 for the National Capital Parks; and \$898,000 for the National Zoological Park.

The amount recommended for the Metropolitan Police of \$18,460,000 is the third largest item under operating expenses. Our Police Department should be one of the most efficient in the United States. The residents of the District of Columbia, and the visitors to our National Capital are entitled to this kind of a police department.

The amount appropriated for the Police Department provides for \$472,059 for administration; \$14,361,066 for prevention and detection of crime; \$158,514 for special services; \$48,361 for the dog pound; \$3,509,000 for policemen's pension and relief fund. This is an increase of \$389,000 over the budget for 1958 and does not include the \$192,000 in the second 1958 supplemental bill for emergency police funds for combating crimes on the streets in the District. In 1955 we had an appropriation of \$13,621,001; \$14,577,614 for 1956; \$14,531,100 for 1957 and for 1958 we have the sum of \$18,150,000.

Public Law 514 of the 84th Congress provided for a police force of 2,500. For a number of years the chief of police has attempted to recruit the total force authorized by law, and so far has been unsuccessful. On April 30 of this year the total force was 2,332. Our committee recommends funds for 2,500 man-years of employment in this bill. Even though the total force is less than 2,500, the additional funds are to be used for payment of salaries of policemen who work on their day off. Crime has increased in the District and this is the general condition throughout the United States.

In 1946 the major crimes in the United States totaled 1,685,203, and in 1956 the major crimes totaled 2,563,150. Here we have an increase of 40 percent. Not only have we had an increase in crime but we have experienced a definite shift to more brutal crimes.

Sixteen thousand three hundred and fifty-four major crimes were committed in the District of Columbia during the year 1957. This list includes murder, manslaughter, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, auto theft, and grand and petty larceny. In the District we had 78 murders in 1957, 23 negligent manslaughters, 185 rape cases, 718 robberies, 2,708 aggravated assaults, 3,058 burglaries, 7,826 larcenies, and 1,758 auto thefts.

The Police Department in the District operates under a 3-shift, 8-hour day. The daily average of foot patrolmen on the 8 a. m. to 4 p. m. shift totals 109; 223 on the 4 p. m. to 12 midnight shift and 135 on the 12 to 8 a. m. shift. The total for foot patrolmen at the present time is 467. Keep in mind that the authorized force of the Metropolitan Police Department is 2,500.

In order to have a better Police Department in the District of Columbia more foot patrolmen must be assigned to the precincts where the majority of the

crimes are being committed. More foot patrolmen must be assigned throughout the District. The pending salary increase proposal for police officers in the District should be approved. Approval of such legislation will prevent the other branches of our Government from taking people out of the Metropolitan Police Force by offering more attractive salary schedules. Salary schedules should be established for the District of Columbia commensurate with the police departments of cities comparable in size. Starting salary for a private in the District of Columbia is \$4,193; in Baltimore the starting salary is \$4,400; in Minneapolis, \$4,776; the starting salary in Cincinnati, where, by the way, we have one of the finest police departments in the United States, is \$4,567. The District of Columbia is about 17th in the United States insofar as salaries are concerned.

Law-enforcement problems are considerably different in the District of Columbia than they are in any other city. This is due partly to the huge number of visitors each year and to the number of known law violators who finally land in the District of Columbia from other cities and towns.

The strongest bulwark against crime is the up-to-date progressive hometown police department. In order to have such a police agency, we must have adequate manpower, and sufficient funds for suitable salaries, training, and facilities.

The best deterrent against crime is the foot patrolman. His main job is to prevent crime and he does this by reducing the opportunity for occurrence by surveillance and patrol. The violator is discouraged by virtue of the quick threat of sure retaliation.

In addition to more foot patrolmen in the District of Columbia, every consideration should be given at the present time to one-man patrol cars. This would release one or more men from each car, thereby increasing the number of foot patrolmen. A number of cities with excellent police departments comparable in size to the District operate one-man patrol cars. Single patrolmen operating alone in cars are more efficient because the officer patrolling must give first attention to police duties. There are no distractions other than those he is obligated to notice on his beat, and he is completely self-dependent for his own safety and welfare. When an officer is alone in his patrol car he knows that he has no one else to rely upon in the event of trouble; consequently, he is more cautious about stepping into dangerous situations and is better prepared to take care of unexpected emergencies. The presence of a second officer appears to encourage assumption of unnecessary risk.

Regardless of the efficiency of the Metropolitan Police Force, crime conditions will not improve in the District unless adequate sentences are meted out to law violators. A sentence of 90 days in a yoking case is the equivalent of awarding a medal. This has occurred in the District of Columbia. Anyone guilty of yoking a citizen of the District of Colum-

bia or a visitor in our Capital City should under no circumstances receive such a sentence, but in each and every case an adequate sentence should be meted out. In most instances the question should be asked as to how much can be given and not what is the minimum sentence that can be granted in such cases.

Crime conditions will improve in the District of Columbia when more foot patrolmen are assigned to the streets and adequate salaries are paid to the members of the Police Department. The new retirement act for District of Columbia policemen should reduce the problems of recruitment and retention of police personnel.

Mr. Chairman, our committee recommends this bill to the Members of the House.

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

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

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. RABAUT. Neither have I, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12948) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1959

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has signed H. R. 11767, the appropriations measure for the Department of Agriculture for 1959. The total appropriated or authorized in this bill is \$3,191,875,539 as compared to \$3,320,888,539 for 1958. I regard this as sound and progressive legislation. As a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I am pleased to have had a part in the passage of H. R. 11767. It is beneficial not only to our American farmers, but to all our people, and to future generations.

When the President presented the budget, he recommended that the agricultural conservation program for 1959 be reduced from previous authorizations of \$250 million annually to \$125 million. If history were to repeat itself the amount of conservation practices carried out on the Nation's farms would be drastically curtailed. The tonnage of agricultural limestone, one of the most popular conservation practices, dropped from over 30 million tons in 1947 to 25 million in 1948, of which 29 million and 22 million tons respectively were accounted for under the ACP.

Liming is one of the most needed conservation practices in my District in Indiana and the entire humid area of this Nation. This product supplies the calcium, magnesium, and other minor elements needed to produce vigorous crops which are transmitted to the people and are the basis for strong healthy bodies.

I have consistently supported appropriations for the extension service, rural electrification, and telephone systems which have helped modernize our farms and raise the standard of living of this segment of our population. The new act increases the amount for the extension service by \$3 million. This is for use by the States for salaries and expenses of county agents to promote the educational phase of our farm programs. This increase is in contrast to the reduction of over \$76,000 proposed in the budget.

The act includes \$317 million for rural electrification loans and \$67.5 million for rural telephone loans as compared to \$150 million and \$56 million respectively for these items in the budget. Had the Congress not acted wisely, our farmers and rural population would have suffered a severe setback in the progress being made to improve their standards of living. In the case of the Farmers Home Administration the regular loan authorization was retained at \$209.5 million which is \$34.5 million over the budget request. A contingency fund of \$20 million was also established for this agency.

For research in agriculture, the Congress recognized the importance of the Agricultural Research Service by appropriating \$18.3 million more than in 1958.

In another field of conservation, the conservation reserve part of the Soil Bank, \$375 million is authorized. This is \$75 million more than was available for 1958. In the past 2 years farmers have used only a small portion of the funds available for this program. It is growing in popular acceptance. However, I believe that if any funds remain in this appropriation after all farmers have been offered the opportunity to participate, the State committees should be granted the authority to reallocate such unused funds to farmers for carrying out additional conservation practices under the ACP. Since requests from farmers for conservation assistance greatly exceed the funds available under the ACP, and since soil conservation is the prime objective of each of these programs, the farmer committees should have some latitude in allocating the funds where they are most needed and will result in the greatest amount of conservation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one more observation. It is unfortunate that the administration of the agricultural conservation program cannot be entrusted to the Department of Agriculture. Despite testimony before Congressional committees last year, the Department attempted by administrative directive to change and curtail the practices available to farmers under the program. This year the act contains language to prohibit the Department from making changes unless they are first recommended by the county committees and then approved by the State committees.

The Congress wisely incorporated these provisions into H. R. 11767 but only because witnesses from the Department admitted to the Subcommittee on Appropriations that the proposed program had not been checked with the farmer committees. It developed that these committees did not approve of the proposed changes. Hence I say, it is unfortunate that we cannot entrust the Department to carry out the program as developed under the democratically elected committeemen and State committeemen appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

It is my hope, and I believe that of my colleagues in the Congress, that the development and administration of the program will be restored to the committee system and that the officials of the Department of Agriculture will provide the needed leadership and technical assistance for efficient administration of the program to get the most conservation from every dollar of expenditure for the program.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12858) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; and pend-

ing that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 12858, with Mr. Boggs in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the bill reported by the committee reduces the budget estimate by \$1,898,800.

As originally submitted to the committee, the Bureau of the Budget instituted a slowdown program which would have resulted in increasing the cost of projects without compensating advantage. When the committee rejected this budget, the Bureau then submitted a new budget adding \$125 million to going projects of the corps and \$70,823,000 to Bureau of Reclamation projects. It was testified that these increases would result in substantial ultimate savings due to speedup in construction.

Because of additional amounts budgeted, the committee has held to the policy of not increasing amounts budgeted for specific purposes on individual projects.

There are 45 unbudgeted projects in the construction programs and 26 unbudgeted surveys included by the committee.

We made a material savings in the reclamation loan program for which \$25,200,000 was requested. In view of the fact that the items were not spelled out project-by-project, and only one of the potential projects had been properly authorized, we reduced the item by \$20,400,000.

Mr. Chairman, we would like to include as amendments two items which have been received in the last few days from the Bureau of the Budget. We were confronted with the proposition of including them in the present bill at this time, or adding them as a new chapter to another bill. In order to avoid that unnecessary proceeding, we propose to offer them today. They have been justified by the Budget and are merely routine appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I might say, too, that the committee in drafting this bill has not given weight to the argument that in a depression the appropriation of such amounts will serve to stave off the depression. All testimony points to the fact that any such amount which might be added to this bill would have a negligible effect on the general economy, in comparison with the huge amount involved as a whole. This is a public works bill and not a relief bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Public Works Appropriation bill which is now before the House for the fiscal year 1959 includes funds for the Quartermaster Corps, cemetery expenses, the civil works activities of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern and Southwestern Power Administrations, and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Estimates received by the committee for these agencies for fiscal year 1959 total \$1,076,016,000, as contained in the 1959 budget and in House Documents Nos. 351 and 354. The committee recommends in this bill appropriations of \$1,074,117,200, a reduction of \$1,898,800 below the budget request.

Over a 2-month period, as you will read in the report, the committee took testimony totalling 3,901 pages in the printed hearings from representatives of the agencies involved and approximately 900 other witnesses, including 190 Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

The Army Engineers section in this bill provides for \$779,714,000; for the Bureau of Reclamation, \$245,739,200; for Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration and Southwestern Power Administration a total of \$31,814,000 and for the Tennessee Valley Authority \$16,850,000; or as I said before a grand total of \$1,074,117,200.

That is a lot of money, of course, but comparatively speaking it is small compared to what we appropriate for other activities of our Government, being just about one-thirty-eighth of the amount we appropriate for national defense and is a fraction of the amount we appropriate to foreign aid.

Let us remember when we think about this bill and the cost that is involved in taking care of all the rivers and harbors improvements, hydroelectric power, reclamation, irrigation, everything that we appropriate money for in this bill is for America, every dime.

Let me give you an idea of the magnitude of the job which the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have to do and the great responsibility that rests upon the members of the Committee on Public Works appropriations and the Public Works legislative committee and the Congress in general and, of course, the American people. Just let me give you some facts and figures.

In evaluating the large amount carried in this bill, it must be realized that it includes funds to meet widespread Federal responsibilities in the fields of navigation, flood control, and reclamation. Parenthetically, let me say that no private individual, no political subdivision or organization in America except a Federal agency can put any structure in a Federal stream or change the course of that stream in any way without first getting the permission of the Federal Government. So it is a great responsibility for the Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to handle this great pub-

lic works job. The magnitude of Federal responsibility is evidenced by the fact that in addition to the coastal harbors and channels, and the Great Lakes, the total length of our main streams and tributaries is about 60,000 miles. Of that some 22,600 miles have been improved, and improvement of about 6,000 miles more have been authorized. The need for continuing Federal outlays to improve and maintain this vast river system is self-evident.

Since the 1936 Flood Control Act, assigned to the Corps of Engineers, responsibility for nationwide flood control, 358 projects having a total cost of \$980 million have been completed and 155 projects having a total estimated cost of \$3,900,000,000 are under construction. Not only are these projects preventing needless loss of life, but they are also preventing flood damage estimated to average about one-half billion dollars annually. An equal amount of damage is still being incurred on the main rivers and their tributaries and this loss can be curtailed only by continuing to pursue this program to bring to all sections of this country the benefits of flood control. The money we have spent on flood control is not reimbursable. The money that this Congress appropriates for irrigation and reclamation is returned to the Treasury to the extent of about 85 percent of the money so expended. That revenue comes from the irrigators and from power revenues.

Many local communities have not in the past contributed much to their project. Local participation has been almost nil on many of such projects. Our committee is determined to see to it that henceforth where projects benefit local areas that a substantial local contribution is made to the cost of the project.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I approve of this bill as a whole. However, there are a few projects where I find the committee has been too liberal. I understand amendments will be offered to reduce a couple of the items that are in this bill for those projects.

The Army Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Soil Conservation Service, the County Extension Service, et cetera, of this Nation all are working in full cooperation in the conservation of our priceless soil. They have come fully to the realization that this Nation must never forget that our soil will wear out. Looking around the world any place you care to go you will find where those nations who forgot many, many years ago that their soil would wear out, blow away and wash away to the seas. Without a single exception, there you will find misery and strife, and in many cases cold war and in some places bloodshed. Their people are looking for new productive lands. To a very great degree that is the cause for this unrest around the world. I am happy that we in America took hold of soil conservation and flood control before it was too late, but there is much

yet to be done. We were fast on the way to the same fate as in the other nations before we started the soil conservation program in 1935.

There is much to be said about this bill. I feel deep down in my heart that this Nation must never forget that the preservation of our high standard of living depends upon the productivity of our soil.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe many of the older Members of the House, for the last 20 years at least, have heard the gentleman from Iowa make this statement time after time, that the prosperity of the United States will depend eventually upon whether or not we conserve our soil. I cannot help but rise at this time to pay what I consider a deserved tribute to the gentleman from Iowa for the splendid work he has done throughout the years in the Congress of the United States in conserving what I consider to be our second most precious asset of the United States, next to our children; that is, the soil of America.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman; and I must say that the gentleman from Minnesota has been in the forefront in this great and important fight to conserve our precious soil.

Let me just state one more fact before I yield the floor: We hear a great deal about the high cost of food but do you know that all America today spends in the neighborhood of only about 26 percent of our income for food, while the average over the rest of the world is more than 60 percent? This means that in America we have about 74 percent of the income of the American people to spend for other things, where the rest of the world on the average has less than 40 percent to spend for luxuries, automobiles, refrigerators, and everything else, which makes their life less enjoyable than we who live in this blessed land of ours, the good old U. S. A.

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee has one of the most difficult tasks of any in the Congress. Its members are subjected to tremendous strain of long hours of sitting through exhaustive testimony on a seemingly never-ending variety of projects, many of which cannot possibly hold great interest or promise. Yet, they do this herculean task with courtesy and tact. Then when the long hearings are ended, they have the thankless responsibility of trying to decide what is the proper course of procedure in bringing a bill to the floor. Obviously, only a small percentage of the items that are heard can be included.

The bill presently before us is, I think, the best one this committee has ever approved. It is not bound by the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget or by the recommendations of the administration. It projects the thinking and sound judgment of the committee and that I approve most

heartily. Altogether too often we seem unable to depart from the line of thinking laid down for us by some other agency of Government.

This bill is an investment in America. It is predicated upon America's promise of tomorrow. When we develop our rivers and harbors, we develop arteries of traffic which stimulate the development of America. I recognize the fact that in our zeal to develop our own districts, we may sometimes oversell projects which in actual operation do not live up to our predictions. Yet, I am strongly convinced that in the overwhelming majority of cases our recommendations are sound and that subsequent developments substantiate the judgment of the Congress in developing waterways and harbors. Be that as it may, I have no apology ever for wanting to develop our own country, for it is here that our future and the future of the world is to be found.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I cannot support the pending bill. It contains so many large items that are not authorized by law and contains items where the figures are many millions of dollars above the authorization that the Congress by law has provided. When the items are reached under the 5-minute rule I propose to make points of order against all of those involved.

For instance, there are appropriations in here for items where the appropriations in the case of one item, for instance, is as much as \$57,702,233 above the authorization figure. I do not believe in doing business that way. I do not think we can afford to go back on what has been provided by the authorizing committee and I feel that we should stick to it. I hope the membership will feel that it can go along with that approach. I do not like to take a position contrary to so many of my colleagues, but I feel it is my duty to my country to raise this question and I intend to raise it as the bill is read for amendment.

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

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I heartily concur in what has been said on the floor by our chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for the very fine way in which he conducted the hearings. He was very fair to all of the witnesses and to the membership of the committee.

I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] because of the fine way in which he has always conducted himself in the hearings. I have had the privilege of serving with him for many years in connection with reclamation projects and, in my opinion, he is an authority as far as reclamation work is concerned, particularly irrigation.

I enjoyed being a member of the committee. We have worked hard and long.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, H. R. 12858 which the House Committee on Appro-

priations has reported to you is a bill in which a great majority of this body is interested.

The Public Works Subcommittee of which I am a member worked many days in hearing testimony. As the report indicates, the committee took testimony totalling 3,901 pages in 4 volumes of the printed hearings which included representatives of the agencies involved and approximately 900 other witnesses, including 190 Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

H. R. 12858 is presented to you under three titles, namely:

Title I—Civil Functions, Department of the Army.

Title II—Department of the Interior, which includes (a) Bureau of Reclamation, (b) Bonneville Power Administration, (c) Southeastern Power Administration, and (d) Southwestern Power Administration.

Title III—Tennessee Valley Authority.

Recommended in the bill for title I is an appropriation of \$779,688,300 of which \$6,915,000 is for cemeterial expenses and \$772,773,000 is for the Corps of Engineers.

Title II—which represents funds for the four bureaus of the Interior Department—is in the amount of \$277,553,200 of which \$245,739,200 is for the Bureau of Reclamation, \$30,104,000 for Bonneville Power Administration, \$735,000 for Southeastern Power Administration, and \$975,000 for Southwestern Power Administration.

Title III represents an appropriation of \$16,850,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The total amount for the three titles of this appropriation bill is \$1,074,091,500, or a decrease of \$1,924,500 from budget estimate.

The hearings required about 2 months and the funds recommended are the results of those hearings.

Our chairman, Mr. CANNON, conducted most of the hearings and he was fair to all the witnesses that appeared and was most courteous to the members on the committee.

The ranking minority member of the committee, Mr. JENSEN, as usual, was most helpful during the hearings and his knowledge of the reclamation problems, particularly power and irrigation is to my mind outstanding.

The other members of the subcommittee devoted much time and effort during the hearings to bring out the facts in all the projects and it was a pleasure to serve with them.

As usual, credit must be given the clerical staff for doing a fine job from beginning to end.

The report of our committee discloses and as has been previously said that at the request of the committee the Corps of Engineers increased the original budget estimate by \$125 million and the Bureau of Reclamation increased their original budget by \$70,823,000.

These increases were thought to not only speed up the construction work but would also provide substantial savings as well as helping to decrease the number of unemployed.

TITLE I

In general investigations for rivers and harbors and flood control the budget estimate for 1959 was \$7,800,000.

In permitting the addition of 25 unbudgeted surveys which appeared to be justified, which amounted to \$647,000, the total amount allowed for general investigations is \$8,447,800.

In general construction and planning the budget suggested a total of \$564,620,000. However, the committee was convinced that by approving \$577,085,500 that it would not only speed up the construction work on work which would ultimately be started but would in a great many instances provide work to help alleviate the unemployment problem.

You will note by the report and hearings that considerable discussions were had in the committee about the relative amounts various areas are paying for their direct contributions.

There appears to be gross inequities throughout the country in this field and it is quite evident that corrections should be made.

Likewise the question of maintenance should be resolved with equality for all.

It was also brought to our attention that there are 19 completed projects in which maintenance is being neglected or delinquency in maintenance. The committee, therefore, decided to recommend that no funds be used on any project where local interests are delinquent in their maintenance commitments.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

The committee recommended \$735,000, the same amount as the budget estimate for 1959.

This is a decrease from 1958 of \$1,204,000 and due to change in their system of net billing with its customers under power exchange contracts.

Heretofore all firming energy purchased by the Federal Government was paid through this appropriation. Now the Government will only pay the net difference between the energy bought and the energy sold.

