

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Guy E. Peterson, O2205385.  
George P. Short, Jr., O2204293.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1951, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Carl A. Anderson	John A. Johnson, Jr.
John S. Bailey	Joe T. Knox
John D. Barringer	Raymond F. Korber
William W. Beutler	Mark E. Kuhn
Nelson R. Bickley, Jr.	Erady L. Kunkle
Odie E. Biggs	Matthew B. Lamer, Jr.
Robert M. Blasingame	James D. Langley
Phillip H. Bradley	David L. Lichtenstein
Allan A. Buergin,	Lon U. Lutz,
O2208985	O2206631
Robert B. Burke,	Frederick M. Martin,
O1913006	Jr.
Donald Q. Carmichael	Moyle D. Mitzner
Eugene C. Cochran	John H. Mjoseth
Thomas J. Compton	Donald O. Nachtigal
Daniel L. Criswell	James W. Neff
Lowell M. Davis	Eugene H. Nettles
Michele N. Diana	Robert E. Otterson
William H. Dobson	Charles E. Parker
John E. Donaldson	John E. Parks
Elmore G. Dufour	Gilbert W. Pavlovsky
Loren D. Eaton	John J. Peppard, Jr.
Robert W. Elliott,	Joe H. Pitts
O2209905	Wendell L. Prince
John H. Englund	Bobby D. Reusser
Donn C. Fendler	Keith L. Riley
Leo J. Fitzgerald	Bill D. Saxon
Harry L. Forsyth	John H. Schnibben,
Walter A. Fred	Jr., O2205065
Richard S. Fridy	William K. Short
Donald W. Freeman,	Thaddeus R. Sobieski
O2002672	Herbert J. Stevenson
James E. Gay	Joseph T. Tambe
Richard E. Gillis	Robert C. Taylor
Robert E. Grant	Roger K. Thompson,
Robert L. Greer,	Jr.
O2202853	George G. Tucker, Jr.
Donald R. Hannum	Ray E. Tucker,
Floyd J. Helmick	O966941
Jim C. Hicks	Donald S. Wean, Jr.
Arthur R. Hill, Jr.	Sylvester L. Wilhelm
Stephen H. Janovick,	Milton B. Witty, Jr.
Jr.	Melvin G. Wode
Louis N. Jensen	Webb S. Wraith

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 13 (legislative day of May 11), 1951:

##### SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Robert I. Millonzi, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1952.

##### POSTMASTERS

###### ALABAMA

Kathleen F. Davis, Ragland.

###### CONNECTICUT

Lambert W. Harrison, Gullford.

###### ILLINOIS

Robert P. Cash, Columbia.

Carl R. Hesler, Moline.

Lela M. Campbell, Oakland.

Harry Leonard Thompson, Robinson.

Winsor Brayfield, Sesser.  
Herschel B. Wilkinson, West Frankfort.

###### IOWA

Norman W. Bell, Boyden.  
Charles N. Schinker, Norway.  
Ray H. Fink, Tripoli.

###### KANSAS

Alice M. Campbell, Blue Mound.  
Gerald E. Harville, Coats.  
John W. Robinson, Coffeyville.  
George C. Piersall, Hardtner.

###### KENTUCKY

Vivion L. Sutton, Mackville.

###### MAINE

Charles E. Frey, South Bristol.

###### MARYLAND

Irving F. Bodenburg, Fullerton.  
Vernon L. Sullivan, Garrison.  
Louis A. Stoddard, Joppa.  
Morris G. Richardson, Owings Mills.

###### MISSISSIPPI

Sammy Jo Crawford, Mount Olive.  
Charles E. Ross, Weir.

###### MONTANA

Donald Cameron, Jr., Gardiner.

###### NEW HAMPSHIRE

Maurice E. Kierstead, North Hampton.

###### NEW YORK

John J. Bohuslaw, Bay Shore.  
Hannah M. Curtis, Morrisville.  
Anthony M. Cipriano, Mount Morris.

###### NORTH DAKOTA

Joseph K. Salwek, Crystal.

###### OREGON

Albert L. Burch, Powers.  
Floyd V. Cavanaugh, Seaside.

###### PENNSYLVANIA

Isaac R. Weiker, Irvona.

###### SOUTH DAKOTA

Francis G. Jurens, Buffalo Gap.

###### VIRGINIA

Cletus E. Bomgardner, Bumpass.  
Alice H. Fields, Castlewood.  
Frederick T. Given, Chase City.

###### WEST VIRGINIA

Carl T. Lee, Ethel.  
Edward W. Fitzgerald, Glen Dale.  
Lillie M. Wintz, Lorado.

###### WYOMING

Alexander M. Gilchrist, Kemmerer.  
Ira B. Dickinson, Lance Creek.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 13, 1951

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

O Thou eternal spirit of the living God, in this moment of prayer, may our own spirits be inspired and reassured with a new faith and a new hope as we face tasks which are far beyond all finite wisdom and strength.

We are bringing unto Thee the many needs and problems of our country and the world which we know cannot be solved by legislation alone or by any form of political action, nor by might or power, but only by Thy spirit.

We pray that Thy servants, who are entrusted with the responsibilities of leadership in the affairs of government,

may be richly endowed with some special revelation of Thy divine guidance.

May all that we are seeking to do to build a nobler civilization reflect and validate the reality of Thy spirit within our hearts. May the day speedily come when the presence and influence of Thy spirit, in the life of man, shall conquer all feelings of hatred and unworthy attitudes.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution authorizing certain changes in the enrollment of Senate bill 435, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, 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 amendment of the House to the bill (H. R. 1424) entitled "An act for the relief of T. L. Morrow."

#### COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file reports on 13 bills voted out of the committee this morning.

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

There was no objection.

DRAFT OUR BOYS, BUT DO NOT TOUCH THE PRICE OF BEEF

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it appears that there are separate standards of sacrifice in this emergency—one for men, another for cattle.

We expect our men from 18 to 26 to answer to their names when they are called up for military service to defend us all against the threats of Communist aggression. That is one standard. But when we try to set a fair price in this country for meat—135 percent of parity—we are told that the beef will all go into the black market. Beef is sacred.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, this charge is made with a straight face by people who supposedly believe in democracy. They say the order is bad, therefore it should be criminally violated.

Imagine what we would say in this Chamber if people who set themselves up as spokesmen for our young men would threaten us that unless we repealed the Draft Act they would tell all of the young men to refuse to serve in the Armed Forces.

Actually, there is no equality of sacrifice in this emergency. Many of our young men are dying for the right of our cattle raisers to get a fair price for their beef in an American system of free enterprise. But the beef crowd says a fair price is not enough. Tell that to the boys in Korea.

#### THE DEFENSE OF WESTERN EUROPE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I think, in light of the testimony which has been given before an investigating committee in the other body by General Wedemeyer, that it is extremely important that it be placed in the Record that many of the Members of this House have for many months, and in fact for several years, been asking for an increased measure of American air power on the continent of Europe. It seems to us that the concept of the ground defense of Western Europe is as antiquated as oxcart travel and that any successful defense of that area of the world against Communist aggression must come through effective and planned use of strategic air power from bases in Western Europe.

#### THE CHINA LOBBY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand headlines from the paper reading "Acheson presses probe of corrupt China lobby." That is interesting because the China lobby as I understand it, has been anti-Communist and for Chiang Kai-shek. I can understand Mr. Acheson and some of the State Department folks who have been so soft with the Communists in the State Department wanting to investigate the China lobby. The China lobby has opposed the Communists. It is my opinion that when the Secretary of State gets down to the bottom of this thing he may change his mind about the China lobby. The investigation ought to extend to the whole field of the Communist lobby and the softness in the State Department toward the Communists. Any probe should investigate the other foreign lobbies, who work so hard sucking economic blood from the American taxpayer.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and ex-

tend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

[Mr. DOLLINGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### SECRETARY OF STATE ACHESON

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, as adroit and as skillful as Secretary Acheson has proven himself to be as a witness before the Russell committee investigating the dismissal of General MacArthur, his entire statement as regards the China policy pursued by the State Department will have been badly shaken unless the testimony given by General Wedemeyer to the effect that his appointment as Ambassador to China was canceled because he was unsatisfactory to Russia is convincingly disproved.

SPEAKER EMPOWERED TO DECLARE RECESS ON JUNE 21 TO RECEIVE THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF ECUADOR, HIS EXCELLENCY GALO PLAZA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Thursday, June 21, 1951, for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair for the purpose of receiving in a joint meeting the President of the Republic of Ecuador, His Excellency Galo Plaza.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech recently made on the occasion of the Tufts College commencement.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman tell us whether there will later in the week be a request to adjourn over Friday next?

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say to the gentleman that the only business I know of this week is the bill now before the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Can the gentleman tell us when a request to adjourn over will be made?

Mr. McCORMACK. Why, I am unable to state that. It will be made sometime after the termination of consideration of the present bill. If the gentleman wants the House to meet on Friday, that is perfectly all right with me, and I have no objection, but if the present bill is disposed of there will be no legislative business. I welcome the opportunity of advising my colleagues to that effect so that they can govern themselves accordingly. If the unanimous-consent request is made and objected to, I shall protect the rights of

all Members who want to make speeches and will offer a motion to adjourn.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understand it, there are some who would like to be present when that request is made to adjourn over Friday, so that if we know when the request will be made we could govern ourselves accordingly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Sometime after the present bill is disposed of. To give the exact minute or hour is impossible. I would like to be able to accommodate the gentleman, but, of course, that is beyond human possibility.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I realize that the issue of final adjournment is a very important question and requires consideration.

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

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 75]

Aandahl	Hébert	Preston
Battle	Heffernan	Rains
Bosone	Herter	Reed, Ill.
Breen, Edward	Hinshaw	Ribicoff
Brehm,	Hoffman, Ill.	Richards
Walter E.	Irving	Rivers
Brooks	Johnson	Rooney
Byrne, N. Y.	Judd	Sat: th
Camp	Kelley, Pa.	Scott,
Carnahan	Kennedy	Hardie
Celler	Kersten	Secret
Chelf	Lantaff	Sheppard
Chipierfield	LeCompte	Short
Cole, N. Y.	Lind	Sikes
Cotton	Lyle	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	McKinnon	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	Machrowicz	Smith, Wis.
Dawson	Mansfield	Sutton
DeGraffenried	Martin, Mass.	Teague
Delaney	Meader	Towe
Dempsey	Merrow	Velde
Dingell	Miller, Calif.	Whitten
Flood	Morano	Wigglesworth
Fulton	Morrison, La.	Winstead
Gary	Morton	Wood, Idaho
Gillette	Moulder	Zablocki
Goodwin	Murray, Wis.	
Gordon	Patten, Ariz.	
Hall,	Poulson	
Leonard W.	Powell	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and forty-nine Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

#### CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

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 further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4386) making appropriations for civil functions admin-

istered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 4386, with Mr. HARDY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read the first paragraph of the bill. If there are no amendments to this paragraph, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CORPS OF ENGINEERS

##### RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL

The following appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$1,500,000 shall be available for the current fiscal year from such appropriations for the services of such civilian personnel as the Secretary of the Army may deem necessary to be employed in the Office of the Chief of Engineers, to carry into effect the various appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control, surveys, and preparation for and the consideration of river and harbor and flood-control estimates and bills: *Provided further*, That the various appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control may be used for examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; purchase (for replacement only) in the current fiscal year of 250 passenger motor vehicles and 1 motorboat (to be acquired from surplus stock where practicable) and the maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft: *Provided further*, That, during the current fiscal year, such appropriations shall not be used to start or resume any project for which funds were not allocated for construction in the preceding fiscal year; but this proviso shall not apply to any project for which funds are provided in this act.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: On page 4, line 17, before the period, insert "*Provided further*, That the project known as Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C., shall hereafter be designated as the John H. Kerr Dam and Reservoir."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, little or no time should be spent on an amendment of this kind. Judge KERR has been in public service for 50 years of his 75 years of life. He is chairman of this subcommittee and has been intimately connected with this great project. He served for 20 years in his own State and will have served for 30 years in the Congress of the United States at the conclusion of his present term.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I am very glad that the gentleman from Michigan has offered this amendment. It is very fitting that the man who is responsible for this great dam should be honored by having it named after him. Judge KERR has rendered a fine public service for a long time and the very least that can be done is to adopt this amendment. I compli-

ment the gentleman from Michigan for having offered it.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to support this amendment. When I first came to Congress 23 years ago my first chairman was the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR]. I shall always treasure with fond recollections the memory of my service with and under him as chairman of the first committee I served on. As a matter of fact, in a joshing way, every once in a while when I meet my distinguished friend I say: "Well, JOHN, you made me what I am today. I hope you're satisfied."

That represents a state of mind. It is very seldom during the lifetime of people that their work is recognized. That happens usually after they have taken the journey into the great beyond. How fitting and how proper it is that this great project which means so much to the people of his area of the country and for which he fought so diligently, ably and courageously, should be named in his honor during his lifetime.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the majority leader in this recognition of my colleague from the great State of North Carolina, Judge KERR. He has made a great contribution through the years of his public service and this is certainly something which the entire State of North Carolina will receive with great appreciation because they too love this honored and respected Member who has served that State so faithfully.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] is not only an outstanding Member of this House, but he is humble. If ever a man typified or was symbolic of those qualities which make up vividly of man, it is the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR]. I know that the people of his State and his district will realize the significance of what is taking place here today, a most unusual thing, to have a dam and a reservoir, for which we are appropriating money, named in honor of a person who is living. I know that my dear friend is very deeply touched and that he will always remember this as one of his most fondest of recollections.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is a richly deserved tribute to a great man,

a man who has served with distinction here for more than 30 years; one of the most lovable Members of the House.

He comes from distinguished ancestry. His father led a North Carolina company under General Lee in the War Between the States, and my mother always felt that if a man was of Confederate descent, there was nothing more that could be asked or desired.

Judge KERR is one of the scholarly men of the House. He served as trustee of the University of North Carolina and his alma mater, Wake Forest College, one of the historic institutions of the South, conferred the doctorate on him in recognition of his contributions to education and to public service.

Judge KERR has rendered notable service in many congressional fields. Among the many activities in which he has displayed exceptional leadership was as chairman of the Subcommittee on Subversive Organizations. As chairman of that committee he made history in the House and conducted a singularly successful campaign against Communist infiltration in the Federal departments.

Of course his greatest service has been in river and harbor work and flood-control development—in the handling of appropriations for the purposes serviced by the bill now pending before the committee. He has been in charge of subcommittees and bills of this character longer than any Member of either House. He probably is better acquainted with the needs of the Nation in this respect and has a wider knowledge of the subject and a deeper insight in the solution of the problems connected with the waterways of the North American Continent than any Member of either body.

It was but natural that he should early see the vast possibilities for conservation of natural resources and development of needed power in the Carolina and Virginia area, and direct his attention and devote his time to the great project which is now nearing completion and for which he is solely responsible. For unmeasured centuries it will be a source of strength in time of war and unmeasured wealth in time of peace.

It is most appropriate that this giant plant, one of the assets of the Nation, a potential blessing to generations to come, should bear the name of the distinguished statesman who brought it into being. And it is even more appropriate that the House should thus confer this distinction upon a beloved colleague whom the Congress and the country so delight to honor.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to join in the high praise of the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, who has given faithful and long service to the development of flood control in the Roanoke River Valley of Virginia and North Carolina. It can truly be said that Judge KERR is the father of flood control in the Roanoke Valley. I think it is most appropriate, and I think a

tribute like this could not be paid to a more deserving person. The naming of this dam for Judge KERR will be very pleasing, I am sure, to the people of North Carolina, approved by the people of Virginia to the North Carolina delegation. Judge KERR is a gentleman of the finest character and one who holds and carries the dignity of this House to the highest degree.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I have no intention to circumvent my dear friends over here, but I just want to say this: When we go back in the House, I will make a unanimous-consent request that all Members may extend their remarks concerning Judge KERR's leadership in this activity at this point in the RECORD.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to join many other Members of this body in favoring the passage of this amendment to honor our colleague the gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable JOHN KERR, by naming the dam in his State with his famous name. Having been closely associated with Mr. KERR over a period of years on very important committees, I have experienced his tremendous work during which he alone overcame great obstacles in securing the legislation and the funds to institute survey and the beginning of actual construction on this very important project. This work was done and accomplished by Mr. KERR practically alone during the most serious times in our history. He had frequently told me that he would not have fought for this project unless he absolutely knew and was sincerely convinced of its great need by the entire country, his State, and his district. In honoring JOHN KERR by naming this dam for him, this Congress is honoring a statesman whose service to the Nation and his State is an outstanding one. Born and educated in North Carolina, the State which he loves, JOHN KERR represents the third member of the same family with the name of John Kerr who was a Member of the United States House of Representatives. Our colleague's father, the late John Kerr, was a member of the Confederate Army. His ancestors hailed from Scotland where the name John Kerr is prominently known. Our colleague has been a prominent lawyer of North Carolina where he distinguished himself as a judge of the superior court. Our colleague was the United States delegate to important missions in Mexico and is a world traveler as a result of his official missions for the House of Representatives and the Department of State in Europe. It was my privilege to be with him at the Army maneuvers during the Second World War in North and South Carolina and, in my opinion, there is no Carolinian who knows more about the history of his State than does our colleague. From him I learned much of the history of that State and especially his insistence that it was in North Carolina that the first blow was struck for freedom against the British. So it is with a great deal of pride, Mr. Chairman, that I take the floor to support the amendment to honor our dis-

tinguished colleague, JOHN KERR, of North Carolina.

Mr. CARLYLE. Mr. Chairman, of course I join at this time with my colleagues in recognizing and deeply appreciating the loyal and invaluable services which have been rendered to the State of North Carolina and to this country by Judge JOHN H. KERR, who has been a Member of Congress since November 6, 1923. It has been my good fortune to have known him from the time of his election as a superior court judge in North Carolina, and it was at all times a privilege and a pleasure to practice in his court. As a judge, he made a distinguished record because of his thorough knowledge of the law and his innate sense of justice. He had previously served with distinction as a superior court solicitor in our State. North Carolinians are proud of Judge KERR's record in Congress. It is one of achievement and devotion to public service.

The great Federal development at Buggs Island is a product of the fertile brain of Congressman KERR, who has given unselfishly of his time and efforts in its promotion, and it is only natural that his name should always be closely associated with this development. Therefore, it is eminently appropriate that the Congress should now honor our distinguished colleague by officially designating this great Federal project the John H. Kerr Dam.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I deem it a great privilege to be able to join in support of this amendment to pay a small measure of tribute to the distinguished Representative from North Carolina, Judge JOHN H. KERR. My distinguished predecessor, the Honorable Will M. Whittington, has often told me of the great services which Judge KERR has rendered the country from his important post on the Appropriations Committee, and I have come to realize this fully during my brief service in the Congress.

The Mississippi Valley is completely dependent upon an adequate flood-control system to protect the lives and property of its people. The Federal Government has recognized its responsibility in this field and acted to meet it, largely because of the far-sighted leadership of such statesmen as Judge KERR.

It is fitting that this great multipurpose dam in North Carolina should be named in his honor, but hundreds of other great projects of vast benefit to the people of this Nation will always stand as a monument to his foresight and vision of the future potentialities of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### RIVERS AND HARBORS

Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works: For expenses necessary for the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation; for surveys of northern and northwestern lakes and other boundary and connecting waters

as heretofore authorized, including the preparation, correction, printing, and issuing of charts and bulletins, and the investigation of lake levels; for prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City; for expenses of the California Débris Commission in carrying on the work authorized by the act approved March 1, 1893, as amended (33 U. S. C. 661, 678, and 683); for removing sunken vessels or craft obstructing or endangering navigation as authorized by law; for operating and maintaining, keeping in repair, and continuing in use without interruption any lock, canal (except the Panama Canal), canalized river, or other public works for the use and benefit of navigation belonging to the United States; for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors; for the execution of detailed investigations and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects heretofore authorized; for printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of surveys authorized by law, and such surveys as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress; \$162,860,500: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for any preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate not authorized by law: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation the Secretary of the Army may, in his discretion and on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers based on the recommendation by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in the review of a report or reports authorized by law, expend such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality, or other public agency outside of harbor lines and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation, such work to be subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report or reports thereon: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$5,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for the support and maintenance of the Permanent International Commission of the Congress of Navigation and for the payment of the expenses of the properly accredited delegates of the United States to the meeting of the Congresses and of the Commission: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation not to exceed \$1,600,000 shall be available for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for expenditure for the purposes of and in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 8, 1946 (16 U. S. C. 756), and the act of August 14, 1946.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: On page 5, line 21, strike out "\$162,860,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$166,160,500."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, the adoption of this amendment would mean that the request of the corps of Army Engineers for \$3,300,000 would be allowed and used in bank stabilization work on the Arkansas River between Catoosa, Okla., and the mouth of the Arkansas River. I know that the job of this great subcommittee is a hard one, and I want to say to the House that the membership on both sides of the aisle of this subcommittee, are honorable, sincere, courageous, upright, and able gentlemen, my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations and for whom I have the very highest regard. But the committee laid down a criteria to control the marking up of the bill. One criteria was that no new project would be appropriated for. Bank stabilization on the Arkansas River

is not a new project. We have had appropriations during the years past for this work. This year we have a current appropriation for bank stabilization on the Arkansas River. It is not a new project. The second criteria which guided them in their consideration is that no controversial project would be included. This is not controversial. Everybody is, as far as Arkansas is concerned, in favor of the work. The third criterion—and there is a difference, and I want to be honest with the committee—is that there is no budget estimate for the \$3,300,000. But, may I call your attention to the fact that the Corps of Army Engineers made a request for \$3,300,000 for bank stabilization to be used from Catoosa, Okla., to the mouth, and if I am in error on that I would like to be corrected.

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

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. FORD. I am looking at the chart which we used in our committee of the rivers and harbors projects for the fiscal year 1952. Under Arkansas there are only two projects listed. One is entitled Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. The Corps of Engineers requested from the budget under that category only \$400,000 for planning. The next item under Arkansas is the Overton-Red River waterway, Arkansas-Louisiana. The corps asked of the budget only \$50,000.

Mr. NORRELL. I think I can get the gentleman to understand the situation. You must remember that the lower Mississippi extends up the Arkansas River to the vicinity of Pine Bluff. There is a current appropriation in the lower Mississippi River funds for the Arkansas River bank stabilization program on the Arkansas River to Pine Bluff, and your records will so disclose. This part of the river, up to Pine Bluff, is under the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission. We have \$600,000, for bank stabilization.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. In that connection I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that I hold in my hand a letter dated May 28, 1951, from Brig. Gen. C. H. Chorpening, Assistant Chief of Engineers, in which he states in a memorandum to the clerk of this committee:

The estimates submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for 1952 include \$3,300,000 for work on the Arkansas River, of which \$800,000 was for the continuation of work at two locations below Little Rock, and \$2,500,000 was for the inauguration of work at other locations.

Mr. NORRELL. That is correct.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I am in favor of the gentleman's amendment, but I want to know whether or not it includes planning money that the Army engineers asked for and which the Bureau of the Budget recommended?

Mr. NORRELL. May I say to the gentleman that will have to be handled in another amendment, and I am sure the amendment will be offered.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, and I am not going to take the full 5 minutes because I am simply trying to get before you the idea that this is an old project and one currently being worked on; the Army engineers made a request for \$3,300,000.

Bank stabilization is highly essential on the Arkansas River. The stabilization of these banks not only protect the investments of the Government in the levees that have been constructed at great cost but set-back levees are prevented. When the banks are permitted to cave in and destroy existing levees, it becomes necessary for the Government to condemn and buy the land and build set-back levees. This is very expensive, and in addition to the enormous costs the land is placed behind levees and is forever ruined.

I am simply trying to do what the Army engineers recommended, and which the flood-control experts in the Bureau of the Budget, in their wisdom, saw fit to take out. I have no criticism of that. I hope the amendment may be adopted. If not, I trust that this subcommittee, if the other body amend the bill by including it, will not be too hard because this is not a new one. The Army engineers have recommended it. It ought to be done. It is better to save land than it is to try to rebuild it after the land has been destroyed.

If I am unsuccessful here, I repeat, I hope the House conferees will consider any action that the other body might take, with some degree of charity and mercy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude in 15 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL]. This amendment seeks to secure \$3,300,000 for bank stabilization from Catoosa, Okla., to the mouth of the Arkansas River, a distance of 481 miles.