Revenues of the Southeastern Power Administration is estimated at \$19,400,000 for fiscal 1959.

Currently, the Southeastern Power derives its revenue from the sale of electric energy from 10 Federal hydropower dams with an installed capacity of 1¼ million kilowatts.

The 10 facilities now generating power are, first, Wolf Creek; second, Center Hill; third, Dale Hollow; fourth, Old Hickory; fifth, Jim Woodruff; sixth, John H. Kerr; seventh, Philpott; eighth, Clark Hill; ninth, Allatoona; tenth, Buford.

In addition there are four other dams under construction; namely, Cheatham, Fort Gaines, Hartwell, and Barkley.

The estimated cost of these 14 facilities is in the neighborhood of over \$882 million.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

There will be no construction for 1959 and the only appropriation from the Treasury will be \$975,000 for operation and maintenance.

There is also \$4,405,000 to be appropriated from the continuing fund which is derived from receipts from the sale of power and energy. It does not represent an appropriation of new funds from the Treasury.

The Southwestern Power Administration markets power from 8 hydroelectric plants which produced 2.17 billion kilowatt-hours of energy during calendar year 1957.

These hydroelectric dams are Blakely Mountain, Bull Shoals, Norfolk, Denison, Fort Gibson, Tenkiller Ferry, Whitney and Narrows.

Southwestern Power Administration under the able administration of Mr. Douglas G. Wright has done an outstanding job over the years that I have had the privilege of being on subcommittees that have jurisdiction over this agency.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

The committee recommended for Bonneville construction in fiscal 1959 \$20,934,000, a decrease of \$66,000 from the budget estimate of \$21 million. This is a decrease of \$1,104,000 from the 1958 appropriations.

This decrease of \$66,000 was on the advice of the Department that it would not be needed and which was programed for the Lakeside substation.

Since the revised schedule calls for a speedup of construction in the Ice Harbor Dam it is necessary for earlier construction of the Ice Harbor-Franklin transmission line. Hence the Bonneville Power Administration is authorized to use \$20,000 of funds for the planning of this facility.

The committee approved \$9,170,000 for operation and maintenance, which is the amount the Bureau of the Budget requested and \$540,000 above the 1958 appropriation.

This increase is brought about by the fact that additional workload created by new lines and facilities coming into the operation and maintenance stage and for salary and wage increases.

Revenues of the Bonneville Power Administration are estimated at \$80 million for fiscal year 1959.

The Bonneville Power Administration is the marketing agency for 11 Federal generating plants and in 1959 there will be 2 additional plants—making a total of 13 generating facilities.

Their estimated sales for 1959 will be 34,200 million kilowatt-hours.

The geographical area supplied by the Bonneville grid exists in the States of Washington, Oregon, northern Idaho, and Montana, west of the Continental Divide.

RECLAMATION BUREAU

The amount recommended for general investigations for the Bureau of Reclamation for 1959 is \$4,365,474, a decrease of \$386,526 from the budget estimate.

The committee also recommended for construction \$138,986,141, a decrease of \$1,023,859 from the budget estimate of \$140,010,000.

The decreases applied to general investigations and construction are fully explained in the report of this bill.

For operation and maintenance the committee allowed the budget estimate

of \$27,500,000, a decrease of \$500,000 from 1958.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The committee has allowed an appropriation of \$16,850,000 for TVA for fiscal 1959.

This would appear to be an increase in appropriated funds of 1958 which were \$13,317,000.

However, the amount of total appropriated funds in 1958 was \$38,795,000 which included a carryover of \$25,478,799.

The carryover for 1958 is estimated at \$2,207,000 of unobligated funds which together with \$16,850,000 will make available for 1959 a total of \$19,057,000.

The committee went into the justifications submitted by TVA very thoroughly and the hearings will disclose a great many things which the taxpayers of the country should know.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support of H. R. 12858, the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1959, and to express my gratitude that the administration and the Appropriations Committee have seen fit to recommend that two projects of great concern to my district and the New York-New Jersey area generally should receive additional funds in an effort to speed their completion.

I refer to the appropriation of \$5,420,000 for the item, "New York and New Jersey Channels," which is an increase of \$1,420,000 over the original budget request. This appropriation will enable the dredging of the middle section of the Arthur Kill channel to 35 feet to be completed by June 1961, instead of June 1962. This means that a full year will be saved in the work of completely opening these important channels to the bigger and heavier ships now carrying oil and other industrial commodities in and out of the Nation's most important harbor.

The second item provides an appropriation of \$2,500,000 for construction of the Staten Island rapid transit bridge between Elizabeth, N. J., and Staten Island, N. Y. This is an increase of \$640,000 and will enable this badly needed railroad bridge to be completed by March 1960 instead of April 1960.

It has been my privilege, Mr. Chairman, to take an active and continuing interest in the progress of these important projects during the short time I have been in the Congress. I have appeared before the Appropriations Committee of the House, and I have introduced to that committee the spokesmen of the Port of New York Authority; I have also had the pleasure of working closely with the chamber of commerce of eastern Union County, the Corps of Engineers, my colleagues here in the House who represent districts with an interest in these channels, and other organizations and individuals concerned to keep this great harbor complex abreast of the changing times.

I should emphasize at this point that these projects are not simply matters of local interest. The Arthur Kill and the Kill van Kull channels, by connecting lower New York Bay to Newark Bay and upper New York Bay, serve one of the

most highly industrialized areas in the United States for the storage, refining, and distribution of petroleum products, in addition to large chemical plants, railroad, lumber, and coal terminals, public-service companies, and other industrial and commercial plants.

They also serve the ports of the world through the existing deep-draft ship lanes and the ports of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River through the Hudson River.

In fact, the total waterborne movement on this one New York-New Jersey channel added up to 98 million tons of commerce in 1956—the largest volume of tonnage of any waterway in the United States, greater even than the entire Mississippi River from Minneapolis to the Gulf of Mexico.

The importance of the New York and New Jersey channels to the New York-New Jersey port district has been steadily increasing. During the 5-year period 1936-40, when the channel had a controlling depth of 30 feet, it handled an annual average of close to 44 million short tons. Ten years later, during the period 1951-55, after most of the channel had been deepened to 35 feet, this volume had increased to over 72 million short tons, representing an increase of over 28 million short tons, or about 65 percent. In comparison, the total adjusted tonnage for the New York-New Jersey Harbor rose from 119 million to almost 144 million short tons during the same 5-year periods, representing an increase of only about 20 percent.

Furthermore, the channels project is significant not only to the port of New York but to the entire United States in its volume of waterborne movement of petroleum products. Thus, in 1955, this one channel handled 17 percent of the total United States waterborne movement of this commodity.

Approximately 25 percent of the total commerce for the New York-New Jersey channels is handled in the 6.5 mile reach of the middle section of the Arthur Kill, between Sewaren and Piles Creek, which is essentially all that remains in completing the entire 35-foot main channel between Upper and Lower New York Bays. By completing this link the full economic benefits anticipated from the project will be realized and the full capacity of these channels will be available in the event of a national emergency.

Tankers presently using the waterway have loaded drafts up to 36 feet. The major difficulty affecting the operation of deep-draft vessels on this waterway is insufficient depth and width of channel in the middle section of Arthur Kill, since this portion of the waterway cannot accommodate the larger and more efficient vessels now in use in its northerly and southerly ends.

In the present 30-foot section of Arthur Kill, the handling of deep-draft ships can be accomplished only with some hazard or by employing uneconomic methods such as carrying partial loads, navigating only on high tides during the daytime, or lightering vessels before proceeding to terminals. All these alternatives are inefficient and costly and result in appreciable loss. It is essential that a through depth of 35 feet be

provided at the earliest date for the safe and efficient movement of the millions of tons of waterborne commerce transported on this important maritime artery.

The Corps of Engineers reports that work areas have been selected to afford the best possible channel lanes to navigation interests during dredging operations consistent with existing depths. The sequence has been arranged to take advantage of available dredging equipment in this area, to permit traffic to pass without undue delays or hazards during dredging operations, and to provide the deepest available water where possible.

The existing Federal project for the New York-New Jersey channels was authorized in 1933, modified in 1934 and modified again in 1950. The present authorized project provides for a channel 37 feet deep in rock and 35 feet deep in soft material, with a width of from 500 to 800 feet.

The total estimated cost of the overall project will be \$63,362,000, of which the estimated Federal cost is \$61.9 million. Appropriations totaling \$50,645,000 have been made to date, and if the committee recommendation is approved this year a balance of \$5,835,000 is estimated to be needed to complete the project.

According to the Corps of Engineers, the revised schedule for completion of the several parts of the overall project is as follows: First, the channel from lower New York Bay along the Arthur Kill to the vicinity of Smith Creek has been completely dredged; second, dredging in the Arthur Kill from Smith Creek north to Piles Creek will be completed by November 1959; third, dredging of the Arthur Kill and the Kill van Kull to upper New York Bay has been completed; fourth, the deepening and widening of the anchorage at Perth Amboy has been completed; fifth, deepening and extending the anchorage at Sandy Hook will be completed in June 1961; sixth, dredging the cutoff at the main ship channel in lower New York Bay from 21 feet and 27 feet to a depth of 30 feet will be completed in November 1959; seventh, widening of the bend in Arthur Kill at the railroad bridge near Elizabeth by 200 feet will be finished in June 1960; and eighth, the entire project is scheduled for completion by June 1961.

As of the present, the overall project is estimated to be 77 percent complete.

In addition to the costs of engineering and design and expenses of supervision and administration, the budget for fiscal 1959 has been planned to include the following work: (a) complete dredging and rock removal from Pralls Island to Tremley Point; (b) complete dredging and rock removal in the vicinity of Carteret; (c) initiate and complete dredging Smoking to Tufts Point; (d) initiate dredging and rock removal in the vicinity of Tremley Point; and (e) initiate dredging and rock removal opposite Lakes Island.

Construction the Staten Island Rapid Transit railway bridge is a particularly important project. The bridge crosses Arthur Kill and connects Elizabeth, N. J., with Staten Island, N. Y. According to

the Corps of Engineers, the continued existence of the present bridge constitutes a threat to navigation on this waterway. The bridge is outmoded and its limited clearance and its location on a bend in the channel make for very hazardous operation of the large modern tankers that transit the channel.

During the past 24 years, over 100 accidents are reported to have occurred at the bridge. Its possible destruction by collision with a tanker would close the waterway until it could be removed. The threat of fire in the event of a collision with a loaded tanker, is real and would endanger one of the largest concentrations of petroleum refining and storage centers in the world. In addition, destruction of the bridge would close off the major transportation route and the only direct mail route between the mainland and Staten Island, a borough of the city of New York.

The new bridge will be of the vertical-lift type. Its vertical clearance will be 31 feet above mean high water when closed, and 135 feet above mean high water when raised. Its horizontal length will be 500 feet. With the new bridge providing an opening of 500 feet, it will be fully adequate for traffic on the waterway, and the hazards to navigation, industry and transportation service will be removed.

The bridge project was authorized by the Truman-Hobbs Act of June 21, 1940. The total estimated cost of the project is \$9,830,000, of which \$1,670,000 is estimated to be the share borne by the owners of the bridge as the cost of actual betterment to its property, under the formula of the act.

Under the Corps of Engineers revised completion schedule, the substructure of the bridge was scheduled to be completed last month. Its superstructure should be finished by August 1959, while the removal of the existing structures is scheduled for completion by March 1960. By that latter date, work by railroad forces including powerlines, waterlines, trackwork, signals, and so forth, should also be completed and the entire project finished.

Assuming the committee's recommended appropriation of \$2.5 million for fiscal 1959 is approved, there will remain an estimated \$1,680,000 of required Federal appropriations to complete the work.

In addition to their share of the alteration costs, local interests are also required to maintain and operate the altered bridge upon completion at an annual estimated cost of \$34,200.

As the Port of New York Authority has predicted, there is great development potential in the area served by the New York-New Jersey channels. The land area, especially the western shore of Staten Island, is one of the few substantial areas left in the New York-New Jersey port region for industrial expansion where ample waterfront land and direct access by deep-sea channel are available.

The exact nature of the long-range industrial expansion is unpredictable, as the port authority points out, but it is certain to increase the volume of com-

merce moving along the New York-New Jersey channels. In the future, even larger ships carrying bulk iron ore, chemical products, lumber, and a multitude of other industrial raw material should swell the already enormous amount of commerce and further justify the continued improvement of this waterway.

I congratulate the committee on its farsightedness and progressive attitude toward development of this great natural resource. And I urge the House to approve its recommendations.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the people of St. Louis, I want to take this opportunity to thank the Committee on Appropriations, and its great chairman, the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, for including in this appropriation bill the sum of \$1,700,000 to continue work on the urgently needed flood-control program for our city.

St. Louis, the eighth largest city in the Nation, is the only large city in the United States on a navigable stream without adequate and effective flood protection. We are hopeful that in a few years this distinction will have been taken away from us, thanks to this very vital project now being worked on. Eventually, it will cost in the neighborhood of \$130 million, which may sound like a lot of money—and of course it is a lot of money—but is intended to protect the productive vigor of an area which now sends over a billion dollars a year in Federal taxes into the United States Treasury.

ST. LOUIS PROVIDES \$7,500,000 IN LOCAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. Chairman, our St. Louis project was authorized in 1955, and immediately thereafter our citizens voted a bond issue of \$7,500,000 as our local contribution to the project and this money is on hand and is being used in carrying out local responsibilities in connection with the project. A total of \$1,200,000 in Federal funds has already been appropriated for the work, and with the money provided for in this bill now before us, we will be making real and substantial progress toward flood proofing this important American industrial heartland city.

I might mention that there is absolutely no controversy about the project itself. During hearings before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, the city government, the chamber of commerce, the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the St. Louis Flood Control Association were all represented by top official spokesmen who explained the importance of the work and the need for speed in completing our flood walls.

ALL GROUPS UNITED BEHIND PROJECT

Among the witnesses also were all of us from the St. Louis Congressional delegation and representatives of both Missouri Senators.

Mayor Raymond R. Tucker's statement outlined in detail the cooperation which the city is giving and intends to give toward the completion of the work; Mr. Joseph Cousin, executive secretary-treasurer of the Building and Construction Trades Council of the AFL-CIO, described the importance of the project from labor's standpoint and the tremendous assistance work on this project will provide us in helping to alleviate our serious unemployment problem; Mr. Morton Meyer, of the Thompson Hayward Chemical Co., president of the St. Louis Flood Control Association, discussed his many conversations with Army engineers officials on the need for the work and its high priority status; Mr. E. Dean Darley, president of the 111-year-old F. B. Chamberlain Co., and vice president of the St. Louis Flood Control Association, told of the effects of past floods on his firm and many, many others in the path of the flood waters of the Mississippi in the St. Louis area; Mr. Roland C. Marquart, industrial representative of the Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan St. Louis, submitted a statement on behalf of Chamber President and former Mayor Aloys P. Kaufmann detailing the Nation's industrial stake in uninterrupted production from firms in St. Louis menaced by floods, and so on. Our city comptroller, Mr. John H. Poelker, and Mr. Everett Winter, executive vice president of the Mississippi Valley Association, also appeared before the subcommittee.

INDUSTRIAL LEADERS JOIN IN EFFORT

Mr. Chairman, as an example of the unified support of the people and industries of St. Louis in behalf of this project, I need only mention some of the individuals who have spent much effort and many, many hours of work on this activity as members of the board of directors of the St. Louis Flood Control Association, including, in addition to those I already mentioned, Mr. Harry D. Gaines, of the Gaines Hardwood Lumber Co.; Mr. H. H. Colwell, Ralston Purina Co.; Mr. William W. Crowds, one of our outstanding civic leaders; Mr. Dewey K. Lange, of Lange Bros., Inc.; Mr. Otto Conrad, of the St. Louis Materials and Supply Co.; Mr. V. C. Hanna, of the Terminal Railroad Association; Mr. Alfred Hirsch, of Laclede Gas Light Co.; Mr. J. K. Hyatt, of Anheuser-Busch, Inc.; Mr. A. S. Kendall, of Crunden-Martin Manufacturing Co.; Mr. Edwin B. Meissner, of St. Louis Car Co.; Mr. Al Peck, of Peck Products Co.; Mr. A. G. Stoughton, of Midwest Piping and Supply Co.; and Mr. F. E. Wisely, of Monsanto Chemical Co.

All of these men, Mr. Chairman, are aware that the full credit for the inclusion of this project in the pending bill goes to Chairman CANNON of the Appropriations Committee and other members of that committee. Chairman CANNON is a real friend of St. Louis, and we appreciate what he has done for us.

STATEMENT OF URGENT NEED FOR PROJECT

As a final word, Mr. Chairman, I include some factual details on our project as provided by Mr. Morton Meyer, presi-

dent of the St. Louis Flood Control Association, as follows:

ST. LOUIS FLOOD CONTROL ASSOCIATION, St. Louis, Mo., April 23, 1958.

We are asking Congress to provide the funds needed to continue the work already begun on the St. Louis flood protection project, through appropriation of \$1,200,000 in the last 2 fiscal years, because the danger here is very real:

A volume of water equal to the flow in 1844 is a definite probability in the Mississippi River at St. Louis.

Under present riverbank conditions this volume would create a flood stage of 52 feet. A stage of 52 feet is nearly 12 feet higher than the stage we experienced in 1951.

A 52-foot stage would put water 8 feet deep at Broadway and Chouteau and 15 feet to 23 feet deep at many street intersections.

It would seriously cripple railroad operations by inundating more than 250 miles of track.

It would hamper our public utilities and deprive much of the city of gas and electric services.

It would put out of operation many warehouses, factories, and plants. It would cause widespread unemployment.

It would lay our people easy prey to epidemic, through contamination of our water.

The damage in money is hard to estimate but Kansas City is reported to have suffered in excess of a billion dollar damage in 1951.

The completion of this project would remove the fear of complete ruin on the part of area residents.

It would assure uninterrupted transportation and public utility facilities as well as industrial activity.

It would rejuvenate more than 10 percent of the total area of the city.

It would provide hundreds of acres of flood-free industrial tracts for new industries which in turn would make available thousands of new jobs.

Why do we believe we are justified in requesting this protection now?

Because St. Louis is the largest city in the Mississippi Valley but has no flood protection while most others are protected.

Because St. Louis is the only large city in the United States on a navigable stream that has no flood protection.

Because St. Louis is the eighth largest city in the country and as such has great importance in the national economy.

Because St. Louis has committed \$7,500,000 of its bonding authority through the 1955 bond issue as our local contribution. And this action was based on the implied promise that the Federal Government would proceed without interruption to the completion of the project.

Because the project was approved after exhaustive examination by the Chief of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, authorized by the United States Congress, and signed into Public Law 256 on August 9, 1955 by President Eisenhower.

Because by accelerating completion of current engineering work, the St. Louis district engineer can ask for construction bids on September 30 of this year and put men to work shortly thereafter.

To prevent further decay and to promote progress, St. Louis must have this protection from the annual threat of catastrophe.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the public works appropriation bill is certainly one of the most important measures which will be considered by the House during this session of Congress.

It is important for our own country. This bill could easily have been passed on last Thursday evening when it was

originally scheduled for consideration. However, it is well that a measure of this importance should be fully discussed and considered and time given to debate on this important appropriation bill—as arranged for today by the leadership and Chairman CANNON.

I should like at the outset to join my colleagues of the committee in paying tribute to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

It has certainly been an enriching experience to serve on the committee with him and under his leadership. Mr. CANNON not only serves as chairman on the full Committee on Appropriations but also as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriation—as he considers this committee one of the most important subcommittees of the Congress. He has actively participated in the daily hearings—in the laborious, detailed work of our subcommittee—those of us who have worked with him on this subcommittee have been constantly amazed at his untiring energy, at his patience and punctuality and his unflinching courtesy to all.

So, Mr. Chairman, we all are indebted to Chairman CANNON for his great work on this appropriation.

Last week it was my privilege to be present at the Department of Interior when Mr. CANNON's great services to our country were deservedly recognized by Southeastern University.

Mr. CANNON was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree.

I am sure that all agree that no man has completely earned this recognition more than our distinguished chairman, Mr. CANNON.

It has also been a pleasure to work with Mr. TABER, the distinguished gentleman from New York, and the ranking minority member of the committee, as well as all members of the subcommittee—the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the gentlemen from Minnesota, Pennsylvania, and Idaho [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. FENTON, and Mr. BUDGE].

This bill, Mr. Chairman, carries appropriations for the civil works functions of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation; for certain functions of the Quartermaster Corps; and for the four great power agencies of the Federal Government: The Bonneville Power Administration, the TVA, the Southeastern Power Administration, and the Southwestern Power Administration.

The committee held hearings for more than 2 months and, as indicated, some 900 witnesses were heard, including 190 Members of Congress. The testimony is transcribed in 4 volumes with more than 4,000 pages of testimony.