The appropriation we are seeking is for emergency work. The Arkansas

River is causing damage amounting to millions of dollars each year because of the lack of protection afforded to the banks in places where they are caving off into the river. In addition to the loss of land along the river, there is the threat of the loss of newly constructed levees which have been paid for by the Federal Government, in cooperation with levee districts. We have already expended nearly \$50,000,000 for levees which are now being threatened by the bank cavings along this treacherous stream.

I would further call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that the Congress authorized the improvement of the Arkansas River and tributaries in Arkansas and Oklahoma in the River and Harbor and Flood Control Act of the Seventy-ninth Congress and from time to time since then, including the Flood Control Act of 1950, additional authorizations have been made. In last year's authorizing act, provisions were made for the emergency which existed then and which has grown progressively worse since that time. We ask the Congress to provide only sufficient money to protect the present investment that has been made on the Arkansas River and to stop the destruction of hundreds of acres of fertile farm lands and to protect 145 river crossings consisting of highway and railroad bridges, natural-gas and petroleum production pipelines, and electric-transmission lines.

If it were only the postponement of future improvements, we would not be here today seeking an appropriation of \$3,300,000, but this money is to protect investments and values that now exist, and the Government itself may well lose many, many times this appropriation if it fails to make available to the Corps of Engineers adequate funds to take care of the emergency bank-caving problems in the 481-mile reach of the river below Tulsa, Okla.

Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee handling this bill, has been given a justification for the amount which we seek by the Corps of Engineers, and I urge you to consider the conservative judgment of the Corps of Engineers and allow this amendment to pass, which will provide the emergency funds needed to halt the terrible destruction of land and property and to halt the interruption of transportation which is so badly needed at this time in our country's defense program.

Under leave which I obtained in the House, I include herewith the memorandum dated May 28, 1951, written by Brig. Gen. C. H. Chorpening, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works. The memorandum follows:

1. The authorized project for improvement of the Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma, provides for a channel 9 feet deep from the mouth to Catoosa, Okla., a distance of 481 miles, to be provided by lock and dam construction, bank stabilization, and open channel improvement. The bank stabilization work is estimated to cost about \$95,000,000, of which \$2,032,000 has been provided to date for emergency work at critical locations. The estimates submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for 1952 included \$3,300,000 for work on the Arkansas River of

which \$800,000 was for continuation of work at two locations below Little Rock and \$2,500,000 was for inauguration of work at other locations. No funds were included in the approved budget estimate for 1952 for continuation of this feature of work.

2. Funds required for work at the most critical locations, which could be utilized during the fiscal year 1952 where benefit to the national emergency will accrue through the conservation of resources and facilities vital to the war effort, are shown in the accompanying table. For the section, Plum Bayou to Rob Roy, the work consists of about 9,000 linear feet of revetment for immediate protection above Rob Roy Bridge, Ark., where the bank line has now receded as far as it should be permitted to cave and the work should be carried out promptly to preserve a favorable alignment. At other locations the work involved is the continuation or betterment of works already constructed and is necessary either as a protection to the works already constructed, to protection of existing levees, or for protection of additional areas or facilities. For the section downstream from the Morrilton cut-off, the recent completion of this cut-off may accelerate changes in the regimen of the river causing damage to the Conway Levee District

No. 8 or to Faulkner Levee District No. 1. For the section Wilsons Rock to Missouri Pacific Railroad bridge, the proposed work would provide a greater amount of protection in the Bradens Bend section of the Arkansas River where limited protection has been provided for under a flood-control authorization. Additional work is necessary to protect and strengthen the partial project authorized in the Flood Control Act which is to be carried out as a part of the general stabilization program for the Arkansas River. Any funds which might be appropriated should be concentrated on work at the most critical locations and should be sufficient to permit the completion of useful and permanent increments of work of sufficient length to permit tying in at hard points at either end and thus obviating the danger of loss of work through flanking action.

3. In spite of the urgency and importance of this work, I do not believe that provision for bank stabilization work on the Arkansas River can be provided for within the approved budget estimates for river and harbor projects by elimination or reduction in the amounts included for other projects.

C. H. CHORPENING,  
Brigadier General, USA, Assistant  
Chief of Engineers for Civil Works.

*Emergency bank stabilization, Arkansas River*

Location and river mileage	River mileage	Total estimated cost	Allotted to date	Amount which could be utilized in fiscal year 1952	Balance to complete
Wilsons Rock to Missouri-Pacific R. R. bridge.....	376	\$6,800,000	0	\$3,000,000	\$3,800,000
White Bluff to Jefferson County free bridge.....	130	5,465,000	\$1,624,000	2,000,000	1,841,000
Rock Island R. R. bridge to White Bluff.....	165	13,813,000	0	1,500,000	12,313,000
Arkansas Post Canal to Yancopin bridge.....	42	1,400,000	0	460,000	940,000
Rob Roy Bridge to Arkansas Post Canal.....	89	28,760,000	0	2,400,000	26,360,000
Plum Bayou to Rob Roy.....	102	1,500,000	0	1,040,000	460,000
Downstream Morrilton cut-off to Cadron Ridge.....	209	1,022,000	0	500,000	522,000
Upstream Morrilton to downstream Morrilton cut-off.....	217	552,000	100,000	452,000	0
Dardanelles Rock to Reeds Ferry.....	257	6,385,000	308,000	3,000,000	4,077,000
OKane Bend to Patterson Bend.....	302	4,446,000	0	1,000,000	3,446,000
St. Louis & Santa Fe R. R. bridge to Flat Rock Bend.....	354	2,493,000	0	1,000,000	1,493,000
Total.....		72,636,000	2,032,000	15,352,000	55,252,000

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

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

Mr. STIGLER. I wish to associate myself with my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] and ask him this question: Is it not a fact that in the gentleman's district, which adjoins mine, you have quite a bank stabilization project, and if the present situation is not corrected the farmers of that valley stand to lose several thousand acres of very valuable bottom land?

Mr. ALBERT. My colleague is correct.

Mr. STIGLER. Is it not a further fact that if additional work is not done and we have any flash floods the damage will be very heavy?

Mr. ALBERT. Not only to farms but also to transmission lines, highways, railroads, bridges located in that valley.

Mr. STIGLER. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] is recognized.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the Members who are attempting to have this amendment adopted. For instance, in the Corridor bottoms of the Arkansas River this Congress has provided for

bank stabilization projects to the extent of \$2,000,000. Unless this money is appropriated, the \$2,000,000 of bank stabilization projects that have already been constructed will float down the river. I believe every member of the committee will tell you that the testimony in corroboration of my statement was unanimous, that it was not contradicted. I cannot understand why, after we have started trying to curb the flood waters on the Arkansas River, we should at this time leave off a little dab of money to preserve that which we have already spent, to say nothing of the loss of land and the loss of that segment of our economy, the loss of highways, railroads, and so forth. That, of course, this amount of money would not save, but I do know that surely we can afford to spend a dab of money to preserve something we have already established. I know that several other of my colleagues have brought to your attention many of the reasons why this amendment should be adopted, and I do sincerely hope that the House will today allow this very minimum amount of only \$3,300,000 to be used to preserve that which you have in the past already established for that area.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] is recognized.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Next to the children which God gives us, our soil is our greatest asset. As my colleague [Mr. TACKETT] has said, we have spent vast sums of money already in an effort to preserve that soil. If we go ahead and follow the action of the committee here we will jeopardize not only the money we have already expended but will continue to jeopardize and lose the very fine soil of the Arkansas Valley which is so important and vital at all times, but especially at this time of national emergency. I certainly hope the amendment offered by my colleague will be adopted.

Mr. HAYS or Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I appreciate what the gentleman has said about the Arkansas River. I should like to remind the House that in previous sessions, in 1943 and 1945 it was necessary for us to pass emergency legislation to assist the people of the valley whose homes and farms were destroyed by floods. Prior to that, in 1927, the first of these devastating floods occurred. I saw a railroad bridge collapse and fall into the Arkansas River that year. In the 1943 flood one-tenth of all the cultivated acres between Fort Smith and Little Rock were washed away and scores of lives were lost in the floods of that period.

We are undertaking by this amendment simply to preserve the investment that was made through Federal appropriations for flood control following those floods and to preserve and protect the farms that are left in that narrow valley. We are trying to save the morale of the great number of people who live in the valley of the Arkansas.

Remember, the water that causes this damage falls not in Arkansas but in six States above us. It is a national problem.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank the gentleman very much. I especially appreciate his mentioning the preservation of the morale of the people of the valley. That, too, is very important. To deny these funds would be like building a fine home, furnishing it completely, but leaving the roof off. You submit what you have constructed to the whim of the elements.

I do earnestly urge the committee to support the pending amendment. Let us preserve the investment that we already put in the Arkansas Valley.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] read a letter from Brigadier General Chorpeneing, but he failed to read the last paragraph as follows:

In spite of the urgency and importance of this work, I do not believe that provision for bank stabilization work on the Arkansas River can be provided for within the approved budget estimates for river and harbor projects by elimination or reduction in the amounts included for other projects.

It is true, as the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] has said, this project does not fall in the category of a new project, it does not fall in the category of controversial projects, but it does fall under the provision of unbudgeted projects.

We are trying to treat everybody alike. I have a very necessary project in the Detroit River, but it is unbudgeted. No mention is made of it any place here.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I hope that this amendment will be defeated. If we start in allowing a lot of items that are not budgeted and have not been allowed, we are going to have a bill here that will carry more money than we can afford to put up. I hope the House will reject the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that there are many projects proposed by individual Members that will not be included in the bill we are now considering. It is also obvious that the idea of logrolling or being able to get projects through for certain districts is out.

I believe the time has come for us to prescribe some yardstick as to the selection of these flood-control projects. I think we ought to decide a flood-control project on what good it does for national defense. For instance, in my particular district there has been a project eliminated year after year, yet this flood-wall project along the Susquehanna River is entirely indigenous to the welfare, the safety, and the security of thousands upon thousands of workers' homes and hundreds of defense plants, as well as the shoe manufacturing corporations and the International Business Machines Corp. In other words, the Susquehanna River has already washed out several defense plants up in that district and it seems to me that a flood-control project of that kind would come under national defense. I attended a flood-control meeting in my district last week. That meeting was entirely against the building of a flood-control dam in the upper reaches of the Unadilla River, which empties into the Susquehanna. The people up in that district do not want the dam.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Where is that dam?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Up in Mt. Upton.

Mr. KEARNEY. Copes Corners also. Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Well, that is in Delaware County. That is not in my district.

Mr. KEARNEY. We are against that also.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. I

wish he had been at that meeting, but I know he was unable to get there. But that was one of the most enlightened meetings that I have ever attended. It shows that some of the Army engineers and some of the authorities down here in Washington are trying to ram down the throats of the people of these various counties flood-control projects to their own liking, and they are deliberately flaunting the opinion of the individuals that are going to be jeopardized and hurt by putting these projects in. One of the natives came to me and said, "It is my understanding that they are going to force us off our lands and exercise eminent domain over thousands and thousands of acres of our farm lands up here without giving us any voice in it." He said, "I can tell you what is going to happen if the Army engineers come in here ready to build flood-control dams. We are going to fight them with shot-guns and pitchforks and scythes and every other tool we can get our hands on." That meeting of over 500 people that met in the South Berlin School on the 2d day of June consisted of resolute and determined citizens of the United States. They do not want to see that dam constructed, and although the propaganda had been thrown up by one of the daily newspapers in my district down in Broome County to the effect that the Triple Cities depended on that project, and although they had thrown up a smoke screen of propaganda, the people of the Triple Cities do not want the dam either.

Mr. KEARNEY. Was the question of an atomic bomb brought up in that meeting?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes; and they said they would rather see a substantial atomic bomb developed for Korea or some other place to protect the American troops than to spend millions of dollars to construct this flood-control dam that nobody wanted, which was going to jeopardize our lands in Chenango County, much against the will of the people. I think we ought to base the awarding of these contracts not on the whim of the Army engineers, not because it may be lucrative for certain big contractors to be awarded contracts for building flood-control dams, but on the basis of the needs of the people, on the needs of the various communities, so that we can get intelligent flood control.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: Page 6, after line 20, insert the following:

"Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway: For work of construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway heretofore authorized by law (Public Law 525, 79th Cong.), \$5,000,000."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will adopt this amendment. I know some Members will say they do not want to begin a new project. This

is not a new project. It is the missing link in our national defense program.

It is 481 miles from the Gulf at Mobile to the Tennessee River along this Tombigbee inland waterway. More than half of that distance has already been constructed. With the construction of the Demopolis Dam which is now under way, it will be completed all the way up to Gainesville, Ala. The completion of the short stretch, between Gainesville and the Tennessee River means more to the American people, from the standpoint of national defense, as well as that of navigation than any other project of its kind that has ever been proposed.

This project was approved by an act of Congress in 1946, and already the Army engineers have spent \$576,604 on the planning for the construction of this project; and are ready and anxious to speed up its construction. It will cut the water distance between the Gulf at Mobile and our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., by more than 800 miles.

It will cut the water distance between the Gulf at Mobile and our new atomic bomb plant at Paducah, Ky., by more than 300 miles.

It will cut the cost of transportation between those points to the irreducible minimum, and still save the swift current of the Mississippi for the downstream traffic.

This project is more important from the standpoint of national defense than all the billions you have poured into the rat holes of Europe, Asia, Israel, Africa, and Japan through the so-called Marshall plan.

Today the Aluminum Co. of America, that great concern that manufactures the aluminum we need for our airplanes and for other defense equipment, is getting 95 percent of her bauxite from South America, yet instead of enjoying this short slack water route they have to ship it up against that swift current of the Mississippi, which sometimes runs so fast that a barge cannot navigate it at all. It will mean more from the standpoint of national defense than any other project of its kind that has yet been proposed.

Again, we are going to have to get our high-grade iron ore from some other source. Every informed person admits that. Today the United States Steel Corp., and other big steel concerns have gone to Venezuela and bought interests in those high-grade ore mines that have been discovered in Venezuela, which they tell me are the greatest the world has ever known. They are going to need a cheap slack-water route to bring in this material.

It will mean more to the people in the State of Ohio than any other project that has yet been proposed, for the simple reason that it will not only furnish a slack-water route from the Gulf to the Great Lakes but it will furnish what will amount to a slack-water route all the way up the Ohio River up to Cincinnati, and other cities along the Ohio on up to Pittsburgh, Pa.

It will furnish a slack-water route for bringing in the essential raw materials that are necessary for the operation of those great plants, and at the same time,

as I said, save the swift current of the Mississippi for the downstream traffic.

It will mean more to the State of Indiana than any other project of its kind that has yet been proposed, as well as to Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, and all those States up and down the upper Mississippi, the Illinois, the Ohio, the Tennessee, and the Cumberland Rivers, as well as along the Great Lakes.

It is the missing link in our national defense program as well as the missing link in our internal-waterway system.

Let me show you some of the saving it will bring. The other day a man from Detroit, Mich., wrote me that they were shipping hundreds of automobiles down the Ohio and the Mississippi by barges, but, he said, "We need a slack-water route to come back on." He said they are bringing back oil.

Where do they get that oil? They can get oil at Demopolis, Ala., which is right on the edge of one of the greatest oil fields in the world. The first oil well ever brought in east of the Mississippi which produced 1,000 barrels a day was in Jasper County, Miss., just west of Demopolis. Let us see what this would mean. A 14,000-ton barge going from Demopolis, Ala., to Cairo, Ill., by this Tennessee-Tombigbee route would have its cost of transportation—and I am speaking now about the fuel bill alone—cut from \$37,520 to \$9,380, a saving of \$28,140. That is on the fuel bill alone. At the same time, as I said, they would have the swift current of the Mississippi for their downstream traffic.

Suppose this material is going to Oak Ridge, Tenn., where our atomic plant is located and where we need it most. Let us see what the cost of shipping this material to Oak Ridge, going from Demopolis to Oak Ridge, would be. The cost would be cut from \$43,120 down to \$4,760, or a saving of \$38,360 on the fuel bill alone. Is that a new project? Is it a new project when we propose to complete the missing link in our national defense program? If you are going to vote against money for a project of this kind you might as well kill the entire bill.

Suppose this material is going to our new atomic-bomb plant at Paducah, Ky. The cost would be cut—and I am talking about the fuel bill alone now—from \$37,520 to \$9,380, or a saving of \$28,140 on the fuel bill alone for a barge load of 14,000 tons.

This would mean more to the State of Pennsylvania than any other project of its kind yet proposed. Even the St. Lawrence will not mean as much to the Pittsburgh area, for the simple reason that this project will provide a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico right into Pittsburgh, where they need this iron ore, and where they need this bauxite, to manufacture the aluminum and steel necessary for our national defense. It means taking in all the ore that they are bound to get and which they are bound to have if they carry on the great industries that Pittsburgh is now operating. It means more to the States of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, which have hundreds and hundreds of miles of frontage on the Ohio River and

on the upper Mississippi and on the Great Lakes and the Illinois that would be served by this project. It is not a power project. This is merely the completion of our inland waterway system. For you people in the West—in the State of Kansas, when you undertake to ship goods up to Kansas, what do you do? You have to climb that swift current of the Mississippi which at times runs as fast as 7 miles an hour, and when it flows more than 5½ miles an hour, no barge can navigate it. So, for a large portion of the time you are shut off entirely. Up as far as the Missouri River is navigable it will provide a slack-water route for your returning traffic.

Let me say to you Members from Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, and all the other States west of the Mississippi River, that you are paying doubly, if you please, for your transportation of finished products which you ship east. You are paying a one-way freight rate which is robbing and plundering your people of untold millions of dollars every year. I appeal to you to adopt this amendment, and let us move forward with this great development.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has said in regard to this project, and particularly its civilian aspects.

In addition, I want to emphasize something in connection with the desirability of building this project in the interest of national defense. In that connection I desire to read a part of a statement which was made to this House a little more than a year ago, on May 8, 1950, by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of this House. At that time Mr. VINSON said:

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the national defense is vitally involved in this project.

This project gives our Nation a short slack-water route.

And why is that important to the national defense?

It shortens by more than 800 miles the distance from the Gulf of Mexico to our atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge.

It cuts the cost of transportation by 50 to 75 percent.

It gives us an additional outlet to the sea in time of emergency.

It gives us a connecting, highly important slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Ohio River, to the upper Mississippi, to the Missouri River, to the Great Lakes.

In this day of snorkel submarines, of guided missiles shot from submarines against our coastal cities, possibly with atomic waterheads, how vital can a slack-water inland transportation network be?

Of course, we have no way of knowing, in time of peace.

I point out that since that statement was made, as we all know, this country has become involved in one of the most serious wars. A war that has caused more casualties in its first year than we suffered in the first year of World War II.

At the time referred to the gentleman from Georgia further said:

But in time of war its importance can be incalculable.

As an example, I think of the terrible depletion, in the last war, of the Mesabi iron-ore range.

Two years ago the Armed Services Committee had a forecast from an industry leader that in the very near future our great Nation will be substantially dependent upon Brazil and other South American countries for high-grade iron ore.

Now, just how, in time of war, will we get that iron ore, if we have to have it?

That is the kind of defense question that has interested me in this Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway.

I recall only too vividly our tragic experiences with German submarines in the last war.

Why, members of the committee, even the Caribbean became almost impassible.

Ships were being sunk, one after the other, right off New York Harbor.

And that was before the snorkel submarine.

That was before guided missiles.

That was before atomic energy.

I shudder to contemplate the next submarine war—with submarines fighting submarines—with homing devices guiding torpedoes—with submarines serving as carriers of long-range missiles guided by radio to their targets—missiles armed, possibly, with such terrible destructive warheads that it may well be that the future submarine will be able to devastate the coastal areas of the entire Nation.

The grief we had in the last war in trying to get our tankers, our coastal shipping, or Liberty ships through is all too vivid in my mind.

We missed only by an eyelash the losing of the war to the submarine.

And today, Russia has far more submarines—about six times as many—including the modern, deadly snorkel type, that Germany had in her possession at the outbreak of World War II.

Its potentialities in time of war are enormous.

To my way of thinking, with national defense our No. 1 requirement today, that fact must play an important role in the decision of the House on this project.

It will save vast amounts of transportation cost.

It permits the newly discovered, extremely rich iron ore deposits of Venezuela to be brought more cheaply—and, of much greater importance, far more safely—to our great steel centers such as Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Youngstown, Chicago, Detroit, and St. Louis.

Mr. Chairman, this project has been before the House since I have been a Member, since 1949, and for that matter for a hundred years before that time.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama may proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The building of the Pickwick Dam on the Tennessee River raised the level of the water of that river about 54 feet and made this project practical for the first time about 1938. Since that time the Congress became convinced of its practicability, and in 1946 enacted a public law which made



this project one of the rivers and harbors projects for the whole country.

If the project was justified in 1946, in time of peace, it is, Mr. Chairman, 10 times more justified in times of grave and great emergency such as we are passing through today.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Every great engineer who has investigated this project since the building of the Pickwick Dam, including General Wheeler, one of the greatest engineers this country ever saw; including General Reybold, another great engineer; including General Farlinger, another great engineer, every single one of them—and General Pick, too, the present Chief of Army Engineers, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] suggests, has approved this project and said that it was not only feasible but necessary to complete our inland waterway system, which is now a part of our national defense.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I want to say here that there is no one who is more thoroughly familiar with the need for this great project than is the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The attempt is sometimes made, Mr. Chairman, to make this a local project, a project of local application to west Alabama and northeast Mississippi. No impression could be given the membership of the House that would be more erroneous than that. It is so vitally tied to the entire waterway system of this country as to be equally valuable and equally necessary to all the eastern half of the United States that is tied to our inland waterway system. Had we gone ahead and built this project in time of peace, of course, we could have built it for about \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000 less than we would be able to do it today; and I predict, Mr. Chairman, that every single year we postpone this project the cost will increase from \$15,000,000 to \$20,000,000.

Let us see whether or not this is a local project. A day or two ago I received from Hendersonville, North Carolina, a letter from a gentleman who lists himself on his letterhead as being a consulting engineer, in which he makes this statement:

The importance of this canal has tremendously increased in the last year or so, not only for defense purposes, but to the economy of the central part of the country, due to the increasing needs for the large iron ore reserves that have been brought under development in Venezuela, Brazil, and Africa and the need for cheap transportation of this iron ore by river from Mobile, where large unloading facilities are now being erected, to the Tennessee and Ohio Valleys where there are extensive deposits of coking coals.

This is certainly now not a local matter of interest, but of much importance to all the States bordering these great now improved river channels of commerce from western Pennsylvania westward, and the comparatively moderate sums required for this construction should receive the support of all the States in that area.

Mr. Chairman, all of us feel, I believe, that this period of war emergency that we are presently in is likely to last—although we hope in less intensity than it carries with it today—for a period of 10 or 15 years. The time is coming when a showdown with the godless forces of communism that have stolen the hearts of 800,000,000 people in the last 4 or 5 years is going to have to be made by our country. We might as well face that fact. Perhaps we can postpone it, I hope that we can, I hope that it is not immediately upon us, but, nevertheless, the time of reckoning is approaching. I therefore urge the committee to give favorable consideration to this amendment to the end that we may get this great Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway project started and get it built while we still have time. It is false economy of the grossest kind to postpone its construction for another year.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the Tennessee-Tombigbee project is in the budget this year for only \$100,000 for planning—no construction funds. According to the current estimates of the Corps of Engineers the Tennessee-Tombigbee project will cost \$179,264,000. So far only \$898,000 have been spent. The Corps is requesting in the budget this year only \$100,000 for planning.

I would like to make this comment about the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi: Over past years there has been a constant effort to try to include this project in the civil functions appropriation bill. As a result of the efforts of the gentleman from Mississippi and others the project has gone along to a very limited point. Over the past years there has been a considerable amount of criticism of this project by very responsible individuals in the Government and on the outside.

As a result of this criticism and in order to find out the facts concerning the project to determine whether or not it is economically justifiable, whether it is engineering-wise feasible, at the very present time our subcommittee on civil functions is holding a very, very important investigation on the project. It would be the height of folly for this Congress, while we are holding these hearings, to go ahead and authorize \$5,000,000 for the Tennessee-Tombigbee project. These hearings will be completed within a month. Until the committee has gone into every single aspect of this project the Congress would be most unwise to authorize any construction fund.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman has hit at the nub of the proposition. This is an old chestnut that previous Congresses under more favorable circumstances have turned down time and time again. Now the circumstances are such that we should not consider this new project, even if the acknowledged feasibility and the acknowledged need at some time or other were more clearly shown than they are at the present time. I think it cannot be disputed that the Army engineers as of this moment are not prepared to use the \$5,000,000 that the gentleman offers in his amendment; that their planning is not yet complete, and that there is some very serious question in the minds of the members of the subcommittee with respect to the planning that has already been done. Assuming that this is new, and it is new, then you would have to find some very urgent defense necessity in order to proceed with the construction of this project at this time, and I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is prepared to show that contrary to any defense necessities, the record shows that there is nothing urgent, and that the Government agencies concerned have informed the committee that now is not the time to proceed with the construction of this project.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RANKIN. The Army engineers did not tell you that.