The total amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget for these purposes was \$1,076,016,000. The committee recommends in this bill a total of \$1,074,017,200. This is \$182,280,877 more than

we appropriated for these functions for the current year—1958—and \$1,898,800 less than the budget estimates.

In my considered judgment this is one of the best public works appropriation bills that has come to this body during the years that I have been privileged to serve on the committee. I believe I can claim some objectivity in saying this because this bill contains no funds for construction of any project in the district which I have the honor to represent.

It is a good bill because the committee has exercised its own judgments on the merits of the various projects considered—based upon the evidence presented to the committee.

The committee has made some reductions and we have made some increases.

The committee has recommended undertaking 26 new surveys on unbudgeted projects. The committee is also recommending funds for 45 new starts. These increases have been made possible without increasing the overall budget limitation.

As we have eliminated some, we have been able to put other projects in the bill. The report provides that funds have been included for these projects which cannot be increased. Language has been included in the legislative bill to preclude the use of funds until the projects have been authorized, so the safeguards on the other projects are written in the report.

Each year as projects are completed, the Corps of Engineers feels that a reasonable number of new starts should be undertaken—gotten underway. This has been particularly stressed this year because of the lag in employment and because of prevailing economic conditions.

This increase amounts to \$125 million for the Corps of Engineers and \$70 million for the Bureau of Reclamation.

The revised budget, submitted after the committee initially considered this year's requests, represents a net gain for the country as a whole.

This revised budget has been brought about by the request of this subcommittee—I should say the insistence of this committee.

Although I know that it is impossible to please everyone—I want to repeat that this is a well-balanced bill—a truly all-American bill—and it represents the work and judgments of the committee and not just the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget.

This is not a rubber stamp bill, merely approving the Budget requests.

In this bill, the Congress is asserting its constitutional responsibilities for determining the policies of our Nation on appropriations and expenditures.

Like the gentleman from Iowa, I make no apologies for this bill—for the appropriations recommended by the committee. On the contrary, we can take solid comfort in them.

This bill will add to the Nation's assets. These projects will add to our growth, they will insure our continued progress—and this bill will serve to strengthen our Nation as a whole.

The committee is recommending funds for 396 projects and activities in every area of the Union, and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii as well.

The advancement of these projects will add to the greater development and utilization of the resources of all our great river basins—the St. Lawrence, the New England, the South Atlantic, the Ohio River, the Tennessee, the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Rio Grande, the upper Colorado, the Columbia River, the Central Valley basins, and others. They will improve harbors and navigable waterways throughout the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, some of our citizens seemingly do not appreciate how truly national is our program of water resource development. Far too many people appear to labor under the delusion that the program is limited to certain areas like the Tennessee or Columbia River Basins. The truth is—and this bill gives further evidence of it—that there is scarcely a river in the entire Nation which has not benefited from the development and improvement of its resources in the past quarter of a century. The types of programs may differ from area to area and river to river. In some, navigation is the primary concern; in others, flood control; in still others, irrigation; in most of them we have tried to achieve highest utilization by designing projects for multipurpose results, combining in them the benefits of several functions. But in any event we are far along the road toward the realization of the principle first enunciated by Theodore Roosevelt that "every stream should be used to its utmost."

And, Mr. Chairman, every year that passes brings further evidence of the wisdom of this great national program of river resource development. We still have some disastrous floods—news report: 5,000 Homeless in Indiana-Wabash Levee Break—I am sure we all share concern and sympathy for those who suffer loss through these floods. They do point out that our job is still far from finished. We are not always reminded of the floods that do not occur, of the suffering and damage that is averted by these great dams that have been built and the great levees and seawalls constructed. Yes; in each part of the Nation the citizens each year can give thanks for the protection afforded them by the already completed projects along our rivers.

This is the negative side. On the positive side we have the great contribution that these projects have made to the growth and development of our Nation. Large areas of our Nation alone would not and could not have made significant contributions to the advancement of our country. However, enabled by these projects, or stimulated by them all areas have participated in the agricultural and industrial progress of our Nation. The arid Southwest, and the wornout and eroded Southeast are examples.

Fifty years ago the great area of the Southwest was marked on maps as the Great American Desert. According to the best expert opinion the Southeast was well on its way to becoming another Great American Desert. Today, these are areas of prosperous and fertile farms and great industrial growth, each making tremendous contributions to the ad-

vancement of the entire Nation. These and others are the more spectacular examples; but there is no area of the country whose progress has not been aided or stimulated by this great national program of water-resource development.

Furthermore, as our Nation grows—and we are increasing rather than decreasing—the need for water-resource development will likewise increase. Yesterday, we were concerned with navigation, today with flood control and power; but tomorrow, it is all too clear our great problem will be the water itself. This is already true in many areas of the Nation, notably the West and Southwest, where the water provided by these projects is in itself their most valuable product. But the evidence grows overwhelming each year that, even in the more humid sections of the Nation, future growth will be largely dependent on our ability to supply enough water for drinking and sanitary and industrial purposes. Therefore, our Nation's future is quite critically tied in with the continued development and improvement of our water resources.

There is another thing that too few of our citizens realize. Most of the money our Government spends is for services, and expendable supplies and materials, that do not enrich the assets of our Nation. They are necessary, of course, but they are entered in our books on the red side of the ledger. Programs of water-resource development, on the other hand, represent activities of our Government which result in physical assets that can be entered on the black side of the ledger. In other words, the money we will appropriate today will create wealth—not only indirectly by creating employment and business for industry, but directly by building actual physical assets for all to see and to use. We are all conscious of the national debt. Yet, it is well that we should be reminded that we also have assets on the black side of the ledger and that already some \$20 billion worth of those assets are represented by the great dams, harbor improvements, powerplants, locks, and so forth, created by our great national program of water-resource development. These are assets visible to the eye, and millions of our own citizens, and thousands of visitors from all over the world, are each year impressed by them—as they repay the cost—and contribute to the well-being and strength of our Nation.

The projects which this appropriation will serve to develop are among the most productive of all the expenditures we make—productive both of continued progress for our Nation and people, and productive, too, in the sense that they result in something solid, something substantial, and something of value. I repeat, we need not apologize for these appropriations; on the contrary, we can take solid satisfaction in them. They add to our assets, they add to our growth; they insure our continued progress. They are investments in the physical plant and growth of our Nation.

The distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. CANNON] and the other members who have preceded me have already adequately presented the details of the bill. I shall not burden my col-

leagues with repetition. I should like, however, to make reference to portions of the bill concerning the area most familiar to me.

This bill calls for an appropriation of \$16,850,000 in new funds for the TVA. There is an estimated carryover of \$2,207,000, for a total program of appropriated funds of \$19,057,000. This is half of the appropriated funds available to the TVA in the current fiscal year and represents one of the lowest, if not the lowest, appropriations budgets in the history of this great national asset. Of the total appropriated, \$8,982,000 is earmarked for the continued construction of the new lock at Wilson Dam replacing the obsolete old lock which has become a bottleneck for navigation on the entire river. Only \$411,000 of these funds will go to the power program for clean-up work on powerplants completed under past appropriations.

The committee has approved the total obligation program involving both corporate and appropriated funds and, as the report states, considers that it represents a well balanced and reasonable program for the coming year.

Let me summarize the provisions of the appropriations financed budget for the TVA under this bill:

Eleven million seven hundred and eighty-two thousand dollars is assigned to acquisition of assets. Of this amount, as I have already pointed out, \$3,982,000 is for the new lock at Wilson Dam; \$411,000 for clean-up work on the Kingston and Shawnee steam plants built to serve the Atomic Energy Commission; \$423,000 is for miscellaneous improvement, such as improvement of public-use facilities, access roads to sites which are scheduled for sale, and miscellaneous plants and equipment; \$162,000 is for flood-control facilities, principally the purchase of scattered land and land rights in the Norris Reservoir area needed to assure that the flood-storage capacity is utilized to the maximum extent; \$124,000 for investigation on several potential dam sites on tributaries of the Tennessee River; and \$353,000 is for administrative and general expenses in connection with the navigation flood-control and power program.

Seven hundred and eighty-three dollars is for acquisition of additional chemical facilities; \$30,000 for administrative and general expenses of the fertilizer, agriculture, and munitions program; \$494,000 of appropriated funds is for the purchase of various office equipment, transportation facilities, and similar assets in the general service activities of the TVA. This makes a total \$11,782,000 for acquisition of assets.

The balance of the appropriation is for operating expenses to be distributed as follows: Navigation operations \$220,000—it should be noted the cost of navigation operations is considerably greater than this amount, the balance comes from income from river terminals; \$2,297,000 for the operation of the multi-purpose reservoirs—the total expenses far exceed this, the balance coming from the corporate funds; \$200,000 for topographic mapping; \$212 for administrative general expenses. An additional

\$2,959,000 is budgeted for the fertilizer, agricultural and munitions program—again this is only a small portion of the cost of this program, the balance coming from the income of fertilizer production and distribution; \$1,013,000 is budgeted for the watershed protection and improvement program which includes tributary watershed projects and forestry projects intended to protect the reservoir from sedimentation. The total for operating expenses is, therefore, \$7,275,000.

The budget for acquisition of assets is nearly \$20 million less than last year. The budget for operating expenses is \$135,000 more than last year. Most of this increase is in the fertilizer, agricultural, and munitions program. The budget for the other programs is almost exactly the same as last year.

On the Cumberland River, funds are provided for continued construction on Cheatam and Old Hickory Dams, and \$10,500,000 is appropriated for the continued construction of the great Barkley Dam near the mouth of the Cumberland River. This dam, when completed, will greatly increase the protection from floods, not only of the area surrounding the Cumberland, but also of the area in the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers below the mouth of the Cumberland. It will also greatly improve the navigational potentialities of the great inland waterway formed by the Mississippi—Ohio, Tennessee, and Cumberland Rivers.

Mr. Chairman, this bill appropriates for our own domestic development merely 25 percent of the funds we will spend next year in foreign lands. We all recognize that some expenditures for mutual aid seems essential though I have occasionally had doubts as to the effectiveness of the expenditures. But we cannot disregard the needs and the growth of our own Nation. The United States is not ready yet to stop growing. We have not yet reached the zenith of our development.

Our great national programs of water resource development are among the most important steps we can take to insure the continued growth of our Nation. Let us continue to work for this growth by developing the water resources of our Nation, in all its areas, to the utmost, for the benefit of all the people and the entire Nation, and not just for the benefit of a selfish few special interests. In that way we will not only serve our own domestic well-being but assure our Nation's strength. We will thus preserve our country's resources, strengthen our leadership, and maintain American preeminence in the world.

I would like to call to the attention of the Committee that I hold here a statement by no less an authority than General Itschner, the Chief of Engineers himself. This is a statement of General Itschner before the Public Works Committee of the Senate in which he called attention to Soviet water resource development. I think everyone should read this report, which shows the tremendous emphasis that is being placed on water resources development and the great projects that are underway on the Volga River and others in Soviet Russia. There is included here a list of some 20

projects, several of them larger than any in the United States.

Excerpts from General Itschner's statement, to which I have referred, follow:

The United States Army Corps of Engineers is concerned with Soviet water resource development as part of our overall military engineer intelligence mission. * * *

We have enough information to give this committee an evaluation of Soviet accomplishments, progress, and programs. * * *

The Soviets have given water resource development a priority second only to the development of heavy industry designed to support military programs. This fact must be viewed in the light of Secretary Khrushchev's statement: "We declare war on the United States in peaceful production * * * We will win over the United States." * * *

In hydroelectric power development, the Soviets already approach us in total installed capacity and have individual projects under construction that far exceed any American project in capacity.

In inland waterway navigation, they have projects that rival ours, and plans that probably surpass ours. * * *

In irrigation * * * they have bigger projects than ours, and they probably are irrigating new acres at least as fast as we are. * * *

Their power equipment and engineering * * * are excellent, and they are superior to ours in a few characteristics. * * *

Most Soviet water resource projects are multiple purpose. * * *

As to the quality of Russian engineering, a British technical delegation recently inspected some of their projects and reported: "Russian engineers are not lacking in engineering ability when dealing with the varied problems met in river control and development works. * * * They have been most successful." * * *

To illustrate the kind of work they are doing, I will mention a few representative Soviet projects.

The Kuibyshev project on the Volga River has a plant with 2,100,000 kilowatts installed capacity, generated by 20 vertical Kaplan turbines with turbine rotors 30½ feet in diameter operating under a normal head of 63 feet. By comparison, the 18 turbines at America's largest powerplant, Grand Coulee, have a combined rated capacity of 1,944,000 kilowatts. * * *

Thus right now Soviet hydroelectric development appears to be roughly equal to ours in amount. However, their rates of increase is greater than ours.

The United States has no plants completed which reach the 2 million kilowatt market. * * *

But the U. S. S. R. has 10 plants ranging from 2 million to 6 million kilowatts, of which one is almost complete, 3 are under construction, and 6 are in planning or preparatory stages. One single plant, the Yenesei plant on the river of the same name, will have a capacity of about 6 million kilowatts, greater than the total capacity of all the powerplants at all the dams ever constructed by the Corps of Engineers, which now is 5,250,000 kilowatts.

So, Mr. Chairman, I repeat, the projects for which we are making appropriations today are American projects. They are to build up and strengthen our own country. We should have no hesitancy in voting to build up and strengthen America. It is time that we got on with doing the jobs needed at home.

Let us pass this bill to strengthen America.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Mack].

Mr. MACK of Washington. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to thank the committee for including \$50,000 in this bill for a full-scale survey of a proposed power-industrial water-flood control project on the Wynooch River in Grays Harbor County, Wash.

The project was not fully cleared by the United States Army Engineers until December 1957 and therefore too late for inclusion in the President's budget when this was reported to Congress.

The project is a most meritorious one. Its benefit-cost ratio, according to the district engineer, appears to be high based on a preliminary survey.

The project when completed will provide \$340,000 of power annually and will provide \$30,000 a year of industrial water. The Grays Harbor Public Utility District will pay the power costs of the project and the city of Aberdeen which already has a large industrial water system will get this water and will pay the cost of that part of the project involved in supplying this water.

The Aberdeen water system now sells all of its available water supply to two pulp and paper mills and the additional water will make possible the expansion of these plants since both plants need more water before they can be expanded.

The additional hydroelectric power the project will provide should lead to other industrial expansion.

The Aberdeen water system and the Grays Harbor Utility District are financially able and willing to stand their proper cost of the project.

Once the Congress has fully approved this appropriation, I hope the United States Army Engineers will speedily undertake the survey so that this project can be started at the earliest possible date.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, the committee has done a remarkable job under difficult circumstances, possible only because of their detailed and intimate knowledge of the river valleys of this Nation and their patience in listening to countless witnesses.

Particularly interested in flood control is the Second District of Kansas. Being in the northeast corner of the State, flood water from nearly all major rivers is dumped upon us.

The Missouri River brings floods upon Kansas. The Kansas River brings torrents of water upon the Second District and my home town of Kansas City, Kans. Part of that danger will be controlled by Tuttle Creek Reservoir for which in-

creased funds are herein provided, bringing it nearer to completion.

One of the smaller rivers bringing damage upon us is the Neosho. Small, yes, but the flow at the peak of the 1951 flood was equal to the torrents roaring down the Kaw River. Funds for the John Redmond Reservoir above Burlington, on the Neosho River brings hope for relief from recurring floods in the Neosho Valley. The towns of Humboldt and Iola along with others downstream in the Third District will be greatly benefited.

Another flood-plagued valley, with floods almost annually, a valley where in 1951 the flood was so terrific that had it not been for others, it would have made headlines all over the Nation—is the Marias des Cygnes. The funds for Pomona Reservoir on this stream will begin a much needed and long sought dam which will stop floods and give assured water in times of drouth.

Mr. Chairman, to this committee and the House of Representatives goes the thanks and appreciation of the residents of the Second District of Kansas which I have the honor and pleasure to represent.

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

Mr. PHILBIN. 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. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the committee for its able, painstaking work, and will strongly support the bill. As chairman of the Massachusetts Delegation Committee on Flood Control, I am gratified, really beyond expression, at the outstanding results which we have achieved this year in securing practically all of our requests for appropriations to carry forward the well-rounded program of flood control for our area. From a nationwide standpoint the bill covers a wide range of essential projects.

The House Appropriations Committee, to whom we had so strongly appealed, not only acceded to our pleas for favorable action on budgeted items, but it also wisely overruled the Budget Bureau injunction on new starts by providing \$275,000 in construction funds for West Hill Dam and Reservoir in the Blackstone Basin.

Many times I have had the occasion to express to the House Appropriations Committee and the Congress, the sincere deep appreciation of the members of the Massachusetts and New England delegations in Congress for their invariable help and concern about critical New England flood problems.

It is certainly a pleasure for me to do so again today in behalf of our Massachusetts people and in the name of the many communities, business establishments and individuals who will be provided great flood-prevention benefits from the solid protective projects which are now under way under the overall manage-

ment of the efficient Army Corps of Engineers.

The House Appropriations Committee is providing nearly \$10 million to speed flood control in the central Massachusetts area. These are the allocations of Federal funds for specific projects of distinct help to this area which was devastated by the August 1955 floods:

Construction: Hodges Village, \$2,700,000; East Brimfield, \$3,800,000; Worcester diversion, \$2,534,000; West Hill, \$275,000.

Planning: Westville, \$141,000.

Flood-control studies: Blackstone Basin, \$20,000; Connecticut Basin, \$95,000.

Despite a budget freeze on new construction starts, the House Appropriations Committee is allocating \$275,000 to start construction of the West Hill Reservoir and Dam in the Blackstone Basin near Uxbridge.

The committee was unable to grant an unbudgeted \$500,000 in construction funds for Westville to permit the start of this project near Southbridge after the preconstruction planning has been completed. A total of \$141,000 is being provided, however, to complete the \$320,000 planning job for Westville.

HODGES VILLAGE

The \$2,700,000 for Hodges Village Dam and Reservoir on the French River in Oxford would insure completion of the project by September 1959. Under current construction schedules, Army Engineers plan the dam closure by August of this year. About \$160,000 will be required in next year's appropriation bill to complete the work at Hodges Village, a \$5,300,000 project to protect Webster and downstream points in the Thames Basin.

With the \$2,700,000 being appropriated this year, the engineers expect to continue the following work at Hodges Village:

Initiate and complete road relocations, \$314,000; complete utility relocations, \$294,000; complete construction of the dam, \$793,300; initiate and complete construction of buildings, grounds, and utilities, \$65,000; continue land acquisition, \$900,000; initiate and complete access road, \$30,000; initiate and complete acquisition of permanent operating equipment, \$15,000; initiate and complete reservoir clearing, \$105,000; engineering and design \$47,000, and supervision and administration, \$136,000.

Upon completion, Hodges Village will effect major reductions in flood damages at Webster, Dudley, Thompson, in addition to reducing flood flows on the Quinebaug from Putnam downstream to Norwich, the Engineers have stated. Had Hodges Village been in operation during the 1955 floods, it would have prevented \$9,400,000 of the \$61,680,000 damages in the Thames Basin, Engineers have estimated.

EAST BRIMFIELD

Following is a breakdown of work to be undertaken by the Army Engineers with the \$3,800,000 appropriation for the East Brimfield Dam and Reservoir on the Quinebaug in Sturbridge:

Continue road relocations, \$890,000; continue dam construction, \$622,000; continue land acquisition, \$1,980,700;

complete utility relocations, \$85,000; complete construction of buildings, grounds, and utilities, \$63,000; initiate and complete reservoir clearing, \$80,000; engineering and design, \$34,200; and supervision and administration, \$45,100.

The Army Engineers now expect to complete the \$7,400,000 East Brimfield project by November 1959. Dam closure will take place in June of next year, under current construction schedules. About \$1,200,000 will be required in next year's appropriation bill to complete the project.

The East Brimfield project would have prevented \$12,730,000 in damages in the Thames Basin had it been in operation in August 1955, according to Engineer estimates.

WORCESTER DIVERSION

The Army Engineers expect to complete the Worcester diversion project by June 1959 with the \$2,534,000 appropriation. The money will be used as follows: continue construction of channel and tunnel, \$1,806,000; continue construction of floodway control and diversion structures, \$520,000; engineering and design, \$11,500, and supervision and administration, \$195,000.

Total estimated cost of the Worcester diversion project is \$6,113,000 of which \$5,270,000 is the Federal share. According to the Engineers, the Worcester project will provide almost complete flood control of the upper portion of the Middle River and substantial control of flood flows through the remaining portions of Worcester. The Engineers estimate that Worcester suffered damages totaling \$28,500,000 in the August 1955 floods. Operation of the Worcester diversion project would have prevented \$21,700,000 of these damages, the Engineers have stated. Our valued, able colleague, Congressman HAROLD D. DONOHUE, has given special attention to this project.