Mr. FORD. This project is one of those that is absolutely deferrable at the present time. The fact that the Bureau of the Budget and the Corps of Engineers only asked for \$100,000 is excellent evidence that they are not prepared to go ahead and use any construction money. The most they could do in the year ahead under their own schedule is \$100,000 for planning. If the Army engineers did not request \$5,000,000, they certainly are not prepared to go ahead and spend \$5,000,000 to the economic advantage of the country as a whole.

I would like to say this in conclusion: The Corps of Army Engineers have estimated that it will cost \$179,000,000 to construct this project over a period of 8 or 9 years. A number of competent people who have gone into the cost of this project very thoroughly have come up with figures which are considerably higher than the \$179,000,000. These estimates reach well over \$200,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to vote against this amendment by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. The money the gentleman from Michigan talks about, that is asked for planning is the last \$100,000 necessary to complete the planning of

this project, but the Army engineers said they could easily use \$5,000,000 for construction purposes on this project.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, in order that we may review briefly what has transpired since the authorization of this project in 1946 it is necessary for us to examine the general transportation systems that presently exist throughout our country. Since 1946 we have increased the number of vehicles on our highways by some 45 percent. Every highway, every road, is being taxed to its full limit in the number of vehicles using them at the present time. You will recall that last year we appropriated some \$600,000,000 for the continuation of the road system that you had heretofore seen fit to authorize. In addition to that, we have a very critical situation existing in the railroad transportation system of this country. When the National Production Authority granted DO orders to our railroads they gave priorities for steel in the amount of 9,000 cars per month. They stated in the request for those orders that it would be absolutely necessary that they produce that number to supply the needs of the railroads. Up until the present time they have not produced more than 6,000 cars per month. We are falling behind in the construction of cars to carry out the normal functions of our railroads in addition to carrying the extra burden that is being imposed upon them by the defense preparedness program.

Now let us go back and examine and see what is taking place in the development of our waterways. On the main stem of the Mississippi River we have spent—I mean spent and not authorized—\$1,700,000,000 on the navigation features that make it feasible for the operation of our boats on this stream. We have spent \$150,000,000 making the Tennessee Valley navigable from the confluence of the Ohio to Knoxville, Tenn. We have spent additional millions on the tributaries to the Mississippi including the Ohio. All of these projects are designed and developed to make water transportation feasible and economical. This project adds to the tremendous value of the waterway transportation systems already constructed in the eastern part of the United States.

This is a fine investment, a wise investment in the future economic development of our great country. It is a resource in which we should invest. It will be repaid like other waterway transportation developments have repaid themselves.

Not only was the report of the Corps of Engineers favorable in 1946 when this work was authorized but it becomes of increasing value in relationship to the developments on other tributaries of the Mississippi River. We authorized the development of the works on the Arkansas River and on the Red River, and the harbor developments down at New Orleans. As was so well pointed out by the gentleman from Mississippi, these waterway systems are going to be further taxed because to carry out the program of national defense it will be

absolutely necessary that we use all the facilities at our command to insure an orderly and continuous flow of war materials and the articles necessary for domestic commerce.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] to close debate on the amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the investigation by the House Committee on Appropriations which is still pending was conducted by a staff of two engineers, an economist, and an investigator. Files of the Corps of Engineers were studied. In addition, the site of the proposed project was visited and numerous people in the general area of the project were interviewed.

The cost-benefit ratio of this project is not 1 to 1.13, the ratio is 1 to 0.32.

The total cost of this project is not \$179,000,000 but at least \$236,000,000. The annual charges will be over \$10,500,000.

On the question of iron ore, the distance from Venezuela to Baltimore is slightly less than the distance to Mobile. The rate from the port of entry, Baltimore, to Pittsburgh by rail is \$2.61. The barge rate from Mobile to Pittsburgh would be \$4.16.

When you talk of national defense and talk of atomic energy—I have a letter here addressed to our Chief Investigator, from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, W. J. McNEIL:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,  
Washington, December 26, 1950.

Mr. JAMES J. MALONEY,  
Chief Investigative Staff  
Committee on Appropriation,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MALONEY: Reference is made to your letter of September 12, 1950, concerning the interest of the Department of Defense in the Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal.

The question has been brought to the attention of all organizational divisions of this department which might have such an interest and none considers this project as essential to national defense at this time.

Obviously, anything which contributes to the improvement of the economic position of the United States has a bearing on national defense, but in this regard the project is not considered to have sufficiently high priority as to warrant military support at present.

W. J. McNEIL.

There is a letter on this very project from the Atomic Energy Commission by M. W. Boyer, the General Manager, to the chairman of the full committee, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON. The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES  
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,  
Washington, D. C., May 23, 1951.

HON. CLARENCE CANNON,  
Chairman, House Appropriations Committee.

DEAR MR. CANNON: Mr. Vechery, chief of the investigating staff, House Appropriations Committee, called our Mr. Kelehan last night and requested that we advise you as to any interest of the Atomic Energy Commission in a project proposed by the Corps of Engineers for the construction of the Tombigbee-Tennessee waterway.

We had occasion to ascertain our interest in this project in October 1950 at the request of Mr. James J. Maloney, of the investigating staff of the House Appropriations Committee. We discussed the project at that time with our Oak Ridge operations office, and it did not appear that the Commission would have any particular interest in the construction of the proposed canal as we anticipated obtaining little material over the proposed route. As you no doubt know, the use of natural gas at Oak Ridge has very substantially reduced the required coal shipments to Oak Ridge. There have been no developments since last fall which would warrant any change in our previous conclusions.

If there is any additional information which we can supply, we will be pleased to do so.

Very truly yours,

M. W. BOYER,  
General Manager.

Mr. Chairman, with this evidence before us, and with the cost ratio appearing as it now does after closer study, this project cannot now be justified. I ask for a vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 6, after line 20, insert "for planning for rivers and harbors by the Army engineers, \$1,000,000."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, and that the committee be recognized for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I always hesitate to disagree with my good friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I admire him for his sincerity, integrity, ability, and patriotism. In the short time I have been here, only some 17 years, I know of no Member—and, of course, I know that comparisons are not in order—who has spoken more often for Americanism, for the welfare of our people, the security of this country of ours than has the gentleman from Mississippi.

But when he talks about giving this \$1,000,000 to the Army engineers for planning for future public works I just cannot go along. As I understood him, the money was for the purpose of making surveys and for planning future river and harbor improvements. I say to my good friend that if the policy of his party or perhaps more accurately the New-Fair Deal policies and of Secretary of State Acheson continues, we will need to plan for more cemeteries than we will improvements to our rivers and harbors. As General Wedemeyer told the Senate committee Korea is a bottomless pit into which our men are being thrown by the UN and Acheson and Marshall and to no purpose. I am sure the gentleman

agrees with that and that we ought first to do the things which have to do with the welfare of our people, the safety and the security of our Republic.

I cannot see the advisability of spending \$1,000,000 at this time on planning for river and harbor improvements. Since when has either the New or the Fair Deal needed to do any planning for spending?

The gentleman's section of our country ever since the Civil War, and especially since the coming in of the New Deal—and I do not understand why the gentleman is not for the New Deal more unless and I am sure that is the situation, it is that he does value the safety of the country more than he does the material benefits which have flowed to the extent of billions and billions of dollars, and I want to compliment the gentleman on his service to the South—into the South. I am only afraid that he is going to get everything my State has, that he is even going to take my back yard and plant it somewhere down there and on it grow cotton after he gets the price fixed to suit him.

Where are we going? Let us call a halt. I know the gentleman is in favor of economy for this country. If we had followed his advice over the years we would not be in the fix we are in; we would not be in this war had the Congress followed him when the repeal of the Embargo Act was up in 1939. Am I right?

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is entirely right.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Sure, I am right.

Mr. RANKIN. On this proposition.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Right more often than the gentleman thinks. But I shall have to turn him down on this one. No hurry about his amendment. We will have the Tombigbee River with us just as long as the gentleman is in Congress, and he can ultimately take care of that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is recognized.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, speaking in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi I should like to call the committee's attention to one very, very important fact. The Corps of Engineers requested \$1,000,000, and in justifying their request the corps said they wanted the million to plan nine projects, the total cost of which after the plans were prepared would be over \$1,300,000,000. If you want to stop the construction of these projects that will eventually total \$1,300,000,000 you should cut out the planning money of \$1,000,000.

Let me add one thing more; according to the sheets prepared and submitted by the Corps of Engineers to the Civil Functions Subcommittee we now have river and harbor projects approved, projects under way and not finished totaling \$2,900,000,000. That is a substantial amount of unfinished work which should have funds first. It can be seen we will have plenty of work for the Corps of Engineers to do in the next few years without putting in a million dollars in planning money for the spending of an additional \$1,300,000,000 in new projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized to close the debate.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, for planning rivers and harbors the Corps of Engineers had in 1950 \$1,285,000; that is what they spent. They have for this year \$3,189,800. Much of these funds will be carried into the next year. I hope that all who take part in this debate today will not undo all the good we did in spending huge sums of money indirectly for the national effort, by saying things here that are offensive to our allies in every part of the world. Let us start to look at this thing as a whole. After all is said and done, what is done in this room is done for America, done for us, done for that figure that we represent to the entire world, Uncle Sam. Let us not be injecting every other piece of legislation because we are dealing with the home problem today. The home problem is one thing; the problem at the office is another.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I want to point out to the gentleman from Michigan that one of the projects which of the nine were included for planning in the amount of a million dollars has never been authorized by this Congress. There is \$150,000 out of the \$1,000,000 for a project that the Congress has never given its approval to.

Secondly, our biggest trouble in attempting to intelligently evaluate these requests for funds for these projects has been due to the fact that in many cases the authorizations are four or five years old and the plants have not been brought up to date with respect to the amount of money that will be required.

Our subcommittee felt that the intelligent and the proper thing to do is to require the Engineers to consolidate their planning and their thinking on the projects which have had some planning done on them, some of these 413 projects that are pending at the present time, before we enlarge the field and scatter buckshot all over the country.

Mr. RABAUT. Let the Members of the House recall that I just told them they have over \$3,000,000 at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 23, noes 95.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREENWOOD: Page 5, line 21, strike out "\$162,860,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$163,088,500: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$228,000 shall be available for Fire Island Inlet, New York."

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but think as I listened to the testimony and tribute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] that if it were sent out to all the schools of these United States as an example of civic duty it would do more good than many civic

lessons I have heard and have taught. I wish the Members would spread this information in their own communities as to the valuable work the Members of this House are doing in Washington.

I am in full accord with the intense desire and determination of the Members of the House to economize, as my votes in this session have already shown, yet, there are cases which, in the minds of the people of certain localities, and I believe in the minds of the committee which heard the arguments on this civil functions appropriations bill, are pertinent to the cost of living as well as to the defense program.

Under this category comes, what we on Long Island, call the Fire Island Inlet project, that is the dredging or opening of the channel from the Atlantic Ocean to the Great South Bay Shore of Long Island, the only coast line of the State of New York. This project, for which \$228,000 has been requested, is essential for defense and also for the preservation of our civilian economy.

We must save our extensive shellfish industry, our fishing industry, our boat-building industry, our shipping industry, by which fuel oil, coal, feed are transported by tanker rather than by road. I would like to tell the Members that the tankers that are passing through the Fire Island Inlet today are only able to load 50 percent of their capacity. In regard to our production on Long Island, it is no playhouse. Long Island is no longer a playhouse locality; it is a place of industry. The population in my district has grown in 10 years from 270,000 to 440,000. We produce on Long Island 12,000,000 pounds of Long Island ducks. We produce 12,000,000 pounds of fish and shellfish and 15,000,000 pounds of oysters and clams, 74,000,000 pounds of cauliflower and 750,000,000 pounds of potatoes. From those figures it is obvious that the Fire Island Inlet is an important avenue of transportation to and from this important section of Long Island. We have a great number of defense plants on Long Island, including the Brookhaven Laboratory in which the Government has sunk millions upon millions of dollars. We have also, as you know, the Grumman plant and the Republic plant and other plants as well.