WEST HILL

The Engineers expect to complete the preconstruction planning of West Hill this month at a total cost of \$233,000. The \$275,000 will permit the Engineers to initiate construction of the dam and reservoir this year, total estimated cost of which is \$3,360,000. The project is located on the West River in Uxbridge just below the Uxbridge-Northbridge line. The Engineers estimate that West Hill would have prevented \$12,215,000 in flood damages in the Blackstone Basin had it been in operation in 1955.

WESTVILLE

Preconstruction planning for the Westville Dam and Reservoir on the Quinebaug, west of Southbridge, will be completed with the \$141,000 appropriation. Westville is a companion project to the East Brimfield Dam and Reservoir to provide joint protection to Southbridge and downstream points in the Thames Basin. The Engineers estimate that \$5,500,000 damages would have been prevented in 1955 had the project been in operation.

The estimated total cost of Westville is \$6,500,000. Engineers have indicated some considerable savings would result on Westville if the East Brimfield project is completed first.

FLOOD STUDIES

The committee has allocated \$20,000 for flood control studies in the Blackstone Basin would complete a \$95,000 flood survey under way since the 1955 floods. The Engineers propose to complete their flood control studies of the entire basin during fiscal year 1959 from Blackstone's origin in Massachusetts down to Fox Point in Rhode Island.

The \$95,000 appropriation for the Connecticut Basin will permit completion of a \$294,000 flood study started after the 1955 floods. Tributaries of the Connecticut, including the Chicopee River, will come in for special survey with these funds.

I do not have time to set forth in detail the other projects in our area which the bill provides for with wisdom and efficiency. It will suffice to state that these projects are all necessary and their completion at an early date will be most helpful and, we believe, effective in affording protection against the ravages of disastrous floods.

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

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, the Arkansas River program has received the consideration of the Appropriations Committee and the full budget request has been recommended. For this, we who represent the great Arkansas Valley are grateful. I believe that as a result of the testimony presented to the committee, presided over by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. CANNON], the committee has become familiar with the potentialities of the river basin, and I am confident that their approval of the budget request signifies their faith in the value of this comprehensive plan which was first approved by the Congress in 1946, with important amendments following in 1949.

The Arkansas is the last of the great rivers of our country to receive substantial consideration. It has been called the most treacherous and unpredictable river in the United States, but the same authorities testify to its tremendous potentialities.

While disappointed that the committee did not recommend the increases which we believe are justified, I nevertheless would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, the significance of the forward steps being authorized by the sums which are included in the bill. In the bill is a \$2½ million appropriation for the Dardanelle Dam, and except for the fact that siltation-control dams farther up the stream are necessary, I am confident this sum would be much larger.

I must confess, too, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Budget Bureau was unduly restrictive in the request for bank stabilization. According to convincing testimony presented to the committee, several million dollars could be used in this important phase of the river development program.

It is a well known fact that the Arkansas Basin is rich in natural resources which await adequate usage. The only things that have held us back are lack of water transportation and abundant water for industrial use. There is no reason why an Arkansas Valley industrial empire cannot be brought into existence when these obstacles are removed. The Ohio River Basin provides an outstanding example of what can be done when a major river is fully developed. Fourteen billion dollars have been invested in industry along the Ohio since the end of World War II, and barge tonnage in 1956 was 76.4 million tons. The characteristics of the two rivers are enough alike that we could have every reason to expect a similar explosion of industrial development when we have readily available an ample supply of water, controlled and of good quality.

The completion of all the Arkansas River projects will mean the dawn of a new day for the 5 million people who live in the Arkansas Valley. While the rest of the Nation has been enjoying a population boom, this region has been losing population because of the lack of economic opportunity. The utilization of the resources of this region will not only provide a better life for the people in the Southwest but will enrich the Nation by adding significantly to our total productive capacity and output. By making the valley hum, we will enable the people who love this region to stay at home and prosper, at the same time relieving population pressures in other sections of the country.

Since water may well be our most precious natural resource, Mr. Chairman, it would definitely be to the country's advantage to utilize efficiently the fortunate abundance of water that we find in the Arkansas Valley. With the continued support of the Congress, in the not too distant future we should realize on the great economic potential and add significantly to the Nation's material strength at a time when our national security is at stake.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I am not under any illusions as to what will happen to this bill since 190 Members of the House appeared before the subcommittee and testified in favor of various projects that are included. However, I voted against reporting the bill in the full committee and I therefore feel that I have a right to oppose it on the floor. I do not quarrel with any of those who have a contrary view, but there are some projects in this bill which I cannot approve. I take my stand alongside the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in his opposition to it.

In the first place, the committee report states that this bill is nearly \$2 million under budget estimates. The committee is able to make that claim only because it reduced by \$20 million a \$25 million item to provide loans under Public Law 130 and Public Law 894 of the 84th Congress. If you eliminate the item for loans, which of course are repayable, you will find that the net result is that the committee has increased

budget requests by \$18,500,000 in this bill.

While the total amount appropriated by this bill is \$1,074,000,000, it would be a serious mistake for the Members of the House to assume that this is all that is involved. This is only one installment on a very large bill we are incurring today which future Congresses will be called upon to pay.

The current estimated total Federal cost of the projects involved in this bill is not a billion dollars; it is \$12 billion. Instead of being concerned with an appropriation of a little more than a billion dollars, we are actually considering projects that involve a total expenditure of \$10 or \$12 billion.

The bill before us today contains funds for 41 unbudgeted Corps of Engineers projects and 4 Bureau of Reclamation projects, a total of 45 new projects for which money was not requested in the budget. The money included in the bill for these unbudgeted items amounts to approximately \$17 million, of which \$14.5 million is for construction and \$2.5 million is for planning money. But this is only the beginning. Just to complete the unbudgeted construction projects in this bill will require \$318 million, and to complete the other unbudgeted projects for which planning money is provided in this bill will require \$427 million. So what is involved here, before we complete the unbudgeted projects for which money is provided in this bill, is approximately \$750 million.

A number of projects in this bill relate to navigation. A discussion of navigation is important today when bills are pending in both houses of Congress to provide relief for railroads. Senate Report No. 1647 of the 85th Congress listed as one of the reasons for the general decline of the railroads "the Government assistance offered to their competitors. This includes the building of highways, airports, the provision for toll-free waterways and other facilities." It seems to me to be inconsistent for Congress to be asked to appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars, which eventually will run into billions of dollars, to provide new toll-free waterways whose tonnage will be achieved almost wholly at the expense of existing business or future growth of the railroads at a time when we are considering extraordinary measures to keep the railroads of the country in operation, particularly since those who will use the waterways will not pay anything toward construction or maintenance.

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

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I concur completely in what the gentleman is saying, but I do want the Members to know that there is no money in this bill for new starts for waterways.

Mr. JONAS. May I comment on that, Mr. Chairman, by saying, and I hate to single out projects because there are a number in this bill that are in the same category, but if I were asked to single out one to use simply as an example it would be the development project for the Arkansas River. That involves

\$1,200 million, and most of the money is for navigation.

There are three projects involved. There is the Dardanelle Lock and Dam, for which \$2.5 million is in this bill, but the total cost will be \$94,600,000. Eufaula Reservoir, for which there is \$7,500,000 in this bill, but the total cost will be \$154 million; Keystone Reservoir, for which there is \$8½ million in this bill, but the total cost will be \$137 million.

But the significant part about it is that here we are embarking upon a \$1,200 million project before we have even completed the planning; because in this very bill there is included an appropriation of \$18½ million to begin construction of the three projects just named, while in the same bill we include \$900,000 to finance further studies and an additional sum of \$1,258,000 will be requested to complete the planning for the project. In all sincerity, I submit that the \$18½ million for construction should be eliminated—at least until we have completed the planning and know where we are going.

It is also interesting to note that there is to be no—no—local contribution for these projects which will cost \$400 million, and that \$179 million is to be used for relocation of existing facilities. This is a navigation project and I believe the interests that will benefit from it should make some contribution toward its construction and upkeep. I cannot see the justice in requiring the people of my district to help finance such projects when those who will financially benefit fail to make any contribution toward construction or future maintenance costs other than as general taxpayers.

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

Mr. JONAS. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Have we not had many big basin projects in which we have appropriated money for part of the projects in the overall basin picture before we have done any of the detailed planning on some of the other projects involved?

Mr. JONAS. If we have, we made a mistake. I do not think we should start the construction of this billion-dollar project until we have completed the planning for it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. If the gentleman will yield further, the Congress started the construction of this 2 years ago. This is continuing the construction.

Mr. JONAS. No; the record shows that very little construction money has been spent to the date of the hearing.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Construction money has been voted for 2 successive years for the Arkansas Basin project and this is the third year.

Mr. JONAS. I am talking about the \$18,500,000 of construction money in this bill before the planning stage has been completed. I think it is inadvisable for us to proceed that way. We should complete the planning before beginning the construction.

There are other navigation projects in this bill subject to the same criticism. I have only 5 minutes and cannot possibly discuss them all. I only mentioned the Arkansas River project by name as

an illustration of some of the questionable projects. I believe funds should be denied to proceed with these projects until some basis can be found under which the local and special interests that will be benefited can be made to contribute to the cost of construction or for future maintenance.

A motion to recommit this bill will be made at the proper time. I hope it will prevail so that the committee can reconsider these cases and require some substantial local contributions to be made where great local benefits will result.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, today is a great day for water development in the United States.

With the passage of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill, we have taken a great forward step in the vital undertaking of conserving and using the Nation's water resources.

Under title III of that bill, the Water Supply Act of 1958, we have opened a great new field of Federal-State-local cooperation for water storage. For the first time, we made it possible for the Army Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation to estimate future water supply needs of an area—to use those future needs as a justification for a reservoir—and to build reservoirs to meet America's future needs.

This step is taken none too soon, for there is evidence on every hand that the needs of America's pyramiding population are rapidly overtaking our water storage facilities. Now we can build for the future—which will be with us before we know it, if water consumption continues to increase at present rates.

We also provide money, in the public works appropriations bill we are discussing today, to continue development of the greatest American river not presently developed for navigation—the Arkansas River.

The delegations of Arkansas, Kansas, and Oklahoma had hoped for larger sums to expedite construction of Eufaula, Oologah, Keystone, and Dardanelle Dams—to mention only four now under construction for which additional money was sought in the Committee on Appropriations—and I thought a strong case for increases was made before the committee.

We still have painful memories of the \$250 million Southwest flood of 1957, a disaster these dams would have greatly reduced in its intensity, and we hope the Congress will move as rapidly as possible to prevent a repetition of this disaster.

However, the sums provided by this bill, as finally recommended by the Army Engineers and Bureau of the Budget, will provide the most substantial progress in recent history in our area, and we are grateful for the committee's recognition of the great Arkansas Basin program.

We are also grateful for the action of Chairman CANNON of the Appropriations Committee, who requested that Army Engineers and Budget Bureau

officials revise their original requests, to provide more realistic program funds.

This request led to increases of a substantial nature for the Arkansas Basin, along with other projects of an essential character in our country's water development, and Chairman CANNON thereby made a major contribution toward establishment of an adequate water program.

In view of these facts, we are not pressing on the floor of this House for additional increases at this time, but earnestly hope the House conferees will give their careful and sympathetic consideration to any increases provided in the other body.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I commend this fine Committee on Appropriations for this excellent and timely public works bill. Presidential budgets are, of necessity, compiled well in advance of appropriations. Only a wise and alert Appropriations Committee can adjust budget figures to changing conditions; and this committee has done an excellent job this year.

Led by Missouri's outstanding Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, they have given us a public works appropriation bill that is adequate for today's needs; is less than the Presidential budget request by almost \$2 million; and one that considers tomorrow as well as today. Here is a bill that continues Table Rock, Pomme de Terre, and other projects now under construction and also provides for new planning and new starts.

Of particular interest to us in southwest Missouri is the planning money—\$150,000—for Stockton Dam, a project that has been authorized since 1954 but on which no actual work has been done.

This is a valuable project. The Corps of Engineers recommended it long ago, estimating its benefit-cost ratio at 1.15 to 1.0. They tell me that the ratio might be even higher than that when they bring their computations up to date.

In the national picture, Stockton Dam is a part of the overall flood-control program. It is also considered to have power potential. No professional authority has ever said that it should not be built. All have agreed that it should be. The question has been: When?

Now, the Congress is proceeding to answer that question. The Appropriations Committee says, with this bill, "Let us start it now. Let us get the planning underway. Here is \$150,000 to get it started." I beseech the House to stand behind the Appropriations Committee in this answer.

In Cedar and Dade Counties, in Missouri—the area affected directly by Stockton Dam—our people have been awaiting action on this project since it was authorized. Many are wondering what effect it will have on their property. Others are wondering what adjustments will be involved in their daily lives when the reservoir is completed. They have a right to see some maps and some plans. They should not be kept up in the air. Their Government should—and must—get down to business on Stockton Dam.

After many sessions of explaining the story of Stockton Dam and the compelling reasons for it, I am delighted to see this committee include it in the fiscal 1959 appropriations, even though it was not included in the Executive budget.

This great body of men—some of the select Members of the House—have rendered their judgment: Stockton Dam should be built and the planning should start in fiscal year 1959. Let us ratify their good judgment without objection or delay.

This Nation has long recognized the need for flood control and its attending benefits. On a dollar-and-cents basis alone, it is good sense to prevent billions of dollars' worth of flood losses by constructing dams and reservoirs. Already, Table Rock Dam has saved more than \$20 million worth of flood damage. But in other areas, disastrous losses are still occurring. We must proceed on a regular basis—gradually, methodically, and wisely—to build more dams and reservoirs. Each year's progress should be steady and consistent. Otherwise, it will become burdensome.

This appropriation bill provides for steady, consistent progress in 1959. It takes care of today's needs and plans for tomorrow's progress.

I congratulate the committee on a job well done and urge this House to ratify the committee's judgment and pass this bill in all haste.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, if there are no further requests for time, I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, and when authorized by law, preliminary examinations, surveys and studies (including cooperative beach erosion studies as authorized in Public Law No. 520, 71st Cong., approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented), of projects prior to authorization for construction, to remain available until expended, \$8,473,500: *Provided*, That, no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the survey of Carter Lake, Iowa, until it is authorized.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON. On page 3, line 19, strike out "\$8,473,500" and insert "\$8,613,500."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, has that place in the bill been reached?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it has.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in this language which indicates which projects it is for or whether or not they are authorized by law. It seems to me we ought to have that before the item is reached for a vote so a point of order should be made, if they are not authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has been recognized and it is presumed that the gentleman will make his explanation in support of his amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves a point of order.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reread by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman is doubtless aware, this is an item from a supplemental budget just received from the Bureau of the Budget. It puts into the bill \$140,000 under Public Law 303. That was approved, as you will recall, last September. It gives the title to certain land to the Territory of Alaska, and provides that the Territory may dispose of it; the Territory cannot dispose of the land until certain matters have been established as to the seaward limit of the land. This merely permits the Government engineers to establish the seaward limit of the lands, and thereby makes it possible for the Territory of Alaska to go ahead with the transfer of these tracts.

With respect to the money in this paragraph it is all for authorized surveys with the single exception of this Carter Lake in Iowa. Of course, if the gentleman wants to insist on the point of order, we can let it go out and offer it later without that provision.

Mr. TABER. It is subject to a point of order?

Mr. CANNON. Only the language, "to remain available until expended." Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. TABER. No; not for that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York withdraw his point of order?

Mr. TABER. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALE as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. CANNON: On page 3, line 19, strike out "\$8,473,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$8,498,500."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] is recognized on his amendment.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of including in the bill \$25,000 for a study of the situation in Portland Harbor. The purpose of the study would be to determine the advisability of deepening the harbor channel and anchorage to 45 feet to allow the accommodation of

deep-draft tankers. The study has been approved by the Chief of Engineers and authorized by the House Public Works Committee. It was authorized too late, however, to be included in the fiscal 1959 budget.

I would like to remind you that the Committee on Appropriations has added 26 similar unbudgeted surveys to the 1959 public works appropriation bill. One of them, I am informed, has not yet been authorized. I do not know the criteria used by the committee in selecting these 26 particular unbudgeted surveys. I am sure the studies are completely justified. But I do not understand why the authorized Portland Harbor study was not also included.

Portland is the second-ranking port in New England in volume of commerce. Over \$325 million worth of cargoes moved through Portland in 1957. The total tonnage increased from over 15 million in 1956 to over 16 million in 1957. This tonnage consists mostly of oil tankers which serve a pipeline running from Portland to Montreal. Of 917 vessels using Portland Harbor in 1957, 692 were tankers, which means to say that we got an average of 2 tankers a day. The tankers bring oil for domestic use and for export to Canada over two pipelines.

Portland ranks next only to Philadelphia as a major oil terminus on the east coast. Obviously, with such a heavy tanker movement in and out of Portland, it is necessary to have an adequate channel and anchorage areas for handling the modern vessels.

Portland Harbor is not adequate at the present time. The existing project depths of the channel and anchorage area is only 35 feet, yet more tankers with drafts of over 35 feet, and some of over 40 feet, are being constructed.

Portland Harbor's inadequate depth is already affecting ship movements. By March of 1957 Portland pilots had turned away 11 ships because of depth limits. Last January the pilots had to tell petroleum officials that large tankers could not enter Portland Harbor unless the most favorable conditions prevailed.

The United States Army Chief of Engineers recognizes the importance of this proposed project. He stated in his report to the Public Works Committee:

In view of the continued trend toward use of larger tankers and the economic importance of petroleum commerce at Portland, it appears that a review of reports is warranted at this time.

The Corps of Engineers has also advised me that its New England workload is such that it could undertake the Portland Harbor study in fiscal year 1959 if Congress appropriates the funds.

The general manager of the Maine Port Authority emphasizes that the project is in the emergency class. To the State of Maine this project is indeed in the emergency class. Our State economy depends on Portland Harbor. We cannot afford to wait another year to get the proposed survey underway.

In closing I should like to say that I have seldom come before the House to ask for anything not included in the committee bill, but to my district and my State this is a very exceptional sit-

uation, and I urge the approval of this additional \$25,000 for the completion of this study.

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

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. I am not certain that the gentleman understands the situation as affected by his substitute.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Maine has offered a substitute for my amendment proposing to appropriate an additional amount of money for a specific purpose, but he does not change the total amount to conform to the additional expenditure. The original item was \$8,473,500. He proposes to add \$25,000 to the amount I proposed. I asked to add \$140,000, and to make the total \$8,613,500. Now the gentleman proposes to increase the amount by \$25,000, yet he does not change the total. He should ask unanimous consent to amend his substitute to make the total read \$8,638,500, or else propose an original amendment and not a substitute.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. This same question will come up in connection with an amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE], and I think we should have a ruling from the Chair as to whether each individual amendment to this particular figure must be disposed of prior to offering another amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it provides for items that are not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maine care to be heard on the point of order made by the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HALE. Yes, Mr. Chairman; but before doing so I would like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] I would like to inquire whether instead of offering a substitute amendment I should have offered an amendment to his amendment? If so, I should like unanimous consent to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot read the gentleman's mind. The gentleman will have to decide in his own mind what he proposes to do. If the gentleman desires to ask unanimous consent to withdraw the proposed substitute and offer an amendment to the amendment, then the gentleman may proceed in that order, if he so desires. A point of order is pending.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, can a unanimous consent request be propounded while a point of order is pending before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would entertain such a unanimous consent request. Any Member can object if he so desires. Does the gentleman from Maine care to make such a request?

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can be heard and he is recognized. The Chair is interested in disposing of the point he raised a moment ago.

Mr. HALE. I will be happy to have any solution of the parliamentary situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can ask unanimous consent to withdraw the substitute and offer an amendment.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I make that unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this has not been authorized by law. It was in the bill which was passed here and sent to conference this morning. That is not yet law. Inasmuch as there are 25 or 30 of that sort of amendments in the offing, we might just as well have that disposed of at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine is recognized to respond to the point of order that the gentleman from New York has made.

Mr. HALE. My understanding is that the study was approved by the Corps of Engineers and authorized by the House Committee on Public Works.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman cite the statute which authorizes the appropriation?

Mr. HALE. I cannot do that at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would like to argue the point of order, if the Chair would withhold his ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will withhold his ruling.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the general provisions contained in this appropriation bill have to do with projects that are to be surveyed by the Corps of Engineers. Under the Flood Control Acts of 1928 and 1944 there is general authority for the Corps of Engineers to carry out studies of flood control, navigation, and other water related projects for which there is authority under existing law. Now, the gentleman from Maine offers an amendment to the amendment that authorizes the increase of \$8,475,000 by some \$25,000. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine only identifies the project for which there is an increased authorization. Now, I submit to the Chair that there is no need for identity of the project contained in the amendment. Now, of the \$8 million already contained in this bill, it authorizes numerous works to be surveyed by the Corps of Engineers, some of which are not authorized by law and the identity of which would have to be brought forward by the Committee on Appropriations. But, that is a principle that we

do not recognize nor have we insisted upon in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I submit further, notwithstanding the fact that the amendment goes to the identity of the project already contained in law, as I have pointed out to the Chair, it is an authorized project for survey heretofore enacted by the House Public Works Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. I wonder if the gentleman from Alabama could cite the specific authorization for the funds that the gentleman from Maine seeks to include?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I will say to the Chair that my chief argument was made under general authorization which empowers the Corps of Engineers to carry out surveys on general appropriations for survey purposes. I did not rest my argument particularly upon the amendment identifying the Portland Harbor project, because that is in the inherent authority contained in existing law for the Corps of Engineers to execute surveys of projects without those projects being identified in an appropriation bill. If the point of order is sustained, then a point of order would lie against the entire amount, because it fails to identify the project to be surveyed, as to whether or not those projects have been authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the gentleman from Maine has based his argument, as the Chair understood it, on the bill which passed the House today and which has not been acted upon by the other body or signed by the President.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That, Mr. Chairman, was the argument that I was making—that it is not necessary for the survey to identify the project, since it has been authorized by committee resolution—and the point of order is not well founded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was merely telling the gentleman what the argument was as made by the gentleman from Maine, as the Chair understood it. The Chair is quite happy to have the gentleman's argument and, of course, will consider it.

Does the gentleman from Iowa have a statement to make?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I think, Mr. Chairman, since this amendment has caused so much argument, that I should read to the Chairman and to the House from page 652 of the hearings on the 1959 appropriations for public works and what Mr. HALE's reply was to Mr. CANNON. Mr. HALE appeared before the committee and made the request for this \$25,000. Now, reading from page 652 of the hearings:

Mr. CANNON. Congressman ROBERT HALE, of Maine. I believe that you appear for the Portland Harbor project.

Mr. HALE. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Appropriations Committee to provide \$25,000 in fiscal year 1959 public works appropriations for a review of reports by the Corps of Engineers on Portland Harbor, Maine, as authorized by the House Committee on Public Works in a resolution adopted on August 20, 1957.

In a matter of this nature, Mr. Chairman, I understand that a resolution approved by the Committee on Public

Works of the House—possibly approved by the House, although I am not sure that it needs the approval of the House—is all that is necessary to authorize, in a sense, an item of this nature. I want very much to have all the facts brought out. I am not arguing pro or con on this amendment. But I do want the Chair to know all the facts that surround this matter.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the point of order against the gentleman's amendment should not lie. Apparently the gentleman from New York made his point of order on the basis that his thought was that this survey was authorized in the bill which the House passed an hour or so ago. That survey was not included in that bill. The survey, as pointed out by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] was authorized under a resolution approved by the House Committee on Public Works something over a year ago. Under the law, the approval by the Committee on Public Works of a study previously authorized under the law some years before is fully entitled to appropriation if the Congress decides to appropriate the money.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Boggs). The reasoning of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] impressed the Chair. The Chair was prepared to rule on the basis of the statement made by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] that he was relying upon the action taken by the House earlier this afternoon, which obviously was not an authorization in light of the fact that that is an action by this body, but the other body has not acted and the President has not signed it. But the argument advanced by the gentleman from Mississippi impresses the Chair and the point of order is overruled.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] is recognized in behalf of his substitute.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, what is the proper procedure in the case of continual amendments to a specific figure? For example, if the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri were to carry, would it not then be in order for the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] to offer his amendment to the new figure?

The CHAIRMAN. No. The gentleman knows that after an amendment has been adopted changing the figure no further amendments are in order to that figure.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We have previously been put in the position of having to reject a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. In previous years, it is my recollection, we have had the right to first amend the

figure, and then other gentlemen would get up on the floor and offer further amendments. Otherwise, how can we proceed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman knows, of course, that the Committee of the Whole can vote down any and all amendments or vote them up. As the Chair stated some time ago, the Chair is unable to read the mind of the gentleman from Maine or any other Member who offers an amendment. The gentleman has the floor, he is properly recognized, and the only way to dispose of the gentleman's amendment is to vote it up or down.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GUBSER. If the substitute offered by the gentleman from Maine should prevail, then would it not be true that no further amendments to this line could be made from the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. In response to the gentleman the Chair states that, as the Chair stated a moment ago, once the Committee has adopted an amendment changing the figure no further amendments are in order to that figure.

Mr. GUBSER. May I say to the gentleman who occupies the well of the House that I hope he will decide to ask unanimous consent to amend the amendment rather than to present a substitute.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I renew my unanimous consent request to amend the amendment.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a difficult parliamentary situation. There is \$25,000 urgently needed for a survey in the city which I have the honor to represent for a 45-foot channel for these tankers. This, as has been explained by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], has been authorized by the Committee on Public Works. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] also outlined the situation, as I understand it. If I conveyed the impression I was relying on the bill that passed the House earlier this afternoon, I did not intend to convey any such impression. I relied on the action of the House Public Works Committee.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I propose would add \$25,000 to the amount for general investigations for a study of Portland Harbor, Maine. The purpose of this survey would be to determine the advisability of deepening the harbor channel and anchorage to 45 feet to allow the accommodation of deep-draft tankers.

Now \$25,000 is a small amount as compared to the total of over \$8 million for general investigations. But to the State of Maine, and the district I represent, this mere \$25,000 is of great and signal importance. If it were not of such importance, I would not be before the House making this plea for its approval.

This study has been approved by the Chief of Engineers and authorized by the

House Public Works Committee. It was authorized too late, however, to be included in the fiscal year 1959 budget.

I should like to remind you that the Appropriations Committee has added 26 similar unbudgeted surveys to the 1959 public works appropriations bill. One of these surveys, at Carter Lake, Iowa, I am informed has not yet been authorized.

I do not know the criteria used by the committee in selecting these 26 particular unbudgeted surveys. I am sure that the studies are completely justified. But I do find it difficult to understand why the authorized Portland Harbor study was not also included.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of Portland Harbor to the economy of Maine. It is the second-ranking port in New England in volume of commerce. Over \$325 million worth of cargoes moved through Portland in 1957. Total tonnage increased from over 15 million in 1956 to over 16 million in 1957.

Oil tankers comprise much of this commerce. Of 917 vessels using the harbor in 1957, 692 were tankers. In other words, an average of almost two tankers per day arrive in Portland Harbor. They bring oil for domestic use and for export to Canada on two pipelines from Portland to Montreal.

Portland ranks next to only Philadelphia as a major terminus on the east coast. Obviously, with such a heavy tanker movement in and out of Portland, it is necessary to have an adequate channel and anchorage areas for handling the latest and most modern vessels.

But Portland Harbor is not adequate. The existing project depth of the channel and anchorage area is only 35 feet. Yet more and more tankers with drafts of over 35 feet, and some of over 40 feet, are being constructed.

Portland's inadequate depth is already affecting ship movements. By March of 1957 Portland pilots had turned away 11 ships because of depth limits. Last January the pilots had to tell petroleum officials that large tankers could not enter Portland Harbor unless the most favorable of conditions prevailed.

The United States Army Chief of Engineers recognizes the importance of this proposed project. He stated in his report to the Public Works Committee, and I quote:

In view of the continued trend toward use of larger tankers and the economic importance of petroleum commerce at Portland, it appears that a review of reports * * * is warranted at this time.

The Corps of Engineers also has advised me that its New England workload is such that it could undertake the Portland Harbor study in fiscal year 1959 if Congress provides the funds.

Mr. Edward Langlois, general manager of the Maine Port Authority, emphasizes that the project is in the emergency class, and not a moment should be wasted.

To the State of Maine this project is indeed in the emergency class. Our economy depends on Portland Harbor. We cannot afford to wait another year to get this proposed survey underway.

In closing, I should like to say that I have seldom come before the House to

ask for something not duly approved in committee. But to my district and State this is an exceptional case. I urge your approval of an additional \$25,000 to enable an immediate start on the Portland Harbor survey.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Maine.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALE) there were—ayes 39, noes 73.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HYDE as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. CANNON: On page 3, line 19, strike out "\$8,473,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$8,913,500"; line 21, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "Provided further, That \$500,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be used for the purpose of carrying out the study and investigation and survey of the Potomac River Basin."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] reserves a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my substitute amendment is to add to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] the sum of \$300,000, the purpose of which is to increase an appropriation item already in the bill in the amount of \$200,000 for the Potomac River survey by the Army Corps of Engineers. It has been hoped to complete this survey by 1961. However, the testimony before the committee is that it will not be possible to complete that survey by 1961 with just the \$200,000 that is in the present bill and that it will be necessary to increase that item to \$500,000. Mr. Chairman, I can do no better than to read from the testimony given before the committee and submitted to the committee by Col. A. C. Welling, District of Columbia Engineer Commissioner. Colonel Welling said this:

The budget carries an item of only \$200,000 for this survey during fiscal 1959. Since only \$140,000 has been appropriated so far for this work and since the total survey cost is now estimated to be in the order of \$1,650,000, it is obvious that the rate of progress possible with the pending budget will be such as to retard the work many years beyond the scheduled completion date of June 30, 1961.

The metropolitan area of Washington is growing at a tremendous rate and decisions as to how best to develop the Potomac for its needs are urgent. Such decisions will depend on the findings and recommendations of the review report and hence this work should be accelerated in all ways possible. I therefore strongly urge that the appropriation for 1959 be increased to \$500,000 from the \$200,000 now pending.

And he further points out that even after the completion of the report many years will be required to carry out whatever recommendations it may contain as to flow regulations.

Mr. Chairman, statesmen from both bodies have been rowing up and down the Potomac River in recent years in

rowboats holding their noses and complaining that something should be done about the terrible situation. Before something can be done, Mr. Chairman, this survey by the Army Engineers must be completed. If we get the amount that has been asked for by this amendment, there is some chance that we can complete this survey by 1961. If we do not, there is no telling and they are unable to estimate when we will be able to complete this work. Hence, this horrible condition on the Potomac River may continue for another half generation unless we can get sufficient funds, as has been requested by the District Engineer Commissioners to complete this work at least by 1961 and we cannot complete it by 1961 with the amount of money now in the budget. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Congress have been complaining about this situation and have been saying that it is deplorable and something should be done about it. Now is the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, for the Members of the Congress to do something about it. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that, with the adoption of the amendment I have offered as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, we then will be able in proper time to do something about the deplorable condition of pollution of the Potomac River and about the water supply for this great Washington metropolitan area.

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

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Maryland. He has pointed out a very pressing problem that we have in connection with the United States Capital.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ascertain whether or not the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] withdraws his point of order.

Mr. TABER. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is all the money asked for, although we gave them two opportunities to present their request. And the Engineers did not ask for additional money.

On page 55 of the hearings when Colonel Renshaw was before the committee, the statement was made that \$200,000 has been appropriated for the Potomac River review, and for this purpose, and an additional \$200,000 was being requested for 1959. When we asked them about expanding the budget, they did not ask for more money. As a matter of fact, the national chamber of commerce with headquarters here in Washington, and representing the local and adjacent chambers of commerce, urgently recommended that the total appropriation for such proposals be reduced by \$81,500,000. The amendment should be rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. This item for an increase of \$500,000 has been

strongly supported by the Washington newspapers, has it not?

Mr. CANNON. I must say the gentleman understands the attitude of the Washington newspapers.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Those Washington newspapers are the same ones who in opposing legislation in this field have said anything not in the budget is "pork barrel."

Mr. CANNON. As usual I find the gentleman from Mississippi is correct. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

While the amendment offered by Mr. HYDE will increase the recommended amount by \$300,000 and would, therefore, possibly increase the expenditure for the next fiscal year by that amount, in the long run it would not mean an additional net expenditure of \$300,000. I say this because we have authorized this overall survey, which is estimated to cost \$1,450,000, and have previously appropriated \$200,000 toward this cost. If we expect to complete the survey by the deadline of 1961, the entire amount will have to ultimately be appropriated and expended. The purpose of this amendment, therefore, is to accelerate the program in such a way that we can meet the deadline and thereby reduce the overall cost in the long run.

This Potomac River matter has been referred to as a pork-barrel project. I consider the Nation's Capital as the Capital of all the people and not just the personal problem of the people who live adjacent to it in the metropolitan area of Washington. We in the metropolitan area of Washington are naturally concerned about this problem and want to do something to alleviate it. However, we feel that the Federal Government likewise has a responsibility in the solution of this problem, and I do not feel that asking the Congress to meet its responsibilities should be considered as a pork-barrel project for the people of the area.

This so-called beautiful Potomac River is a cesspool of filth. It is a national disgrace and is getting worse every day. It has been estimated by experts that unless something is done before 1970 there will not be sufficient water in the Potomac River to adequately supply the Nation's Capital and its environs. Something must be done to provide water for the Nation's Capital. The Nation's Capital continues to grow. Something must be done to stop the raw sewage that is being dumped into the Potomac River every day.

The gentleman from Missouri stated that the full \$500,000 could not be utilized this year. I have a letter in hand here from the Chief of the Corps of Engineers dated May 5, in which he stated:

From a strictly engineering standpoint, considering this Potomac River review study by itself without reference to our overall program, our overall capability, or fiscal consideration, an amount of \$500,000 could be utilized for this study in fiscal year 1959. As you know, the amount for this survey

included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1959 is \$200,000, which represents the maximum amount which can be utilized in view of the overall budgetary considerations.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that to delay this survey and to deal with it in piecemeal fashion is to seriously delay the physical work that has to be done to actually assure a future water supply and to start on some program to clean up this disgraceful, filthy Potomac River which flows by our Nation's Capital. To do it piecemeal would be penny wise and pound foolish and certainly is false economy. Approval of this item will in the long run be of benefit to the taxpayers of the country because it will cost a great deal less to have this survey completed by 1961 than to postpone it with endless delay. To continue to postpone the survey and delay the physical construction work which ultimately must be done will cost a great deal more in the long run as well as to delay the time when we can again enjoy the use and the view of this beautiful historic Potomac River.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The substitute amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUBSER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. CANNON: On page 3, line 19, strike out "\$8,479,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$8,508,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The question was taken, and the Chair being in doubt the Committee divided and there were—ayes 83, noes 12.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today includes funds for a number of Bureau of Reclamation projects.

The hearing record shows that the Bureau has had little regard for fiscal responsibility in connection with several of these projects. While there may be little that can be done to correct the situation at this time on these particular projects, I believe the House should be given the picture and the Bureau advised that a continuing lack of proper regard for the expenditure of taxpayers' funds will not be countenanced.

The Trinity River division of the Central Valley project is the first project I want to discuss; \$41,752,000 is provided in this bill for this project. This is \$24,644,400 above the initial \$17,107,600 provided in the fiscal year 1958 appropriation bill—P-12 conference report, fiscal year 1958. Ten million dollars additional was included in the second supplemental

appropriation bill for fiscal year 1958 to provide for a greater rate of construction than was previously scheduled.

The hearings before the Appropriations Committee disclosed that the contractors' bids on the Trinity River construction work were as much as 40 percent above the Bureau's estimate for such work. Under such increases it would appear logical for the Bureau to have rejected the bids and readvertised. These bids were not only accepted but the contractors have been permitted to proceed at a much greater rate than was contemplated or provided by the funds appropriated for such work by the Congress. In order to prevent these contractors from having to close down at a time there was increasing unemployment, \$10 million of additional funds were provided.

If funds are to be provided at increasingly higher levels as now indicated, there should be some reexamining or reevaluation of the contract to see whether the contractor should not make a proper reduction in the contract amount to reflect a sharing with taxpayers of some of the benefits obtained through a faster and more economical rate of progress than originally provided in the schedule upon which the initial bids were based.

It is noted that the committee report makes mention of such policy in the future, but it seems that the taxpayers should get a break on this project now. Particularly when it appears that some portions of the work will now be completed ahead of beneficial use.

I want to comment also on housing construction at Bureau projects. It appears that operation Ghost Town, is in full swing at Trinity, Flaming Gorge, and Glen Canyon Dam projects.

The Congress has, from time to time, expressed its displeasure at the construction of these elaborate and costly housing developments at Federal projects. In disregard of Congressional warnings, the Bureau is spending millions for permanent facilities in towns where only a handful of Bureau personnel will be stationed after the dams are constructed. The Bureau is squandering millions of dollars to create these new ghost towns in the West.

It now appears that the Bureau is building more or less permanent housing for the Trinity River project. The committee was told initially that this would be temporary construction to be dismantled after the construction work was completed. This is particularly questionable when the Bureau program contemplated the construction and operation of the power features by others and no resulting need for permanent housing on this scale.

This same apparent lack of regard for the taxpayers' dollars has extended to the Bureau's Colorado River storage projects where construction was started this past year.

Even though the committee has, over the years, been critical of the elaborate and unwarranted camp facilities being constructed by the Bureau, it appears that this has had little effect on Bureau action.

The Commissioner of Reclamation testified at the fiscal year 1958 hearings that ultimate permanent employee need at Flaming Gorge would be about 20 or 25, yet we find the Bureau has laid out and is well on the way to completing an elaborate town site with over 2 miles of 70-foot—7-lane—paved boulevards, and about a mile of 42-foot—4-lane—cross residential pavements, miles of concrete sidewalks, concrete driveways, concrete floors in the garages for temporary houses, and so forth. I wonder how many of the millions of taxpayers that are called upon to contribute to these projects would be satisfied with a fraction of the facilities to be provided at this campsite. At least there should be no traffic problem with a seven-lane boulevard, when the camp settles down to its permanent staff of 20 or 25 that the Commissioner of Reclamation testified to.

I hope that some action is being taken to assure that this sort of thing does not happen again on other Bureau projects.

The Glen Canyon housing development is not as far along as the one at the Flaming Gorge project. However, it has the same elaborate and costly layout but on a much larger scale. There are to be 4 miles of 70-foot 7-lane paved boulevard and over 4 miles of 42-foot 4-lane paved residential streets and miles and miles of sidewalks. Some reduction was made on the amount to be spent on the Glen Canyon camp facilities but the greater part of this was a paper reduction covering 190 so-called temporary houses which the Bureau may later request additional funds for. The elaborate and costly layout is totally uncalled for and many items are more than double the cost given to the Congress last year.

It would seem highly questionable to provide \$577,000 for an administration building which will not be needed by the Bureau after the Glen Canyon project is completed. In fact a question is raised as to the need for such a costly building at any time. In addition, the Bureau proposes to build a \$200,000 police building, a \$141,000 municipal building, a \$200,000 garage and fire station, and a \$478,000 warehouse. All this for a town with an ultimate permanent Bureau staff of 200. It just does not make sense. If it is not too late, I believe some further restriction on the expenditures for this townsite should be imposed.

Otherwise, after the construction period is over, these costly, permanent towns may join the ghost towns of the mining booms as tourist attractions in the West, and the taxpayers will be saddled forevermore with the cost of upkeep.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction); and not to exceed \$1,600,000 for transfer to the Secretary of the In-

terior for conservation of fish and wildlife as authorized by law; to remain available until expended \$577,085,500: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein may at the discretion and under the direction of the Chief of Engineers be used in payment to the accounts of the Confederated Tribes of the Yakima Reservation, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation, or other recognized Indian tribes, and those individual Indians not enrolled in any recognized tribe, but who through domicile at or in the immediate vicinity of the reservoir and through custom and usage are found to have an equitable interest in the fishery, all of whose fishing rights and interests will be impaired by the Government incident to the construction operation, or maintenance of the Dalles Dam, Columbia River, Washington and Oregon, and must be subordinated thereto by agreement or litigation: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by a law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated: *Provided further*, That there shall be credited against the local contribution requirement on the Canton, Missouri, project a sum equal to the total cost of the improvements contributing to the project which have already been constructed by the city of Canton: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used on the project "Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth", for any purpose other than bank stabilization work.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the paragraph.

Mr. TABER. The paragraph beginning page 3, line 22 and ending on page 5, line 9, on the ground it contains funds the appropriation which has not been authorized by law. The figure there is \$577,085,500. I am advised by the Corps Engineers, by letter dated June 11, 1958, that there is contained here \$57,702,253 in projects which are not authorized by law.

I am able by referring to the different items on page 5 of the Report that there are the Beaver Reservoir in Arkansas, the Bull Shoals Reservoir, Arkansas and Missouri, the Greers Ferry Reservoir, the Table Rock Reservoir, the Carbon Canyon Dam and Channel, the Los Angeles County Drainage area. It covers all of these items and they are not authorized by law. There are probably 15 or 20 of those items. I could read them but it seems I have read enough already.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman's point of order is lodged against the figure in line 8, page 4?

The CHAIRMAN. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. I made a point of order against the whole section, but I could confine it to a figure.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman confine it to the figure?

Mr. TABER. I do.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman makes a point of order against the figure \$577,085,500 in line 8

on page 4. But the point of order does not lie for the reason that in the proviso at the bottom of page 4 it is specifically provided:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by a law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated.