Equally important, if not even more vital, are the defense aspects of this project. The Coast Guard station, maintained at great public expense, at the inlet would be ineffective, unless this improvement is made, in going to the assistance of any disasters occurring in what is known as a graveyard in the Atlantic Ocean, off the coast of Long Island, and into the harbor of New York.

Also, in the case of atomic bombing, the millions of people in the city of New York, would, if they could, teem out of the city. They would be blocked in their escape on the roads already congested. If the bridges were bombed, there could be only one avenue of escape, and that would be by water transportation.

The Fire Island Inlet project, which involves only the sum of \$228,000, should, in my estimation, not have been left out of the bill, and I hope that some way

can be found to include it in this legislation. In my mind it meets the President's criteria of being necessary for defense and for the maintenance of essential civilian economy.

This is not a new problem. Work was done on the Fire Island Inlet about 10 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will accept the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I know that politically it is unwise for me to take this step, but I recognize at this time we must put aside political considerations. My deep and genuine affection for the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GREENWOOD] would prompt me, normally, to attempt to agree to his amendment. I recognize, and so do my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, how diligent he has been, yes, and how persistent he has been in attempting to get this subcommittee to approve his project. I know, too, politically, that he comes from a district where it would be to the advantage of my own party if this could be achieved. But, I respectfully submit to this House that political considerations and personal friendships must be put aside when we are dealing with a bill amounting to over \$514,000,000. No budget estimate has been made for this project. The engineers requested no funds for it.

We have set up a test that we thought was fair to the people of the entire country, that no new projects, no unbudgeted items, would be considered. If a budget estimate is obtained, I would be happy to assist the gentleman to have the item added in the other body. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GREENWOOD] is working toward this end. It is with some reluctance that I oppose this amendment and ask that it be voted down.

The grave danger in adopting an amendment of this character, although it calls for only \$228,000, is that you are faced with \$13,000,000,000 of expenditures once you make an exception. There is \$5,300,000,000 now under construction, \$4,000,000,000 in the planning stage, and over \$3,000,000,000 authorized but not started in the line of construction. So I say that while this amount may be small, while there is a crying need for the improvement, and while the gentleman from New York has been most diligent, yet we must live up to the tests heretofore stated, without exception. This bill will have a sound budgetary effect on our national economy. I must reluctantly, nevertheless sincerely, oppose this amendment. I ask that it be voted down.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The very commendable attitude which the gentleman from New York has exhibited on this amendment prevailed through the entire discussion and the marking-up of this bill in the subcommittee.

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

Mr. Chairman, no one is more aware of the dramatic need for economy with which this country is faced than am I.

Our people are already carrying a heavy tax load and are soon to be asked to add to their burden. It follows that as a Congress we must not impose upon them national expenditures that are not a definite part of a clear-cut defense program—that do not fit into the long-range picture of a strong and impregnable United States. But the people expect us to see to it that defense is adequately planned for and carried out.

Probably none of the subcommittees of the great Appropriations Committee has a more difficult task than that dealing with the civil functions of the Army, whose program we have been considering for several days. Under the very able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], its work could well be a pattern for us all.

It has been my fortune to appear before them on various occasions. Always well informed on the matters under discussion, they draw from those testifying the heart of the matters involved. No one could question the conscientiousness of their study of the facts as presented nor their desire to see imperative work done. Upon them lies the burden of weighing one project against another and the final increasingly difficult choice.

One of the budgeted projects eliminated this year by the committee is that of the long-authorized and steadily progressing work on the Cleveland Harbor.

I had thought that no one need be reminded that our steel output is the yardstick by which we measure our effectiveness in all our other production, both defense and nondefense. Yet, with the Cleveland area being called upon by the Nation to produce more and yet more steel for the defense plants, no provision is being made here for making possible the delivery of the extra tonnage of ores that are and will be increasingly needed to produce that steel.

Cleveland has only 1 percent of the Nation's population. Yet it accounts for 2 percent of the Nation's industrial production. It is preparing to do more. Two of our big steel plants are at this moment carrying out expansion programs which will cost between \$100,000,000 and \$130,000,000. The Ford Motor Co. is building the largest foundry in the world there. How are they to be supplied if the harbor and the river will accommodate only the smaller boats, which are years out of date, and will not adequately carry the larger, more efficient new-type ore boats?

Nor is this all, Mr. Chairman. Cleveland is an important point for transshipping of ores and materials to Youngstown and other points to the south. A bottleneck in this harbor means a bottleneck in many, many other plants. We cannot afford to risk such a tie-up at this point in our defense program.

Cleveland Harbor last year handled nearly 15,000,000 tons of ore and limestone. Under the steel expansion programs I mentioned, it will be expected to carry 2,500,000 tons more than that in the coming year. Our national steel program will be seriously hindered if the harbor is unable to accommodate this

added traffic when these new facilities begin to function.

Let me remind you that the work on the Cleveland Harbor has gone forward under provisions set forth in Public Law 647 of the Seventy-sixth Congress setting up provisions for the relocation of certain bridges and roads and some channel work. This is a joint operation by the railroads, the Federal Government, and the city of Cleveland. The city has spent some \$12,000,000 on its part of the project, the Federal Government has spent \$3,667,900, and the railroads stand ready with their share as soon as the work progresses to that point.

Mr. Chairman, steel is the crux of our national defense program. Without a constant increase in our production of steel there cannot be the machine tools and all the other devices that mean supplies and equipment for our Air Force, our Navy, and our indispensable armies. Without a constantly increasing supply of ore and other needed materials, foundries, furnaces, and mills cannot produce steel.

Through the Cleveland Harbor must flow the ore required by the huge factories of the Cuyahoga Valley as well as mills in Youngstown and Pittsburgh. To meet the national need, such great companies as the Republic Steel, Jones & Laughlin, are spending hundreds of millions of dollars on new plants. Ford is in process of putting up what will be the largest foundry in the world in connection with its new Cleveland plant. Their needs must be met.

The program as set up in the Seventy-sixth Congress would meet the situation. Unfortunately the timing has been seriously slowed down by the cuts recently made. No one can estimate the harm that may result from the elimination of all Federal moneys this year, for it will not become dramatic until the interference with the steel production program contemplated by the tremendously enlarged mill capacity evidences itself.

I wish it were possible for the Members of this House to see for themselves what goes on. I wish you could see the new ore boats being gentled around the curves and under the old bridges with only a few inches to spare. Only the most skillful of captains could manage. But even these cannot prevent the overhang of these new vessels from turning over boxcars and parked automobiles. The time involved in getting these big boats to the docks, the waiting vessels in the harbor and the great furnace up-river waiting for the ore would be impressive to you—particularly if you could project yourselves 1 year, 2 years, 3 years ahead with the country clamoring for more steel and more steel.

Mr. Chairman, I bring this to the attention of the House today because I understand every effort will be made in the other body to reinstate the budgeted \$1,000,000 which has been deleted here. It is my earnest hope that this effort may be successful and that when the matter goes to conference the House conferees will agree to this important defense appropriation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. My brothers were navigators. They were masters of the largest steel ships on the Great Lakes. They have told me repeatedly of the importance of the very improvements which the gentlewoman is now expressing, and surely if they are important in times of peace, they are much more important in time of war.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman. His contribution is most helpful.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREENWOOD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KLEIN) there were—ayes 30, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the argument made by my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

I want to point out just as strongly as I can that the elimination of the bridges which are interfering with navigation on the Cuyahoga River is most vital to the present and future industry of Cleveland, particularly our iron, steel, and ore industries. The transportation of ore is rapidly going to the larger size boats, which are materially more economical than the smaller boats. The small boats are rapidly being taken out of the ore trade, and as this continues, the security of the iron and steel industry along the river is naturally threatened.

I am sure that you appreciate this trend, and also appreciate what the replacement of these bridges means to the industrial life of Cleveland. I am fully familiar—and I think those of you here who are interested in this project are in agreement with—in fact, commend the efforts being made to reduce Government expenditures; and if this expenditure were in the category which could be delayed without affecting the industrial life of Cleveland, as well as the present defense effort, we would not be urging this matter upon you. Because of the fact that it is so important to our industrial life here, we do feel justified in asking that every effort be made to include this appropriation of \$5,000,000 in this year's budget.

This improvement has been acknowledged as necessary by the Army engineers and by every recognized authority. Such outstanding industries as Republic Steel Co., Midland Steel, the American Steel & Wire Co., the Ford Motor Co., and many other industrial plants. As a result of this bottleneck, production and transportation has been hampered tremendously.

I hope that when this bill comes back from the Senate the conferees will find some way of providing the money for this project. I am not offering an amendment. I am simply supporting the argument made by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], calling it to your attention. I trust that when the other body considers this project it will

include the Cleveland Harbor improvement, and I hope the conferees on the part of the House will support this most worthy expenditure.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, may I take a few minutes to warn my colleagues of a perilous situation in Italy which can endanger our whole European-defense program.

We have just received the returns of the elections in Italy. The New York Times and all of our newspapers report gains for the pro-Soviet parties and a considerable decrease in strength of the anti-Communist coalition.

Mind you, of the 6,563,000 ballots cast in the provincial elections, the left Socialist-Communist bloc received 2,530,000 votes, or 38.5 percent, compared to 36 percent in the same provinces in 1948 when America went all out to assist the anti-Communist forces. I remember that election fully well, because I personally caused to be sent a quarter of a million letters to Italy which prompted the New York Times at that time to call me the one-man crusader to destroy communism in Italy.

We also noted in this election of 1951 the rise of another party, the Social Movement Party—MSI—which received 125,000 votes. I have it on pretty good information that this party is Communist-inspired and appeals to former Fascists who could not be induced to follow the Communist label. It is just another front to attack the Democratic-Christian Party of Premier de Gasperi.

Now, why these gains—in spite of our aid to Italy through ECA program?

The reason lies in the unjust Italian peace treaty signed at Paris on February 10, 1947.

Under the terms of that treaty, Italy's armed forces which in 1938 totaled almost 8,000,000 men, including reserves, were reduced to 250,000 men.

Besides Italy is required to pay economic reparations to Soviet Russia, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Abyssinia. There are other unconscionable provisions of the treaty which I shall not discuss now. But it does seem to me that, by these two provisions alone, we are tying the hand of Italy to properly defend her borders and to protect herself internally.

The Communists certainly had plenty of ammunition to throw at the voters when they told them that in the contemplated treaties with Japan and Western Germany that there would be no economic reparations and no limitations on rearming these two countries.

It was recalled that Italy was a combelligerent with the western allies from September 1943, when the armistice was signed and that she helped materially in defeating Japan and Germany.

It was further recalled that prior to this armistice and prior to the landing of allied troops in Italy, the United

States made a pledge to the Italian people by radio and leaflets that the sovereignty of Italy would be maintained.

How can this be done with an army of only 250,000, while at the same time she is required to pay reparations to Russia to build up her war potential, which some day might easily spell doom for Italy and the other western allies. I am afraid that the situation in Italy and in Europe is being completely overlooked and that we are being blinded by the Korean crisis. I beg of you, ladies and gentlemen, both Democrats and Republicans, do not let our country become so completely lost in Asia that we will open the doors wide for Russia to conquer Europe without any measurable resistance.

You know the trouble we have been experiencing to get France and England to organize divisions to aid Western Europe to defend itself.

Here we have a Christian country, which at heart will never become communistic, pleading with us to help it organize an army and navy of more than 3,000,000 men to help defend not only Italy, but all of Europe, and we keep on lending a deaf ear to her pleas.

Our American people have made it clear in no uncertain terms that they do not want to fight other people's battles all alone.

Italian soldiers want to fight side by side with our own boys. Is not it the height of folly not to permit them to do so?

You think Korea is important. It is. But I say to you that the Mediterranean is far more important. And do you know who controls Italy's main Mediterranean naval bases? Taranto and Spezia, as well as Leghorn and Brindisi—the Leftist.

I say to you—unstrap Italy's hands. Give her a fair treaty now when the danger is greatest before she becomes further strapped by the Communists that she can no longer be of any help.