So the point of order is not well taken, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, these projects are without and beyond the limits of the authorization. That is the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, may I also call attention to the language beginning on page 3 as follows:

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law.

The figure the gentleman refers to is for this specific purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The language is very specific. As the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations pointed out a moment ago, beginning on line 23, page 3, the language is as follows:

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law.

Then further, as again pointed out by the chairman, there is this language on the bottom of page 4:

That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law.

Now, that language, in the opinion of the Chair, is quite specific in that none of these funds, regardless of the amount involved, can be used for any project which is not authorized by law.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. TABER. If the Chairman would permit, I would like to be heard on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled. The Clerk will read.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: On page 4, line 8, strike out "\$577,085,500" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$578,085,550. *Provided*, That \$1,000,000 of the amount appropriated by this paragraph shall be for the construction of a tunnel, access roads, and other facilities in connection with the Summersville Reservoir project on the Gauley River, W. Va."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to find myself at variance with the findings of the members of the distinguished Committee on Appropriations, particularly with reference to a project on the Gauley River in West Virginia known as the Summersville Reservoir.

Back on May 5, when the committee was holding hearings, a number of busi-

nessmen and industrialists appeared before the committee, accompanied by myself, to present to them a special request that the Summersville Reservoir be included in this year's appropriation, not for the purpose of construction money but for the purpose of permitting them to erect some two or three small projects that are necessary, preliminary to the awarding of a contract out of money to be appropriated in the next budget; not this current budget.

I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that this is part of a three-way project for the control of the flow of the great Kanawha River. Let my colleagues remember that this is the tributary to the Ohio River that supplies more water to the Ohio than any other of its tributaries. A branch of the great Kanawha comes from North Carolina which joins the Gauley River in West Virginia at Gauley Bridge to form the great Kanawha River. On this river, below the junction of the Gauley and the New Rivers, are located some of the Nation's greatest and the world's greatest industrial plants, particularly in the field of chemicals. Charleston, if you will remember, is often referred to as the Ruhr of the United States. It has the greatest concentration of chemical industry anywhere in the United States. On this river between the city of Charleston and the site of this dam is the location of the National Carbide & Carbon Corp., the Du Pont Co., and the Electrometallurgical plant at Alloy, industries employing over 25,000 people.

The Army Engineers, at the close of World War II, completed the construction of the great Bluestone Dam as a part of an overall project to regulate and control floods in the great Kanawha River Valley. That is outlined on this map. Right now we have on the Elk River a second project aimed at controlling the flow of the great Kanawha River, a project possibly two-thirds completed. We are interested today in the third of those projects, known as the Summersville Reservoir on the Gauley River.

These industrialists came in representing the manufacturers association and said there was a shortage of water and that they could not have any plant expansion or expect any future growth in the Kanawha Valley until they could get a guaranteed water supply free of pollution. This project is one for the solution of that particular problem.

They asked for it, accompanied by the industrialists and the chamber of commerce of three or four of the municipalities in this surrounding area. One of the county commissioners of Fayette County was present and testified. Here is the distressing story told by Dr. Stallard, a member of the county commissioners of Fayette County. We find that right in this immediate location where this project is to be, the county has a population of 81,300 and 26,000 of those people are living on surplus Government food. The percentage of the unemployed labor force is 34 percent.

Here is a project ready to go. I have, and will offer to the committee, a state-

ment from the Army Engineers that they can use \$1 million between now and July 1, 1959, to bring this project up to the point where they would be ready to ask for appropriations for general construction.

Why am I asking that this project be included? Because it will furnish jobs. We have to build some access roads and a tunnel. That will furnish some jobs for these unemployed people. And when I say they are unemployed, I mean they are objects of charity. They have no jobs and have no income and no compensation coming to them. I cannot understand why this committee would include 41 other projects, nonbudgeted projects, when here is a regular project handled by the Army Engineers, and refuse to give us a small grant for the purpose of creating jobs for these idle and hungry people.

They have publicly acknowledged in the report on page 2 that they have included 41 unbudgeted items and 4 unbudgeted items in the Reclamation Department. Here is an item on which the facts were laid before them by some of the largest industrial people in the Eastern United States. People came there who spoke their sentiments about this project.

I have been unable to ascertain from the members of the committee why there was no allotment made. The only reason I can see is that perhaps I led the committee to believe that the Army Engineers would file with their committee a statement of the amount they could use to advantage for the remainder of the year. I have such a statement here from the Army Engineers and would like to read it into the RECORD at this time.

You request information in regard to the amount of funds the Corps of Engineers could use for work on the Summersville Reservoir project, West Virginia, in fiscal year 1959.

Strictly from an engineering standpoint, considering this project by itself without reference to our over-all program, our over-all capability, or fiscal considerations, an amount of \$1 million could be utilized for this project in fiscal year 1959.

In appearing before that committee we brought a statement from the Army Engineers saying that they had two small contracts to let for which the engineering was completed back in May. That is what we want this \$1 million for. It appears that this project where the dam and reservoir will be built, is 6 miles from a railroad, so it is necessary to build an access road and a tunnel preliminary to the construction work on the main dam. This million dollars is for the purpose of building that stretch of highway, for the purpose of building a tunnel, and for the purpose of taking care of two other facilities necessary to this project.

If the gentleman included these other projects that were not budgeted, I could understand, if you had not given to the District of Columbia \$112,500,000 to build public buildings and a lot more to build bridges and for various other purposes. They have no unemployment situation here in Washington. The unemployment here is less than 2 percent of the labor force.

But when you face a situation where the people are helpless and there is no relief in sight as to any possibility of help, the situation is very serious. One of these large industries that employs normally 2,500 is presently employing 1,400, and it has served notice that 400 additional men will be laid off as of July 1.

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. I agree with my colleague from West Virginia that this is a worthwhile project, that it will help to develop the natural resources of the country, that it will assist in flood control at one of the principal chemical centers of America and the world, and that it will also provide jobs in an area which has been hard hit by this recession. This will help to carry it on. The whole project has been authorized.

Mr. BAILEY. That is correct. It is to be used only for the remainder of the fiscal year 1959.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. I must object, Mr. Chairman, because there are other Representatives from my State who wish to speak on this amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of propounding a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. If this amendment is adopted to change the figure on page 4, line 8, will it then be in order for any subsequent amendment to be considered further changing that figure?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must have been out of the Chamber because the Chair has answered that question several times.

Mr. KEATING. I do not think the Chair has answered it as regards this figure.

The CHAIRMAN. The statement of the Chair, as previously made, applies to every figure. Once a figure is changed, it cannot be changed by any further amendment. So if the pending amendment is adopted, no amendment will be in order to change this figure.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, continuing the same parliamentary inquiry, is it possible then to offer amendments subsequent to the adoption of this amendment, to include some other projects that have been authorized or rather approved and authorized in the same fashion, without including the funds?

The CHAIRMAN. That is if this amendment is adopted?

Mr. BECKER. Without changing the amount of money. I am not talking about increasing the amount of the total funds in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would have to see the amendment. The Chair does not understand the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, permit me to restate the question. If this amendment is adopted, which will change the \$577 million figure, that is the only time it can be changed, if this amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BECKER. Will that preclude any subsequent amendment for other projects without changing the amount but just by including the projects in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The answer is that any further projects would be in order as long as the amount is not touched.

Mr. BECKER. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. The project is one which has already been authorized. The quick completion of the project will materially affect the well-being of a large segment of the population of the great Kanawha Valley, in which Charleston, W. Va., is situated, and it will be a major factor in attracting new industries because it will not only contribute to flood prevention but it will also insure an even flow of water during the dry season and an ample flow throughout the year for industrial plants in the Charleston area. The engineers will have completed plans by September. The additional \$1 million which will be provided if this amendment is adopted will obviate the necessity of delaying preliminary work on the project until July 1, 1959, the beginning of the next fiscal year. Work could be initiated in September or October toward the construction of a tunnel, certain access highways, and other necessary preliminary operations.

I am interested in the amendment not alone because it would expedite the construction and completion of a reservoir which would control the water flow in my own District located downstream, but I am also concerned with the effect it would have upon unemployment in the whole area. There are two counties which would directly be involved, Fayette and Nicholas. In the county of Fayette, more than 25,000 persons out of a population of 82,000 are living on surplus food commodities. Out of a labor force in excess of 18,000 men, unemployment, I am informed today by Dr. C. W. Stallard, member of the Fayette County Court, is in excess of 9,000, or better than 50 percent. In the first quarter of 1958, \$165,126 was paid claimants in this county, which is an increase of 123 percent over the \$73,910 paid during the fourth quarter of 1957. Many of the men have used up their unemployment compensation and there is real misery and poverty in

the area. Many families have lost their homes, their property, their refrigerators, their automobiles, and have been forced deeply into debt for the purchase of groceries and everyday necessities. Many small businesses are on the rocks. Here is an instance, Mr. Chairman, where additional moneys appropriated now will not only provide early flood protection and water conservation, but will also provide work for people in the immediate future. West Virginia has the highest unemployment rate of any State in the United States. 13.1 percent of its insured workers were unemployed as of the week ending May 31.

The additional \$1 million which would be provided by the gentleman's amendment can be wisely expended immediately, according to the United States Army Engineers, and it will help to combat the recession. I congratulate my colleague and I urge that the amendment be adopted. May I add, too, in closing my remarks, that I am grateful to the Committee on Appropriations and to its distinguished chairman for including the sum of \$30,000 for survey of the Guyan-dot River Basin in West Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, for the further information of the Committee of the Whole, I call to your attention the following letter received from the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works relative to the Summersville Reservoir project.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D. C., June 17, 1958.

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BYRD: You request information in regard to the amount of funds the Corps of Engineers could use for work on the Summersville Reservoir project, West Virginia, in fiscal year 1959.

Strictly from an engineering standpoint, considering this project by itself without reference to our overall program, our overall capability, or fiscal considerations, an amount of \$1 million could be utilized for this project in fiscal year 1959. As you may know, no funds for the Summersville Reservoir project are included in the President's Budget, so that no funds can be utilized for this project in view of the overall budgetary considerations.

Sincerely yours,

J. L. PERSON,
Brigadier General, United States
Army, Assistant Chief of Engineers
for Civil Works.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to call the attention of the members of the committee to a group of people in the Fourth District of Kansas who oppose appropriation of construction funds for the item described in this bill as the Pomona Reservoir. It is in Osage County, Kans.

The item of \$800,000 for the construction of Pomona Reservoir is not included in the request made by the Bureau of the Budget nor in the approved items of the Office of the Army Engineers. These people were given to understand that only those items which had the approval of both agencies would be included in this appropriation measure.

I have a volume of correspondence from these people calling attention to the destruction of farmlands, and homes, and towns, running into the mil-

lions of dollars, that will result if this appropriation is approved.

The right thing to do is to withhold this appropriation until the Appropriations Committee has had a chance to take a good look at it. These people are already in the process of establishing a watershed program that will, if carried out, prevent the floods anticipated by the promoters of the Pomona Dam. Their program will cost much less money and will prevent damages and injuries that will be sustained if the Pomona project is carried out.

I am listing herewith a number of landowners and residents in the area whose property will be damaged millions of dollars by reason of the construction of this project. Many will be driven from their homes. The least we can do is to postpone the consideration of this appropriation until opportunity is afforded for a full and complete hearing on this project. It is more important than most of you realize. This item of \$800,000 should not be included in this bill.

Here are the names of some of the residents of the area who would be adversely affected if funds, not approved by the Bureau of the Budget are appropriated in this bill for Pomona project. Many of these people would lose their homes if this legislation is approved.

Mr. and Mrs. Melvin Schif, Ruth McReynolds, Mr. and Mrs. C. W. Chrisman, Mr. Lloyd Truelove, Mrs. Glenn Small, Mr. and Mrs. Jim Cochran, Mr. and Mrs. Howard Truelove, Mr. Howard Birkbeck, Mrs. X. Decker, Miss Maude Elliott, Miss Julia M. Elliott, Mr. Vernon E. Griffiths, Mr. and Mrs. W. U. Blankley, Mrs. Leora Smith, Mr. and Mrs. George W. Suggs, Mr. and Mrs. Hugh F. Jones, Mr. Dan C. Evans, Harriet Woodbury George, G. R. Evans, J. O. Williams, David E. Evans, Eugene F. Freund, Mrs. Wesley H. Jones, C. H. Rutledge, Wayne M. Traylor, W. H. Green, John L. Davis, Charles A. Knight, Harry F. Coffman, Masenthin Brothers, Taft Masenthin, Mrs. Fred Jones, Mr. and Mrs. Rees Lewis, Kay Lewis, Elva Leonard, R. L. Booth, Mrs. Russell Booth, Jimmy Booth, Milton Booth, Mrs. Anita G. Niles, Miss Sherrill Niles, Douglas B. Niles, Herbert T. Niles, Mr. and Mrs. John H. Lewis, Mary L. Morton, T. R. Evans, Mrs. Seymour Morton, Mr. and Mrs. A. H. Theobald, Myrl Griffin, Mrs. LaVerne Birkbeck, Albert E. Birkbeck, Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Laws, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Shobe, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Van Arsdale, Mr. and Mrs. R. R. King, E. J. King, O. K. Lyon, Lucian Hammond, Dale O. Thorne, Harold G. Waite, R. B. Shunk, J. W. Wise, Mrs. Nora Lind, Jack K. Allegre, John W. Jones, K. M. Allegre, Mrs. Orlen Dotson, Dale Roberts, Richard L. Jones, Dan C. Evans, R. E. Peterson, Glen Thorne, R. L. Brown, M. L. Bailey, Ivor H. Davies, A. E. Cummins, Glenn W. Jones, Elias Lind, Jack Freund, Nolan Petty, K. E. Richards, Dean H. Evans, Preston Williams, Robert D. Jones, Frank J. George, Mr. and Mrs. Harold Luck, V. E. Underwood, Mr. and Mrs. W. C. Neihart, Ada Neihart, Mr. and Mrs. Wayne Litch, Mr. and Mrs. Gerald D. Goldsmith, Mr. and Mrs. Walter

Mochamer, Mrs. Warren W. Thomas, Commodore W. Wood, R. O. Gardner, G. E. Palin, Mr. and Mrs. Alvin J. Hess, Howard K. Woodbury, Mr. and Mrs. Hiram Monypeny, Mr. and Mrs. Ed Wendland, George Branson, Mrs. Pearl Jones, S. C. Jones, C. F. Clark, Mrs. Mae Clark, Mrs. J. C. McKinney, Mrs. S. R. Gardner, Mrs. Margaret T. Smith, Mrs. Francis E. Hurtig, H. A. Smith, Cora E. Wood, Mr. and Mrs. Mike Garman, Homer Hatch, Walter C. Combes, Mrs. E. C. Kelley, Rev. Wright M. Horton, Mr. and Mrs. Harold Featherstone.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] and the other members of both the Subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations for their excellent work on this bill. The courtesy with which they accepted me in committee after hearing a long list of witnesses is highly commendable. I certainly appreciate their consideration in allowing funds for southern Illinois projects. These projects are vitally important to the welfare of our people and I can guarantee that the work performed will be a meritorious expenditure of public funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the "noes" had it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a teller vote.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Boggess, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12858) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

DESEGREGATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the month of June is the time for taking inventory of our civil rights gains in the field of education, since it marks the end of the public school year. We should take stock of what has already been done

in the various States to comply with the Supreme Court's decisions on desegregation and what exactly needs to be done to pave the way for more concrete and widespread gains in the coming school year.

With this in mind, I have written a letter to the President, asking what specific plans the administration has for preventing repetitions of the Little Rock debacle in other communities.

As we all know, such situations lend themselves to tremendous propaganda use as evidenced by its great coverage in the press, radio and television facilities of countries throughout the world.

Our inept handling of the integration problem at Central High School in Little Rock, Ark., coupled with the mistreatment of Negro students by white students, the flouting of the law by the governor of the State, and the injection of State and National troops upon the scene made this incident truly a shot heard round the world. The result was a disastrous undermining of our leadership and a great loss of face among the free and uncommitted nations of the world.

And now, Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a similar dilemma—to name one specific example—in the State of Virginia right across the Potomac River from the Nation's Capital.

There the State government has announced its intention to close all of Virginia's public schools rather than comply with the desegregation law—the law of the land. A local school board, in an effort to obey the law, has asked its counsel to look for ways and means of complying with the Supreme Court's edict without at the same time running into trouble with the State officials. And still further south in Virginia the chairman of another school board has declared a policy of admitting Negro pupils to white schools and facing the consequences of the State law.

These are shining examples of where communities need to feel that the power and resources of the office of the President of the United States stand squarely behind them—nay, at their service. School boards, teachers, parents, students, and concerned citizens, working in these communities toward the day when integration in the public schools will have become a reality instead of an ideal, are hampered in their efforts without the complete support of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that this support has been available and I should like to know why. The time has come—in fact, the time is past due for the Federal Government, particularly the executive branch, to assume its full share of the responsibility for not only preparing the ground for acceptance of desegregation, but to be actively buttressing the efforts of local organizations and individuals to implement the Supreme Court's decisions.

I have asked the President, Mr. Speaker, two very pertinent questions which need to be answered immediately: First, is the Federal Government preparing a program for these intervening months, between the closing of the

schools and their reopening next fall, aimed at preventing a recurrence of the situation at Little Rock which discredited and dishonored us before the world, and second, because of the international implications inherent in such a travesty upon our democratic way of life, is he prepared to lend the strength of his leadership and the full prestige and resources of his office to spur community efforts to comply with the law?

As I also said in my letter, Mr. Speaker, and I quote:

This is the time for realistic support of the law. Education and enforcement of the law must go hand in hand if we are to do the job of abolishing segregation in the schools within the meaning of the Supreme Court's admonition "with all deliberate speed."

This need not be a nationwide program, Mr. Speaker. We know the localities in which trouble may arise, and I contend that educational material, which would help develop public understanding of the problem, should be prepared and disseminated by the Federal Government at the earliest possible moment. Further, I believe that representatives of public and private agencies in the five or six more crucial areas should be studying ways and means of eliminating segregation in public education, conducting public forums, radio and television roundtable discussions, and using every other available device for reaching all members of the community, especially parents.

And finally, I suggest that trained specialists—those who are immediately available and those who are in the process of being trained—be sent at once to the places of potential and possible outbreaks to give advice, be accessible for consultation, and lend actual assistance in carrying out the programs of desegregation.

If we are foresighted and farsighted enough, if we are not only aware but willing to act, we can make real progress toward the goal which has been set for us by the highest court in the land.

This now becomes an immediately vital matter—not just a matter of principle, but a matter of a situation which faces us in a very short time.

I again quote from my letter to the President:

Thoughtful men who are concerned about the total welfare of the Nation appreciate the dimensions of the problem that we face now. They know the way will not be easy, or devoid of pain on either side. But they also know the real nature of justice, and that the function of the law is to support it. Unless this is true, we stand to lose more than continued denial of the Negro's rights. We open the door to the greatest threat that a democracy can know—that of abandonment of the safeguards of the law. The rights that are guaranteed by the Constitution cannot be selectively applied or selectively enforced. They must apply to us all—or they will soon apply to no one.

I call upon you, Mr. President, to begin to plan now for obedience to the laws of our country and through that obedience to make provision for the protection of the rights of every American no matter where he may live or who he may be in this, our free country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert the full text of my letter

to the President at this point in the RECORD:

JUNE 11, 1958.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As the public schools of the country approach the closing days of the school year, I am impelled by a sense of urgency to ask what positive steps are being taken by the Federal Government and the executive branch to prepare the way for more widespread compliance with the Supreme Court's decisions on desegregation when the schools reopen next fall.

Is the Federal Government preparing a program for the intervening months aimed at preventing a recurrence of the situation at Little Rock which discredited and dishonored us before the world?

Because of the international implications of such a travesty, Mr. President, are you prepared to lend the strength of your leadership and the full prestige and resources of your office to community efforts to comply with the law?

This is the time for realistic support of the law. Education and enforcement of the law must go hand in hand if we are to do the job of abolishing segregation in the schools within the meaning of the Supreme Court's admonition: "With all deliberate speed."

Thoughtful men who are concerned about the total welfare of the Nation appreciate the dimensions of the problem that we face now. They know the way will not be easy, or devoid of pain on either side. But they also know the real nature of justice, and that the function of the law is to support it. Unless this is true, we stand to lose more than continued denial of the Negro's rights. We open the door to the greatest threat that a democracy can know—that of abandonment of the safeguards of the law. The rights that are guaranteed by the Constitution cannot be selectively applied or selectively enforced. They must apply to us all—or they will soon apply to no one.

I call upon you, Mr. President, to begin to plan now for obedience to the laws of our country and through that obedience to make provision for the protection of the rights of every American no matter where he may live or who he may be in this, our free country.

And finally, Mr. President, I ask specifically whether it is possible for you to give me at this time—that I may relay it to my constituents—a well defined, specific program which you and the administration may have in mind.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES ROOSEVELT.

RULES COMMITTEE

MR. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

EXCHANGE OF ATOMIC INFORMATION AND MATERIAL WITH OUR ALLIES

MR. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include four tables.

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

There was no objection.

MR. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it is probable that tomorrow we will complete ac-

tion on H. R. 12716 and I wish to speak now on the subject so that a written explanation of the bill may be before you during the debate.

For various good reasons which will be brought out at that time, a greater exchange of nuclear information and material with our military allies is at this time desirable. I emphasize "at this time" because throughout our nuclear history we have tried to align the volume of our exchanges of information and material of this nature to the exigencies of the times.

At the close of World War II, when the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 was passed and we had an essential monopoly on this kind of information, the needs of those times dictated most strict limitations. The provisions of that act in this regard are set forth in table 1.

By 1954 circumstances had changed and this Congress, in its wisdom, recognized that some of the limitations of the 1946 act were no longer best forwarding the security of this Nation. As a consequence, changes were made by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The provisions of that act, which are currently in effect, are set forth in table 2.

During the last 4 years further changes in international relations together with technological developments by various nations in the nuclear field have been swift. To bring ourselves abreast of them, and by that I mean forward the security of this Nation, the certain changes proposed by H. R. 12716 are now necessary.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held extensive hearings on the subject in both closed and open sessions. JCAE wrote into the bill every safeguard that appeared prudent.

What precisely these safeguards are is set forth in table 3.

What precisely by way of information or material is proposed to be exchanged under these extensive safeguards is set forth in table 4.

It is possible that some of you have received some of the same kinds of letters I have opposing this legislation. These letters seem to be inspired from a particular source, because in almost identical language they set out some four arguments in opposition to the legislation. So that you may know the answers to these arguments, I am setting them out here.

The first argument is that all benefits from a test ban would be offset by this legislation.

The answer is that we have been made increasingly aware over the past years of the fact that the Soviet Union has achieved a significant nuclear military capability. Thus the Soviet Union has an increasing capability to launch a nuclear attack upon the United States or Europe. To counter this increasing Soviet capability there must be broader sharing of United States nuclear knowledge with our allies. In this manner it will be possible for them to participate most effectively in the development of plans for the overall defense. If the United States were not to share its nuclear knowledge with its allies, the only way our friends could achieve an effective counter to the increasing Soviet

nuclear threat would be by the development of their own nuclear capability and this would require continued testing. Thus, contrary to offsetting the benefits which would be derived from a test ban, this legislation is most important if a test ban in any form is achieved. The Secretary of State, in testimony in support of these amendments, stated:

All of our major planning, both in terms of disarmament, the limitation of nuclear testing, the limitation of the use of nuclear weapons, the building of NATO, all those plans would be disastrously affected, in my opinion, without this legislation. (From page 472 of hearings before subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States, 85th Cong., 2d sess.)

The second argument is that more bombs in more countries increase danger of nuclear war and multiply problems of disarmament.

The answer is that these amendments to the Atomic Energy Act do not authorize the transfer of United States atomic weapons to any country. They do not authorize nor has it been the intent of the administration to establish a fourth atomic weapon power. The act itself now contains a provision, section 121, which would permit the administration, by an international agreement, approved by the Congress, or a treaty, ratified by the Senate, to transfer atomic weapons to another country, but these amendments do not permit such a transfer. The NATO stockpile concept is one whereby United States weapons are placed in NATO countries for possible use by our allies. These weapons remain in United States custody. Further, it would be a mistake if we conclude that the spread of nuclear weapons could be prevented, or even retarded, by rejection of these amendments to the Atomic Energy Act. Materials needed to make nuclear weapons are becoming increasingly available as nuclear power plants are built. The knowledge to turn these materials into weapons has been independently attained by three countries, and the scientists of other countries have the skills to enable them to do the same.

Specifically, with regard to disarmament and these amendments to the Atomic Energy Act, the Secretary of State has stated that:

There is today understandable resistance on the part of other Free World countries to an international agreement which would have the effect, if not the purpose, of perpetuating for all time their present nuclear weapons inferiority, without the mitigation which would be made possible by these amendments. Other Free World nations would understandably find it difficult to accept that result and the United States does not want to seem to be seeking to impose it (p. 449, hearings).

The Secretary has also stated that:

The Soviet Union is making extreme efforts to bring it about that the Free World nations of the Eurasian Continent will be limited to conventional weapons as against the nuclear weapons capability of the Soviet Union. If it can succeed in this effort, it will have already achieved a one-sided disarmament of considerable dimensions which involves no controls or limitations whatever on the Soviet Union, but only limitation upon the neighboring nations of the Eurasian Continent. Under these circumstances, there

will be much less incentive for the Soviet Union to seek a balanced limitation of armament.

Therefore, rather than multiplying the problems of disarmament, these proposed amendments of the Atomic Energy Act will serve a useful, and indeed necessary, purpose in the negotiation of any fair and effective disarmament agreement.

The third argument is that giving nuclear weapons to European allies would complicate a European settlement from a foreign relations point of view.

The answer is that these amendments to the act do not permit giving nuclear weapons to any nation or regional defense organization. They do not authorize, nor has it ever been the intent of the administration to create, a fourth nuclear power by these amendments. The weapons that would be stockpiled for use by our NATO allies would be under the custody of the United States. They could not be used without United States approval and I would repeat that no atomic weapons will be given to our European allies by the authority of these amendments. As to complicating a European settlement, the Secretary of States has said that the program envisaged by the amendments "is the very heart of our foreign policy so far as Western Europe and NATO are concerned, and insofar as our disarmament proposals are concerned. I do not think any group could be any more back of this legislation than the State Department is"—page 472, hearing. Without these amendments we may well get into a situation where there will be such an imbalance of military power between the Free World nations of the Eurasian Continent and the power of the Soviet Union that the Soviet Union will have very little incentive to seek any kind of European settlement.

The fourth argument is that a colonial commander of a nuclear-supplied ally could trip off the third world war.

The answer is that in responses to previous questions, I have stated that these amendments do not authorize the giving of any United States atomic weapons to any nation. Atomic weapons which are allocated for the use of any nation would remain in the custody of the United States. We all share the concern that there should be no promiscuous spread of nuclear weapons, but I would repeat that we delude ourselves if we believe that this possibility could be prevented or even retarded by rejection of these amendments to the Atomic Energy Act. I would hope rather that the sharing of our nuclear knowledge with our allies would have an effect upon these people which would permit them to reconsider any ambitions they may have to achieve nuclear weapons independence by the expenditure of their own materials and resources. Indeed, the Secretary of State has said:

I think it unlikely that they will try to do that (develop an independent nuclear capability) as they know that in time of war they will have nuclear weapons and will know how to use them (p. 470, hearings).

Thus these amendments, rather than bringing about a situation where an ally could act independently, would tend

to make it a necessity that that nation act in concert with the United States in the use of nuclear weapons.

TABLE 1

ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

1. Did not permit exchange of restricted data regarding atomic weapons.
2. Prohibited transfer of fissionable material.

3. Provided that an international agreement approved by Congress or treaty approved by the Senate could override 1 or 2.¹

¹ Authority under item 3 never exercised.

TABLE 2

ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954 (NOW IN EFFECT)

1. Permits communication to another nation or regional defense organization of limited information on atomic weapons to:

- A. Develop defense plans;
- B. Train personnel; and
- C. Evaluate capabilities of potential enemies in employment.

But design and fabrication information limited to external characteristics, yields and effects, and systems employed in delivery or use, and then only such data as does not reveal important information concerning design or fabrication nuclear components.

2. Prohibits transfer of special nuclear material for military purposes.

3. Provides again that an international agreement approved by the Congress or treaty approved by the Senate could override 1 or 2.¹

¹ Authority under item 3 never exercised.

TABLE 3

H. R. 12716 WOULD AUTHORIZE GREATER EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION AND MATERIAL WITH MILITARY ALLIES UNDER FOLLOWING STRICT LIMITATIONS

1. If the cooperating nation or regional defense organization is participating with the United States pursuant to an international arrangement by substantial and material contributions to mutual defense and security.

2. The exchange can take place only pursuant to an agreement:—

- A. Approved by the President.
- B. Performance of which the President has determined in writing will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

3. The President must also determine that the specific cooperation undertaken will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

4. In addition, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy shall be kept fully and currently informed.

¹ But provided there is no concurrent disapproving resolution by Congress.

TABLE 4

WHAT COULD BE TRANSFERRED OR EXCHANGED UNDER H. R. 12716

- A. To a nation or regional defense organization classified information as necessary to: planning; training; evaluating enemy capabilities; developing compatible delivery systems; and other military applications of atomic energy.

- B. To a nation additional classified information:

1. Relative to military reactor design.
2. To improve its atomic weapons development, design or fabrication (but only providing that nation has made substantial progress in developing atomic weapons).¹

- C. To a nation material and equipment, including:

1. Nuclear materials for:
 - (a) Military reactors.

(b) Atomic weapons (provided that nation has made substantial progress in the development of atomic weapons).¹

2. Nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons.
3. Military reactors.

¹ Report on H. R. 12716 states only nation presently qualifying is the United Kingdom.

PUBLIC COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE CONSTRUCTION BILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, 1958, I introduced H. R. 12232, a bill to establish a 5-year program of Federal grants-in-aid to the States for the construction, expansion, and remodeling of public community junior colleges. In order to insure that my proposal would meet the concrete needs of the States for public community junior colleges, I subsequently invited various education experts and educational groups in the public junior college field to offer their comments, suggestions, and criticisms on the various features of my bill.

The response from these educators has been most encouraging. The correspondence received since the introduction of H. R. 12232 represents the opinions of educators from Alaska to Florida and from Massachusetts to California. I believe that these letters indicate the strong sentiment which exists on behalf of the public junior college movement, and I am happy at this time to present some of these many letters for the consideration of my colleagues.

I am particularly anxious that everyone realize the full benefit to be derived by the States and the Nation through enactment of this legislation. Therefore, I would like to present at this time those letters in which specific questions were raised about certain provisions in the bill. In the near future I plan to insert other letters from educators who have commented on my proposal.

A number of questions have been raised concerning the priority provisions of the bill. I would like to further clarify this matter at this time. Provisions in the bill require that State plans be submitted outlining proposed projects within the State. Under section 6 (a), priorities, or first considerations, are to be given by the State according to their particular need for public community junior colleges. As stated in the bill the particular priorities to be given consideration by the State educational agency for those communities most in need of aid are:

- (A) * * * at least 30 miles distant from the nearest State college or university,
- (B) desire a public community junior college,
- (C) are making an effort commensurate with their economic resources and are unable solely because of lack of such resources, to finance from the resources available to them the full cost of the needed facilities, and
- (D) are determined by the State educational agency to be communities where the need for public community junior colleges is most urgent.

These priorities are to serve as guidelines. It is not intended that the priorities as indicated are to be considered

in numerical succession. The purpose of this system of priorities is to have the State educational agency determine which areas within the State are in most urgent need for prompt attention. The bill was specifically drafted to provide this flexibility.

It was to obtain this degree of flexibility that I also included a provision allowing for a 1 year carryover of a State's allotment, thus permitting longer range and more realistic planning for State projects.

This same principle of flexibility was incorporated in the allocation formula of the bill. The total authorized appropriation for each year of the program would be \$200 million, of which one-half or \$100 million would be apportioned equally among the 48 States, the District of Columbia, the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. The remaining \$100 million would be apportioned among the States on a matching basis according to the ratio of a State's total public elementary and secondary enrollment as compared with the national enrollment for these same grades. I believe that this system of a flat Federal grant and a variable Federal grant allows for the greatest amount of flexibility in meeting the varying financial demands of the States.

For instance, those States which lack the matching capacity of other States do not have placed upon them the burden of matching a fund larger than they can afford. At the same time, those States able to do so may extend the amount of State and local funds to their own desired proportions. The flat Federal grant, however, guarantees that each State shall receive at least a minimum amount of Federal assistance. Because the educational structure of the United States consists of 48 separate State school systems, this type of flexibility in a program of grants-in-aid for education is extremely important.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to have the following correspondence inserted in the RECORD:

DEARBORN PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
HENRY FORD COMMUNITY COLLEGE,
Dearborn, Mich., May 13, 1958.
Representative AL ULLMAN,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ULLMAN: I was very pleased to receive in yesterday's mail your letter, dated May 6, together with a copy of H. R. 12232 and your remarks before the House of Representatives on April 28. I have read your statement and the bill through rather hurriedly, since we are presently involved in a special millage election having to do with the raising of funds for our community college in Dearborn. Following the election, I intend to study your bill with much greater care and may have additional comments to make at a later date.

In the first place, I am enthusiastic about it and I realize that a great deal of time and effort on your part must have gone into it and the very comprehensive remarks made by you before the House. Since Michigan is one of the leaders in the locally controlled community-college movement, I know your bill will receive enthusiastic support from our State.

Now for a few comments. One of the great advantages of a locally controlled community college is the meeting of the needs

of the community it serves. They are much more apt to meet needs in a better way than a system of State-controlled branches of the State university. It gives a wonderful opportunity for full-time working adults and housewives to continue their education. These are people who have home and family obligations who cannot go away. The family breadwinner needs and appreciates opportunities for upgrading and retraining. It is surprising how many full-time working adults and housewives attend our institution, who would not be able to improve themselves if we were not operating in our community. In other words, I am emphasizing how much an institution of this kind can mean to adults as well as those of the usual college age.

I would like to raise a mild voice of protest to line 15 on page 6 of the bill, "are at least 30 miles distant from the nearest State college or university." Oftentimes, State colleges and universities have no interest in terminal-technical and semiprofessional programs and, as their enrollments rise, their standards tend to go up and up. At times, in highly populated areas where a State college is located, the needs of a great many young people are not any better met than they are in less populated areas. I think each State is, perhaps, in a better position to judge its needs, and I hate to see too definite restrictions in a Federal appropriation. In a highly populated area, the needs for technicians and programs to train technicians are acute, and I hate to see any restrictions put around their development because a State university might be nearby. Of course, we do not want duplication of effort; but we do want equal and adequate opportunities.

One other point I believe needs mention. We have had a capital outlay matching fund for community colleges in Michigan for the past 2 years. Locally controlled community colleges need time for planning. Most of us use citizens committees to do it, and it takes a good while. Following the planning committees must come working drawings, bids, contracts, and so forth. Communities must know how they stand financially before they go too far into these things. I would, therefore, like to suggest that on page 6, line 2, the time be extended to at least the end of the second fiscal year following the year for which such allotment is made. This gives time for longer and better overall planning instead of a bunch of piecemeal projects which the 1-year limitation has caused in Michigan.

Let me express my deep appreciation for your letter, and I shall be interested in the progress of your bill. I hope that I may be kept on your mailing list, and let me assure you of my full support.

Very sincerely,

FRED K. ESHLEMAN,
Dean.

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS,
San Diego, Calif., May 19, 1958.
Hon. AL ULLMAN,
House of Representatives, Congress of
the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ULLMAN: Mr. Walter Thatcher, principal of the San Diego Junior College, has forwarded to me your letter of May 6 enclosing a copy of H. R. 12232, a bill which you have introduced to provide Federal assistance for the construction and expansion of public community junior colleges.

I can certainly support and vouch for the need and desirability of such Federal assistance. The paramount need for legislation to provide Federal aid for general school construction has been fully demonstrated and recommended by the President of the United States. Meanwhile, the problem of providing trained technicians and relieving the 4-year colleges of a portion of the lower division instruction can best be solved, as

you point out, through an expansion of the public junior colleges.

It is obviously unrealistic to expect that this expansion can be accomplished without Federal aid in the face of critical classroom shortages across the Nation.

There are two details of your bill which I feel deserve further study:

1. The priority given to areas not now served by 4-year colleges.

2. The allocation formula.

The priority system implies that 4-year colleges can serve the junior college function in areas within a 30-mile radius. In California, over the past several decades, we have found this is not possible or desirable. First, few 4-year colleges have ever provided sound and continuing 2-year programs of technical education. Second, 4-year colleges should maintain entrance requirements which enable them to concentrate on the well-qualified students. This can only be done if there is a public junior college in the vicinity which can accept all high-school graduates and give the "late bloomers" one more chance to qualify for college entrance. There is now increasing pressure in Oregon to raise the entrance requirements to your universities. This can be done only if public junior colleges are available in the Portland, Eugene, and Corvallis communities.

The allocation formula distributes an unusually large proportion of the money equally among the States regardless of need, population, or wealth. I know of no other Federal appropriation, with purposes so clearly related to the total population ratio, which allocates as high as 50 percent of the total funds on an equal basis among the States. One million dollars per State would be more equitable.

I hope these comments are of some interest to you. I would be glad to provide further information if you feel it would be of value.

Sincerely,

C. W. PATRICK,
Assistant Superintendent in Charge
of Post High School Education.

RIVERSIDE COLLEGE,
Riverside, Calif., May 14, 1958.
The Honorable AL ULLMAN,
Member of Congress, Second District,
Oregon, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ULLMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 6 and a copy of bill H. R. 12232 which you have introduced.

May I call your attention to page 6 of the bill wherein it states that priority for assistance will be given to (A) communities in a State which are at least 30 miles distant from the nearest State college or university. This, of course, will do us in Riverside, Ontario, and San Bernardino, for instance, no good. We have a branch of the State university in Riverside, but only about 11 percent of the high-school graduates in California have grades good enough to enter the University of California. The three junior colleges I have mentioned receive anywhere from 30 to 40 percent of the high-school graduates of their respective districts every year. The fact of the matter is that this bill would not help too many junior colleges in the State of California which, as you know, has for many years been in the forefront of junior-college education.

Very truly yours,

O. W. NOBLE,
President.

REEDLEY COLLEGE,
Reedley, Calif., May 30, 1958.
The Honorable AL ULLMAN,
Member of Congress, Congress of the
United States, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ULLMAN: My work in Oregon with Vanport College and Portland State College convinced me of the need for public

community colleges for the State of Oregon and other States. My present work in the California public junior college increases my conviction that the next great step in the universal public education will be to extend the time which the vast majority of our young people will spend in school through the 14th year.

Now for a suggestion on your bill which I think is excellent. On page 6, lines 11 through 16, I would eliminate the requirement that the junior college must be at least 30 miles away from a State college or university to receive priority. While this would be perhaps desirable in a sparsely settled area, it would be an unnecessary handicap in a metropolitan area, especially in States where the entrance requirements of the university are highly restrictive. This happens to be true in California.

Best wishes for success in getting this legislation enacted. I hope you will keep me on your mailing list to receive material from your office.

Respectfully yours,
STEPHEN E. EPLER,
President.

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON,
Houston, Tex., May 30, 1958.

HON. AL ULLMAN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: Your letter of May 6 with enclosures addressed to Gen. A. D. Bruce has been referred to me for reply.

Let me say first that I have read and re-read both H. R. 12232 and your statement to the House dated April 28, 1958, and that I for one am most appreciative of your actions to assist us educators as we face critical shortages of faculty and facilities. For your information I am enclosing a copy of a letter I wrote to Carl Elliott on his bill. In it you may gather some of my overall views relative to the support of American education in this critical era.

As for the junior college movement, I am convinced, after considerable initial skepticism, that California, Texas, and a number of other States are on sound ground indeed as they proceed toward the establishment of more public community junior colleges, and as they move toward adequate support of those already in existence.

Your bill, I believe, should be enacted. I suggest a number of revisions as follows and for reasons set forth in each case:

Page 3, 1, 2, add after "study": "Whether or not this program is terminal in the total offerings of the institution of higher learning of which the junior college is a part."

This addition is essential it seems to me if those institutions like mine (which started as a junior college and which added senior college and graduate programs) are not to be excluded from the benefits of your program. It must be recognized that such institutions have taken on greatly expanded responsibilities and services to our people and surely should be assisted as they struggle to meet the needs of their communities, State, and Nation.

Page 6, 11, 11-24: Eliminate.

This elimination is urged for the twofold reason that: (1) local rather than Federal control of educational programs is desirable; and (2) there are many struggling junior colleges already in existence which are in dire need of assistance. Surely the State educational agency would be in much better position than the Federal Government to establish priorities.

I might add that in Texas most educational funds are raised and expended by the local independent school districts. Complications which conceivably could result under section 6. (a) (2) might well defeat the fine purpose of your bill. Surely many per-

sons would be inclined toward the view that this paragraph is not consistent with section 12 of your bill.

I expect to be in Washington during the last week of June. I have told Carl Elliott that I would be available for any testifying or conversing that he might want me to do at that time. I add that if I could be of any service to you then, I would be delighted if you would call upon me.

Most sincerely yours,
CLANTON W. WILLIAMS,
President.

HIBBING JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Hibbing, Minn., May 28, 1958.

The Honorable AL ULLMAN,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: Thank you for your very interesting letter of May 6, 1958. You are to be congratulated on your realization concerning the contributions which junior colleges can make to bring higher education to the youth of this country. While I do not qualify as an expert concerning the financial aspects of your bill, I certainly find myself in agreement with its principles.

I would like to raise one question, however. It concerns the need for capital expansion, or even the building of separate facilities for existing junior colleges. Thus, in Minnesota as well as in other States many junior colleges are located in high-school buildings. Hibbing Junior College, for instance, occupies part of the Hibbing High School building, but has expanded at a more rapid rate during the last 3 years than any other college or university in the State of Minnesota. As a consequence, we are very hard pressed for classroom space, let alone other types of college facilities. Speaking for myself, I am hoping that aid will be forthcoming for the construction of a building since I do not know whether the local taxpayers, particularly in view of the economic situation, would be willing to assume the total cost of a new separate building. I was not sure in reading your bill and comments whether this type of need was covered by the law you propose.

Thank you again for informing me concerning this matter, and for spending your efforts in behalf of the public junior colleges and their present and potential students.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN J. NEUMAIER,
Dean of the College.

SHASTA COLLEGE,
Redding, Calif., May 13, 1958.
The Honorable AL ULLMAN,
Member of Congress,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: Our experience of 50 years in junior college development in California convinces me that this is a type of educational development that can be an important cog in the solution to the American higher education program in the next decade.

Recently I visited in your State, at the request of the State Committee of the American Association of University Women, to speak on the subject of California junior colleges. In addition we have an increasing number of students who come across the border from Oregon to have the opportunity to attend junior colleges.

My observations of the difference in our two States in the encouragement of a large group of youth to make their beginning in post high school education leads me to believe that some Federal assistance to State and local communities in this type of responsibility will help to create opportunity

close to home for students to go on to school. I believe that by broadening the educational front we will be ready to take care of the great enrollment surge.

I have no particular suggestion in reference to your bill. I do wonder what happens to the money in a given State that is not allocated in a given year. Will this be used by other States or merely go unused.

I might call attention to one other item, section 6, A-2. The provision that limits assistance to communities that are at least 30 miles distant from State colleges and universities may be a serious restriction. We in California do not believe that the factor of having the State college or university quite close would have an important bearing, particularly if there is a large population concerned which would need a type of program that the junior college is more fitted to promote. Also it may be that in this heavier population the junior college is needed to take some of the lower division load off the State college or university. In addition this restriction may encourage the formation of the very weak junior college in the less populated areas. I would favor removing this restriction and leave the State agency with the power to determine eligibility for assistance.

Once again I think that your recognition of this need is a timely one and I shall be glad to be of any further assistance.

Sincerely yours,
G. A. COLLYER, President.

PALM BEACH JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Lake Worth, Fla., May 21, 1958.
The Honorable AL ULLMAN,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have received and read, with a great deal of interest, the copy of the bill which you recently introduced in the House of Representatives. The proposal you are making to establish a system of Federal grants-in-aid to the States to assist in the construction and expansion of public community junior colleges does, as you can well imagine, strike a responsive note with me.

In reading your statement before the House of Representatives on April 28, I noted on page 3, paragraph 4, the following statement: "In the initial establishment of public community junior colleges and to those 2-year institutions which now exist as a subsidiary of a senior institution of higher education."

There is a large segment of the junior colleges in the United States which do not fall into the two classifications which you have made according to the above quotation. As an example, the junior colleges of Florida are locally controlled by the boards of public instruction, and none of the junior colleges in Florida is subsidiary to an institution of higher education. I realize that there are situations throughout the country where the junior colleges are subsidiary to State universities, but this is not the case in Florida and perhaps many other States. It would seem, therefore, that your bill does not include any program for the expansion of the existing public junior colleges inasmuch as it provides only for the establishment of new junior colleges and those 2-year institutions which now exist as a subsidiary of a senior institution. The public junior colleges now organized are growing very rapidly—conservatively, at the rate of 15- to 28-percent increase each year, and we are about to be presented with very serious problems in connection with enrollment.

I am wondering if you have any thought or idea of including a provision of expansion of existing public junior colleges in your bill.

I want to congratulate you on your concept of the problem with which the junior colleges and higher education institutions are faced in the United States. The promotion of junior colleges is one of the very best ways to take care of the increased enrollments we

will have in higher education in the next few years.

Very truly yours,
JOHN I. LEONARD,
President.

THE MONTGOMERY JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Takoma Park, Md., May 12, 1958.
Congressman AL ULLMAN,
Congress of the United States, House
of Representatives, Washington,
D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: I have received with much interest the copy H. R. 12232 and your remarks to the House. I would appreciate it if you would send me 7 copies of the bill and your remarks in order that I may distribute them, in my capacity as chairman of the legislative committee of the American Association of Junior Colleges, to the members of my committee.

There are a number of comments I should like to make about the bill itself on the basis of the preliminary reading:

1. Under section 6 (a), paragraph (2) (A), I wonder about the priority assigned to the geographical distance from a State college or university. In general, I think the junior college and the senior college are not competing for the same students. Indeed, the community college facility in close proximity to senior colleges can be argued to enhance the service of both. This is true of my own institution in spite of the fact that we are located within 3 miles of a State university. Our need for assistance with our capital program is just as urgent as if we were located at a greater distance from the State university.

2. Section 6 (a) (2) seems to me not specifically clear that existing institutions are meant to benefit from your bill. This seems to be clear in section 3 (4) and in your comments to the House, and I am sure this was what was intended. Section 6 (B), (C), and (D) could be construed, however, to provide only for new institutions.

3. Section 5 refers to the allocation of funds. Of course, I suspect a formula will never be found which satisfies everyone. However, it does seem to me that annual equal grants to the States of \$1,923,076 are extremely generous for some States small in area and population and are extraordinarily small for larger States such as California and New York. I also wonder about the allocation of the variable portion of the grant on the basis of total school population. I think it would be more equitable to allocate on the basis of the annual number of high school graduates or the total population, ages 18 to 24. These figures are available either from the Bureau of Census or from the United States Office of Education.

The bill you propose would be of very great help to present and future junior colleges as we approach the critical time in higher education. You are to be congratulated for your interest in the junior college movement and you may depend upon our support.

Sincerely,
DONALD E. DEYO,
Dean.

OLYMPIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE,
Bremerton, Wash., May 16, 1958.
Hon. AL ULLMAN,
Second District, Congress of the
United States, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ULLMAN: May I express a word of appreciation for your efforts in introducing H. R. 12232 before the House of Representatives. Your bill which would provide public community-junior colleges with Federal assistance for construction and expansion is very much in our minds these

days. We, in the State of Washington, as in practically every other State in the country, are most concerned over the securing of funds for buildings. As any of our administrators could tell you, our needs are much greater in the building area than is money for general operation and maintenance. Therefore, in my estimation, we should turn our efforts to the successful passing of your bill.

High on our priority list for the State of Washington for new public community-junior college construction are requests from several districts within the immediate proximity of senior institutions. Several districts in our most-populated areas, principally around Seattle and Spokane, are particularly anxious to establish their own community-junior colleges. We in the districts already with established junior colleges are inclined to be sympathetic with these groups since the pressure of great numbers of students is greatest in these populated centers. Under the limitations recommended in your bill, these areas would not be on the priority list for Federal help. However, it is realized any new legislation is likely to contain limitations, perhaps more severe than succeeding measures.

I would enjoy corresponding with you further concerning your noble efforts and I hope your efforts have initiated energy in this direction around the country.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK C. KINTZER,
Dean.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Illinois) for June 18, 1958, on account of illness.

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. ULLMAN, for 10 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENTLEY, for 15 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 10 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:

Mrs. GRANAHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOLLINGER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER.
Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.
Mr. METCALF.
Mr. BEAMER.
Mr. BYRD, the remarks he made today on the public works appropriation bill and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas, in the remarks he made today and include extraneous material.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. LIBONATI (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL) in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL) and include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 10589. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12540. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 17, 1958, present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7251. An act to amend the definition of the term "State" in the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act and the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act to clarify the question of whether the benefits of those acts may be afforded to persons pursuing a program of education or training in the Panama Canal Zone; and

H. J. Res. 427. A resolution to permit use of certain real property in Kerr County, Tex., for recreational purposes without causing such property to revert to the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 19, 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:

2029. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1959, involving an increase in the amount of \$8 million for mutual assistance programs (H. Doc. No. 407); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2030. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, relative to certifying that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Crooked River project, Oregon, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2031. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, relative to a proposal by the Department of the Navy to donate two 24-foot plane personnel boats, hull Nos. 102952

and 103062, without engines, to the United States Volunteer Life Savings Corps, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2032. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the receipt of a project proposal relating to the South Sutter Water District of East Nicolaus, Calif., pursuant to section 10 of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2033. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the receipt of a project proposal relating to the Georgetown Divide Public Utility District of Georgetown, Calif., pursuant to section 10 of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2034. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been concluded with respect to the following claim: *The Pottawatomie Tribe of Indians, the Prairie Band of the Pottawatomie Tribe of Indians, et al., Plaintiffs, v. United States of America, Defendant* (Docket No. 15-H), pursuant to the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U. S. C. 70t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2035. A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

2036. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act extending certain privileges, exemptions and immunities to international organizations and to officers and employees thereof"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2037. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2038. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2039. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2040. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2041. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 22, 1958, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Southwest Harbor, Maine, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved September 3, 1954 (H. Doc. No. 408); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

2042. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting plans for works of improvement for the Antelope Creek watershed, Nebraska; Bear, Fall, and Coon Creeks watershed, Oklahoma; and Auds Creek watershed, Texas; pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended

(16 U. S. C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2043. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting plans for works of improvement for the Mud River watershed, Kentucky, and Trampers Creek watershed, New Mexico, pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; 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. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. S. 2752. An act to amend section 207 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to modify and improve the procedure for submission to the Attorney General of certain proposed surplus property disposals for his advice as to whether such disposals would be inconsistent with the antitrust laws; with amendment (Rept. No. 1920). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 10853. A bill to provide for the addition of certain excess Federal property in the village of Hatteras, N. C., to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1921). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 12832. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1922). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1706. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1927). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 582. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the Middle Atlantic Shrine Association meeting of A. A. O. N. M. S. in September 1958, to authorize the granting of certain permits to Almas Temple Shrine Activities, Inc., on the occasions of such meeting, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1928). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 11246. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1902, to exempt certain common carriers of passengers from the mileage tax imposed by that act and from certain other taxes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1929). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 12643. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to consolidate the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, to be known as 'The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia', to create 'The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia', and for other pur-

poses," approved April 1, 1942, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1930). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 3057. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955; with amendment (Rept. No. 1933). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 597. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3, a bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws, without amendment (Rept. No. 1934). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 598. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 11077, a bill to incorporate the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America; without amendment (Rept. No. 1935). 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. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 488. An act for the relief of Eva S. Winder; without amendment (Rept. No. 1895). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRETTELLA: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1524. An act for the relief of Laurance F. Safford; without amendment (Rept. No. 1896). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1879. An act for the relief of Casey Jimenez; without amendment (Rept. No. 1897). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2146. An act for the relief of William F. Peltier; with amendment (Rept. No. 1898). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MONTOYA: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1565. A bill for the relief of Donald R. Pence; with amendment (Rept. No. 1899). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2062. A bill for the relief of John F. Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 1900). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4059. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scopettuolo; with amendment (Rept. No. 1901). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5351. A bill for the relief of Harlee M. Hansley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1902). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7293. A bill for the relief of Capt. Carl F. Dykeman; with amendment (Rept. No. 1903). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8233. A bill for the relief of James L. McCabe; with amendment (Rept. No. 1904). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MONTOYA: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8313. A bill for the relief of Wayne W. Powers, of Walla Walla, Wash.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1905). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MONTOYA: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8732. A bill for the relief of Ella H. Nafafalusy; with amendment (Rept.

No. 1906). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8759. A bill for the relief of W. G. Hollomon; with amendments (Rept. No. 1907). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8894. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Betty L. Fonk; with amendment (Rept. No. 1908). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9006. A bill for the relief of John C. Houghton, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1909). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9197. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sumpter Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 1910). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9772. A bill for the relief of William C. Hutto; with amendment (Rept. No. 1911). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9884. A bill for the relief of the Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., New York, N. Y., with amendment (Rept. No. 1912). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9986. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. Luther A. Stamm; with amendment (Rept. No. 1913). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MONTOYA: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10096. A bill for the relief of Olin Fred Rundlett; without amendment (Rept. No. 1914). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MONTOYA: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10139. A bill for the relief of Wallace Y. Daniels; without amendment (Rept. No. 1915). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10473. A bill for the relief of Hipolito C. DeBaca; without amendment (Rept. No. 1916). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10520. A bill for the relief of Aic Delbert Lanham; without amendment (Rept. No. 1917). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10885. A bill for the relief of Tibor Wollner; without amendment (Rept. No. 1918). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11975. A bill for the relief of Eber Bros. Wine & Liquor Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1919). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1293. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Stefano; with amendment (Rept. No. 1923). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6353. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Brist (nee Eggers); without amendment (Rept. No. 1924). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HILLINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6667. A bill for the relief of Maria Fierro Calogero; without amendment (Rept. No. 1925). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7282. A bill for the relief of Iwan Okopny; with amendment (Rept. No. 1926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 627. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with

amendment (Rept. No. 1931). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 628. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1932). 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. BENTLEY:

H. R. 12999. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 13000. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1959, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 13001. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on electric or gas clothes driers and electric mangles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 13002. A bill to provide for the erection of a Federal and post office building in Mineral Wells, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 13003. A bill to provide for the erection of a Federal and post office building in Snyder, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 13004. A bill to provide for the erection of a Federal and post office building in Dublin, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. R. 13005. A bill to amend the Passport Act of July 3, 1926, to authorize certain restrictions and limitations with respect to the issuance and validity of passports; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLT:

H. R. 13006. A bill to provide that the Channel Islands off the coast of southern California shall be referred to as the Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 13007. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$5,000 a year the amount of outside income permitted without deductions from benefits, and to provide that all types of income shall be taken into account in determining whether an individual's benefits are subject to such deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 13008. A bill to establish a Commission on Primary Election Dates; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H. R. 13009. A bill to provide for assistance by the Federal Government in the construction of schools by local educational agencies which have reached their bonding capacities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 13010. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place ground, powdered, or granulated seaweeds on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 13011. A bill to amend section 5 of the Administrative Procedure Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 13012. A bill to incorporate the National Association of State Militia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 13013. A bill to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 13014. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide additional funds for direct loans; to remove certain requirements with respect to the rate of interest on guaranteed loans; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 13015. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 13016. A bill to provide for a National Cultural Center which will be constructed, with funds raised by voluntary contributions, on a site made available in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 13017. A bill to provide for a National Cultural Center which will be constructed, with funds raised by voluntary contributions, on a site made available in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 13018. A bill to authorize the Gray Reef Dam and Reservoir as a part of the Glendo unit of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 13019. A bill to create an independent Federal Aviation Agency, to provide for the safe and efficient use of the airspace by both civil and military operations, and to provide for the regulation and promotion of civil aviation in such manner as to best foster its development and safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 13020. A bill to provide for the purchase of copper, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 13021. A bill to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 13022. A bill to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act to provide for the election of the justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii and of judges of the circuit courts of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 13023. A bill to provide compensation for extra duties assigned to postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROWN of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 629. Joint resolution to authorize the placing of suitable memorials by the American Battle Monuments Commission marking and commemorating the Spanish American War of 1898; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. J. Res. 630. Joint resolution providing that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be authorized to use squares 354 and 355 in the District of Columbia and certain water frontage on the Washington Channel of the Potomac River for the proposed Southwest Freeway and for the redevelopment of the Southwest area in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. Con. Res. 341. Concurrent resolution relative to the execution of Hungarian national leaders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

**PRIVATE BILLS AND
RESOLUTIONS**

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 13024. A bill for the relief of Tong Yuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTAIN:

H. R. 13025. A bill for the relief of Miksa Frater; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 13026. A bill to validate the conveyance of certain land in the State of California by the Central Pacific Railway Co. and the Southern Pacific Co. to D'Arrigo Bros. Co., of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 13027. A bill for the relief of Claude Thomas Lawrence; to the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 13028. A bill for the relief of Victor Hoffer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 13029. A bill for the relief of Teresa Rosa Panesi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H. R. 13030. A bill for the relief of Joan Bennett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 13031. A bill for the relief of Angelos J. Maroulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 13032. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a homestead patent to the heirs of Frank L. Wilhelm; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 13033. A bill for the relief of Floyd Oles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEWES:

H. Con. Res. 342. Concurrent resolution recognizing the lifelong contributions of Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault (retired) to his Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

686. By Mr. DOOLEY: Resolution adopted by the mayors and other municipal officials at the annual meeting of the New York State Conference of Mayors, Lake Placid, N. Y., June 4, 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

687. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city clerk, Elizabeth, N. J., urging proposals on the State and Federal levels for governmental action to ease the burden on the community of Elizabeth, relating to unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

688. Also, petition of the secretary, Richmond Chamber of Commerce, Richmond, Mo., relative to approving and urging the enactment of Senate bill 3778 and the adoption of Senate Resolution 303; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Extra Compensation to Postal Employees Performing Service at Higher Levels

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1958

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am offering a bill which would provide that postal employees who are assigned to duties and responsibilities of a salary level higher than that to which ordinarily they are assigned shall be paid the higher salary attached to such more responsible duties.

In the Postal Pay Act approved June 10, 1955—Public Law 68—it is provided in section 204 (b)—

If any employee is assigned for more than 30 days in any calendar year to duties and responsibilities of a salary level which is higher than the salary level to which his position is assigned * * * he shall be paid for the period of his assignment in excess of 30 days a basic salary computed in accordance with the provisions of section 502.

Section 502 of the cited law has to do with permanent promotion to the higher level and the effect of section 204 (b) accordingly is to provide that when any employee works at a higher level than that to which ordinarily he is assigned he may be paid at a higher rate of pay in the same manner as though he had permanently been promoted to that higher level except that he must first perform 30 days of service.

Postal employees report that the Post Office Department is requiring them to repeat the 30-day requirement in each calendar year. I point out to you that in the quotation it is stated that such payment shall be allowed if an employee is assigned for more than 30 days in any calendar year. The law does not say that this employee must requalify in every

calendar year. It simply says that in order to qualify the period of 30 days must fall within a single 12-month calendar period.

I think it is improper for the Post Office Department to require, as I understand it is now doing in the vast majority of cases of this kind, the 30-day requalification period each succeeding year. It is now almost 2 years since this law has been in effect. In that period of time there has been acting supervision of varying degrees and lengths of time.

Mr. Speaker, I think that in view of the application placed upon this section by the Post Office Department, and in view of the length of time the law has now been operative, there can no longer be any continuing need for the 30-day indoctrination period. Accordingly, I am today introducing a bill to remove that 30-day limitation.

I hope that the bill can be brought to speedy action in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and that my colleagues in the House will support the legislation when it comes to the floor.

Flying Saucers

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the advent of the saucers as sky objects has mystified the world. Several scientists predicted that their origin would be discovered as interplanetary, and surmised, further, that a secret weapon was in the inventive stage of development. The official word later came that, in reality, these objects were aircraft with saucer-like characteristics, recognized as in the development stage, with some now flying.

The prediction later was that we would see some official ones soon.

It was described as the simplest flying machine ever created and can hover, climb, and dart sideways riding on a column of air.

Thus, for 12 years the probes have been going on. The knowledge of these "what-niks" is still at the zero level.

The Air Force, acting upon these reports and being fearful of dangers from the skies, launched a secret, scientific search—over 200 scientists and engineers—working to discover the nature of this baffling aerial phenomena—these mysteries seen, but never caught—flying saucers. The Air Force has collected more than 800 sightings of flying saucers, and reports were received from outposts such as Alaska and Newfoundland, and from our vital atomic installation sites. Great secrecy shrouded this planning and special mechanisms, apparatus, instruments, and cameras—lens—were perfected to photograph and register identifying color glows for determination of fuel supply, material, construction, and so forth.

By combining existing radar telescopes and cameras, photographs were taken of objects spotted in the daytime and glowing objects at night. Modified Navy sonar sound detection equipment shows the absence of sound a characteristic of most reports on flying saucers.

The Air Force, releasing after a 10-year study, a report that previous sightings of flying saucers were illusions, or explainable as conventional phenomena. The Air Force added that no aircraft of foreign origin were identified in these sightings. The study encompassed 316 pages, replete with charts, drawings, and statistical data.

Our Air Force also has a project in this field of research and has perfected a revolutionary design study that envisions a craft that will outdistance and outmaneuver present day jets and eliminate runways.

A vertical rising, man-bearing plane, resembling a flying saucer, has passed