Form now in the Mediterranean a strong Mediterranean Pact with the countries there—Turkey, Spain, Greece, and Italy.

Admit Italy to the United Nations. Let her stand side by side with the United States, which every person with real Italian blood loves so well, and as sure as there is a God above, the forces of freedom will conquer the diabolical forces of communism.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUTLER: Page 5, line 21, strike out "\$162,860,500" and insert "\$163,165,500, of which \$305,000 shall be available for the deepening of Buffalo Harbor."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, this is not a new project; it is an old one; they have been working on this for years, receiving just a little bit at a time. Originally it was a \$16,000,000 project, but of this \$9,000,000 is still to be done, so I am not asking for anything new. All I want is something old. The deepening of this river harbor will in my opinion be a great help in the defense effort of this country. We have to go up river to the plant of the Republic Steel Co.,

and in the inner harbor we have the Bethlehem Steel plant, which latest reports I get show to be the third largest steel plant in the country.

The \$305,000 which originally was in the budget request has been stricken out. All I am asking is to have restored the \$305,000. At the present time we have the following situation up there: They were blasting under the river getting some of this rock ledge out and they disturbed the foundation of one of our bridges. We would like to get the \$305,000 so that we can take care of this bridge. We do not want to repair the bridge, then have them blast in the same area again and damage the bridge. It is going to cost Buffalo \$125,000 to repair the bridge.

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

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Was this item stricken out by the committee or was it stricken out or left out by the budget?

Mr. BUTLER. It was left out by the committee.

Mr. DONDERO. It was in the budget as an item?

Mr. BUTLER. That is right. All I am asking is to restore the \$305,000 so that we can continue with our defense movement and help get the ore to the steel plants and the steel back out to the fabricators who need it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to commend the Appropriations Committee for their action in again refusing to appropriate sums for construction of Ice Harbor Dam.

This is a dam which would have little or no value from either a navigation or a power standpoint but would do irreparable damage to the salmon industry. I wish to point out that while the committee was asked to appropriate only \$4,000,000 to start this dam that the entire project would total about \$400,000,000, as it would be necessary to construct not only Ice Harbor but three other dams, namely, Lower Monumental, Little Goose, and Lower Granite. In other words, the attempt to obtain the \$4,000,000 appropriation this year was merely a foot in the door to obtain over a period of time the necessary \$400,000,000 to complete the project. A competent authority indicates that the construction of any of these dams would eliminate 75 percent of the salmon runs in the Columbia River. This would happen, of course, because the extensive spawning grounds in the Snake River would be completely blocked off. The salmon-fishing industry is a very important one. The Columbia River salmon-fishery resource, according to published reports of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, produces an annual revenue of \$17,440,000 per year. This figure is based upon the first processing level for the commercial pack which is credited with an annual revenue of \$13,800,000 a year. This figure should be appreciated 30 percent to reflect the final value of this pack at retain level, thus bringing the total annual return from the resource to \$21,500,000 a year. If this revenue is calcu-

lated on the basis of a 4-percent return, it reflects a capital value of \$537,500,000. This resource has been utilized for almost a century, and in that period has produced well over a billion dollars in new values.

There has been a contention made that this dam was very necessary for upper Columbia River navigation but this argument, of course, is out of the window since the completion of a pipeline from Salt Lake City into this area. The only justification I have ever heard for the navigation feature of the project involved these oil shipments, and that, of course, is no longer of consequence.

As far as the power feature is concerned, the amount produced by Ice Harbor is negligible compared with that of Chief Joseph, Hungry Horse, McNary, and other dams soon to come into production.

It is my hope that this project has been killed, once and for all, but I presume that, as usual, the proponents will be back here asking for an appropriation next year and I hope that the House and the committee will again take the same action they have taken on this bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment for one very simple reason. Although I have been always on the side of economy during my short tenure in this House, I do not believe, and cannot believe, that the elimination of this recommended sum of \$305,000 for project work in the port of Buffalo is on the side of economy.

It is not because I am one of those who favor reductions in appropriations in all things and everything except for those things coming directly into my district but I am for this amendment. Regardless of the geographical allocation of the funds to be spent, I sincerely try to always apply the test that if it is not good generally for America, it is not good for me or the people of my district. However the total estimated costs of the authorized projects for the improvement of Buffalo Harbor made some six or seven years ago is \$16,146,000, of which only \$4,623,000 have been provided to date. I realize and understand that part of the project includes works to be done up the river, which probably are not and should not be done in the immediate future because of the present emergency.

But I am asking support for the allocation of only \$305,000, \$250,000 of which is to be provided for entrance improvements near the south end of the outer harbor and for deepening a portion of the south outer harbor to 23 feet and \$50,000 to remove shoals at the south entrance.

The areas proposed to be dredged have available a depth of only from 11 to 14 feet and thus form an unsurpassable

barrier between the south outer harbor and the north outer harbor so that much of the available depth in the north and south outer harbors cannot be used for transportation, loading, and so forth.

Buffalo is one of the largest traffic harbors on the Great Lakes and, as Colonel Potter testified before the subcommittee, the commerce haul is practically the same as the foreign commerce of Baltimore and actually, I believe, is in excess thereof. Almost 20,000,000 tons in receipts and shipments annually.

The commerce consists principally of grain, iron ore, limestone, and petroleum—all vitally needed in our defense effort, and yet because ore ships have a draft in the neighborhood of 24 feet, much of the Buffalo Harbor is inaccessible to them, if they are to be fully loaded, and certainly now when time is of the essence, we want our ships fully loaded.

Through the port of Buffalo go many items needed in the West for the production of finished defense items, and though the port of Buffalo go many of these defense items when they are finished, and if you cripple the facilities of the port of Buffalo, you cripple the contribution of the Great Lakes and all the ports thereon to the general defense effort. It is only common sense that the port facilities in Buffalo should be comparable to the port facilities of Cleveland, Detroit, Duluth, and other cities on the Great Lakes so all commerce can flow unhampered across the Great Lakes in both directions at full capacity.

We are spending millions and millions to build railroads for Britain in Africa and have spent millions to rehabilitate the transportation systems of other nations. It seems that we can export, through bills passed on the floor of this House, billions in materials and dollars for the welfare of other people but one thing we will never be able to export is the commodity known as Americanism because we apparently have not enough to give to our own people. The only economies come in the crippling of our own natural resources, our transportation-economics came in the crippling of our own people.

The more than \$4,000,000 spent to date on this project in Buffalo will have been of little use unless this project is at least extended to include the small item asked in this amendment so as to utilize all the facilities in the outer ports of Buffalo just to the simple extent that we shall have water deep enough to load the boats and room enough to tie them up.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. We must not overlook the fact that Buffalo is one of the greatest ports on the Great Lakes. Buffalo also has two of the most outstanding steel mills in this country. There are no steel mills in the United States that are more important to our national defense than those located in Buffalo, N. Y. This item should be put in. I am sure if the committee really understood the situation so far as this great harbor is concerned and the need

for the improvement, the item would be put back in the bill.

Mr. MILLER of New York. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, although I take second place to no one in this House in a desire to retrench in the cost of government, to eliminating waste and extravagance, I feel compelled to rise to support this amendment because I do not think it is in the interest of economy or our national defense not to support or pass this amendment.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER] has just pointed out, this minor item of \$305,000 was requested by the engineers and the Bureau of the Budget. It only increases this project from 29 to 31 percent, and it is not a case of starting a new project. It is a case of deepening the harbor and removing the shoals. And, as the point has well been taken, this project is in the interest of our national defense and in the interest of the economy of our country.

While I am on my feet, I would like to commend the subcommittee for the fine work they have done, and I should like to call the attention of the House at this time to the report of the committee on page 2, where they say:

At the present time the corps has under construction 413 river and harbor and flood-control projects involving a total estimated Federal cost in excess of \$5,300,000,000. Furthermore, many of the projects for which planning funds have been requested were authorized a number of years ago. The economy of this country is a live and changing force. Transportation patterns have changed. Emphasis as to types of structures and locations have changed. Accordingly, the committee suggests that the Corps of Engineers make an economic reevaluation from a national standpoint of all projects presently in the planning stage with a view to effecting greater economies and a better integrated national program.

I should like to raise this question with the committee: What assurance have we in this House that such a survey or reevaluation would be made as to the importance of these projects, both as to those that are authorized and those projects that are planned, so that we can deal with these matters intelligently? If the committee has no such assurance, I think legislation should be introduced to bring about that end.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this Buffalo Harbor amendment deals with a budget estimate of \$305,000. It is not easy for me to oppose this amendment, but I want to read to you just what this stands for. I recognize the position of the Members from the area and I commend them for their devotion to their people and their projects.

This project is in its initial stage, being only approximately 29 percent completed. The funds requested for fiscal 1952 allow for new starts—get that—new starts within the project. According to Colonel Potter's testimony the funds will be for minor works. "Minor works" is a quote from his own statement.

It is recommended that the entire amount be deleted until such time as the Engineers believe it desirable to go ahead with the major portion of the work which would allow for the economic justification of the project.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. At this point I should like to have an answer to the question I raised as to what assurance the House has as to reevaluation of those projects, those authorized and those planned.

Mr. RABAUT. The committee has recommended that to the engineers, and we are making more studies on it at the present time.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I concur in what the gentleman from Michigan has said, that last year substantial funds were provided for the northerly entrance, and that was almost completely cleared up, as I understand. The southerly entrance was used to a great extent for part-time purposes because of the inadequacy of the northern channel. That does not seem to prevail any more. This can be deferred, inasmuch as it is a new portion of an over-all project, until an appropriate time for the expenditure of funds.

Mr. RABAUT. I refer those who are interested to the testimony on page 173.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Do I understand the gentleman quoted the testimony of Colonel Potter to the effect that he recommended that this sum of \$305,000 be deferred until such future time as the whole project can be completed?

Mr. RABAUT. No; I did not say that at all.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Was not the testimony of Colonel Potter to the effect that he did favor the expenditure of this sum?

Mr. RABAUT. The testimony of Colonel Potter is right here on page 173.

Mr. MILLER of New York. It was to the effect that he supported the expenditure.

Mr. RABAUT. That is what he came before the committee for.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of New York) there were—ayes 24, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, down in western Oklahoma we have had three very serious floods in the last 3 weeks. As much rain has fallen in 6 days of these last 3 weeks as ordinarily falls in 6 months. It has done untold millions of dollars of damage.

It had been my intention to offer an amendment at this time, but I have talked with the acting chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from

Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], and he has informed me that section 205 funds provide \$1,000,000 which would be available for projects not specifically authorized, with a limitation of \$150,000 on each local emergency; further, that there was an emergency flood-control fund of perhaps \$3,000,000 remaining in this fiscal year of the \$6,000,000 that was available during the hearings; further, in the pending bill providing for the next fiscal year, H. R. 4386, on page 7, lines 18 to 23, there is provision for \$7,000,000 of "flood control, general (emergency fund)" funds. I would like to make inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan if these statements are true?

Mr. RABAUT. That is true.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I thank the gentleman, and I hope that the United States engineers and those in charge of spending this money when it is made available will take care of this area in western Oklahoma.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am taking the floor today not to offer an amendment. I am not here to seek additional funds for my district. I wish to compliment the committee, and particularly the two distinguished young gentlemen on the minority side, the gentleman from Michigan, JERRY FORD, and the gentleman from Wisconsin, GLENN DAVIS, who have done such a magnificent job of giving sympathy and little money to persons requesting additional funds. I am most appreciative, however, of the consideration the committee has given to Sault Ste. Marie in providing funds to complete the hydroelectric power project in the St. Marys River. That project is nearing completion. It will mean a great deal to the upper peninsula of the State of Michigan and will provide them with the power which they so badly need. I am particularly pleased with the committee's report. It recommends that the old power plant be retained. That is the feature which I am sure will bolster the hands of the engineers in keeping the old power plant in operation in order to provide the additional power needed to take care of this emergency and possible future emergencies.

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

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What I think my able colleague means is to retain one unit in the old powerhouse in order to have that available to provide the necessary power with a new powerhouse to take care of the needs.

Mr. POTTER. Yes; unit No. 10 is about the only unit of any value in the old power plant.

Mr. DONDERO. I will say to the gentleman that the Committee on Public Works was there.

Mr. POTTER. I can assure that the committee had a very gracious time; the people in Sault Ste. Marie are most friendly and were very happy to have had the gentleman's committee visit their city.

Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to emphasize to the committee that many Members of the Congress have

appeared in the well and asked for funds for rivers and harbors projects which affect their own districts. These are trying times, times when we must do everything possible to have some economy in Government. We are going to be asked next week to pass on a tax bill which will dig further into the pockets of the taxpayers of this country. When sacrifices are made by men who are fighting in Korea, and when sacrifices are made by the taxpayers who will have to dig deeper into their pockets, we also must make sacrifices with respect to projects which are very desirable and which many of us would like to have. I might mention that my congressional district, the Eleventh Congressional District of the State of Michigan, which has the longest coast line of any district in the United States, has three harbor projects which have been authorized. Yet with the emergency that exists I did not feel I could go before the committee and ask for funds for those projects. I did not feel that I could today offer an amendment to provide those funds. Although the amount of money is small, the total amount for these three projects involves less than a million dollars, nevertheless in these times we cannot afford to spend money of that kind. However, I wish to warn the committee that if we should ever get back to normalcy and we are no longer in a war situation, you can be very sure I will be in constant communication with you. I know the committee will be very fair, as it always is, in giving meritorious projects their full consideration.

There are three small projects in my district; one at Grande Marais, one at Manistique, Mich., and one in my home town, Cheboygan, on which work should be done. As a matter of fact, the maintenance work that is being done now is costing considerable money. The additional harbor work authorized by the wisdom of this Congress will greatly aid in cutting down the maintenance expense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] has expired.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHUDOFF: On page 5, line 21, strike out "\$162,860,500" and insert "\$163,760,500."

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to restore to this bill \$900,000 which is a legal obligation on the United States to the Schuylkill River project. Members of this House come before this committee oftentimes to request funds, but this request on my part is that the United States carry out its legal obligation to the State of Pennsylvania.

During the year 1945 the Government of the United States and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania entered into an agreement to clean up the Schuylkill River. The State of Pennsylvania agreed to dredge the silt which had accumulated in the river north of Norristown and the Federal Government agreed to do likewise south of Norristown to Fairmont Dam. The State of

Pennsylvania has practically completed 90 percent of its job. They first caused over 37 collieries on the upper branches of the Schuylkill River to build silt basins so that the water being discharged into the river at the present time is clean and pure water. The State also agreed to dredge out an estimated 24,000,000 tons of culm deposits in the river above Norristown at a cost of \$35,000,000. This has been 90 percent completed. On the other hand, the Federal Government agreed that when Pennsylvania had completed one-half of its work they would then go to work and dig out of the Schuylkill River 12,000,000 tons of silt between Norristown and Fairmont Dam, at a cost of approximately \$12,000,000.

This year the Bureau of the Budget and the Army engineers agreed that \$1,900,000 of this money would be expended for that purpose. Nevertheless, in spite of that agreement, the Appropriations Committee took out one-half of the agreed sum, namely \$900,000, and that is what we would like restored.

The Schuylkill River just south of University Bridge is a navigable river. There are many business firms, the Atlantic Refining Co., the Gulf Oil Co., the Allied Chemical division of the Barrett Co., and many other plants have ships coming up the river for the purpose of carrying out those industries. What happened? Every time we have a storm in Philadelphia approximately 100,000 tons of silt are washed over the Fairmont Dam and slowly that navigable part of the river is being brought to a point where perhaps the ships will not be able to go up the river. That means that those plants will not have the right to bring water transportation to their plants.

Also down at Girard Point where we have some of the largest grain elevators in the world on the Schuylkill River, there are many ships that might find it impractical to come up and load this grain. I could go on and on giving you reasons why this appropriation should be increased, but probably the greatest reason is that there is a legal obligation on the part of the Government of the United States to carry out its agreement with the State of Pennsylvania; and I know that you will agree with me, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to carry out our legal obligations.

If you were to take a drive along either the east or west side of the river in my district, you would see what originally was a half-mile-wide river reduced to a stream of probably 50 or 60 feet in width, with culm on both sides of the river built to the height of 14 or 15 feet.

We showed pictures to the Committee on Appropriations and asked them to go along with us to get this job started since the State has completed its half of the job. We not only need this money, but this is a legal and a moral obligation of the United States and that is why we ask that it be restored.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this is the Schuylkill River project, Pennsylvania. The budget estimate this year was \$1,900,000; the recommendation was

for \$1,000,000; the reduction was \$900,000.

This is virtually a new start since the Corps of Engineers did not allocate funds for the project in fiscal year 1951 despite the fact that the House allowed \$2,500,000, and the Senate raised it to \$3,500,000. That is the story in a few words.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I just wanted to add to what the gentleman from Michigan has said, that there is no question but what the Federal Government is going to have to contribute at some time, but that does not mean that this obligation of the Federal Government has to be handled in the next fiscal year at this critical time any more than other obligations of the Federal Government are going to all have to be fulfilled in this year. Last year it was deferred a year. Today our condition either internationally or fiscally cannot be said to be any better than it was a year ago. This matter was deferred by the Army engineers. At that time it might be said that there was considerable feeling on our subcommittee that this entire thing could be deferred for another year, but because the State of Pennsylvania has done so much here at its own expense we felt that we ought to show the good faith of the Federal Government in keeping the project moving to some extent. There was a compromise in the subcommittee to the extent of \$1,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### FLOOD CONTROL

Flood control, general: For expenses necessary for the construction and maintenance of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented, including preliminary examinations, surveys, and contingencies in connection with flood control; \$268,009,900: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein may be used for flood-control work on the Salmon River, Alaska, as authorized by law: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein may be used to execute detailed surveys and prepare plans and specifications, necessary for the construction of flood-control projects heretofore or hereafter authorized or for flood-control projects considered for selection in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, and section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 638): *Provided further*, That the expenditure of funds for completing the necessary surveys shall not be construed as a commitment of the Government to the construction of any project.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: Page 7, lines 3 and 4, strike out "\$268,009,900: *Provided*," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$269,409,900: *Provided*, That \$1,400,000 of such amount shall be available for flood-control work on the Licking River section of the project at Covington, Ky., authorized by law: *Provided further*."



Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I do not come here with any quarrel with the Appropriations Committee. It gave me profound pleasure this morning to know of the great honor that has been conferred upon Chairman KERR of this subcommittee, a faithful and a great public servant, a gentleman who endears himself to everyone who comes in contact with him.

I realize we must effect economy at this time, and I am not opposing that, I think it is essential, but the Covington, Ky., project seems to be in an unusual position. Covington lies at the confluence of the Ohio and the Licking Rivers. The Licking River flows in a northerly direction at that point while the Ohio River flows in a westerly direction. The Ohio River is one of the most treacherous and unpredictable rivers in the world.

The estimated total cost of the project at Covington is \$8,400,000. Allotments to date amount to \$3,399,200. Part of the wall has been completed on the Ohio River side. At the end of that wall there is high land which furnishes protection to the city, but further along there must be some protective works constructed in order to give protection from floods.

The reason that no appropriation has been made, as I understand it, is that this is considered by the Appropriations Committee to be a new project, and I refer to the construction of the wall on the Licking River side. The wall although completed on the Ohio River furnishes no protection to the city. I think it puts Covington in a very precarious position when you realize that in the 1937 flood the city of Covington sustained a loss of \$2,000,000.

The amount mentioned in my amendment of \$1,400,000 has been requested for 1952. It has been authorized and budgeted. I know that Colonel Potter said that this is new construction. It is new construction, but it is not a new project. The project is worthless unless completed and during the time until completed the city of Covington will be greatly imperiled by floods.

Covington, Ky., is a city of 67,000 people. It is highly industrial and is situated in a defense area. Covington has complied with its part and has issued and sold bonds in the sum of \$765,000 for the acquisition of lands, easements, and rights-of-way. I cannot believe that there is any economy in not building this protective work because the loss that may accrue to the city by reason of recurring floods, averaging one every 2 years in the Ohio Valley, would more than offset the cost of this project. If the Licking River floods there is no protection. If the Ohio River goes to flood stage it will back up the Licking River and will cause flood conditions and the situation will be as though there are no protective works there at all.

Is this economy? I do not think it is. I believe that the committee acted on the statement of Colonel Potter who said, and it may be literally a fact, that this is new construction; but the protection of the city of Covington can only be completely effected by the completion of these protective works. I agree that

we ought to have economy, but I am just wondering whether this is economy.

The reason I appear here is that the people of that city are deeply apprehensive of what might happen if another flood came without some protective works to assure them their property will not be devastated again. I hope the House will take favorable action upon this amendment, but if they fail to do so, I shall make every effort to have the Senate restore it to the bill, and in that event, I hope the House will concur. Judicious appropriations often effect the greatest economies in the long run.

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

Mr. Chairman, I meant to speak on a former title of this bill of one project in my district which I think is of utmost importance to the economy of a large segment of the population in my district. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] yesterday called attention to this project that has been authorized for several years. It is the harbor of Noyo on the coast of California, some 135 miles north of San Francisco. Out of that harbor there are 250 boats fishing commercially. They are producing fish products valued in excess of \$3,000,000 a year which are shipped throughout the entire country. A large portion of the fish caught in this area is processed and sent to the Armed Forces of our country in the Far East.

Mr. Chairman, these men are risking their lives every day that they go out of that harbor. Boats have been wrecked on the rocks in an effort to make port. Men have been drowned and property has been lost due to the lack of the Government in continuing a job that they undertook many years ago. It was in 1945 that this project was authorized for the construction of a jetty to protect the harbor entrance and the lives of these men and their equipment, and from that time on Congress has not seen fit to appropriate the comparatively slight amount of money necessary to complete this project. At the time it was authorized, the project would have cost \$600,000. Today it amounts to about \$1,500,000, and that, I think, is important. I believe small projects should be given consideration because they benefit a large and scattered segment of our population. These men have a just claim for seeking this appropriation. However, I realize that this is not the place or the time for an amendment to effect the completion of this project, but I would ask that the conferees take into consideration the argument that was made by these people so that if this bill should be amended in the other body, they would give consideration to this project.

Another project in my district is the Russian River project authorized last year for a very important program of flood control, irrigation, and for domestic water purposes. It would cost the Government about \$12,000,000 in all. The local communities are ready and willing to put up over \$6,000,000 as their share. Every year we are suffering about \$500,000 in damages by reason of floods. This is a project where the people locally are willing to cooperate with the Federal Government. If we do not receive some

assistance in this matter, the city of Santa Rosa will be forced to construct a water system at a cost of over \$5,000,000, which would be almost as much as the entire district will be compelled to put up in order to match the Government requirements. This type of thing, I think, should be given more careful consideration by the Congress and not so often decided by the Bureau of the Budget or the Corps of Engineers. The Corps of Engineers has asked for \$65,000 for planning, but it was cut out by the Bureau of the Budget. Considerable money has been spent by the engineers in preliminary survey. The district has spent a large sum on projection reports and investigation. The area needs this project and needs it now. I hope the other body provides for this planning money and that we concur.

I appreciate very much the courtesy extended to this delegation who came all the way from California to appear before this committee. The committee gave them a full hearing and went out of their way to see that they were properly heard when they arrived here. And I, too, thank the committee for the courtesy extended me as well as the men who comprised the delegation. They are very sincere in this effort to benefit their community, which shows its willingness to cooperate by putting up an extremely fair share of the necessary funds.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky close in 5 minutes, and I ask that I be recognized.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky spoke in such glowing terms concerning our distinguished chairman, Judge KERR, that I want to say to the Members of the House that I do not think there is a finer gentleman in the Congress of the United States than the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]. I have known him throughout 15 years of service here. He is a gentleman of the old school. My official position in taking this bill through the House in the manner in which I am supposed to take it, in an unblemished state, makes it very difficult for me to talk against his project and his distinguished district.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. May I thank the gentleman for that fine compliment. At least it will not be in vain that I have offered my amendment, because the compliment makes its offer well worth while.

Mr. RABAUT. There are several projects here, the projects called section A, section B, and section C, and the Russell, Main, and Willow Run pumping plants, and so on, all of which have certain total cost estimates upon them. Something has been done on all of them except on this section, the Licking River

levee. The total estimated cost of that project is \$3,450,000. This is the first request for funds on this project, \$1,350,000.

Under the four provisions under which we wrote this bill, of course this is a recognition of a new project, and it falls out under that category. The 1952 budget estimate was \$1,450,000, the recommendation is nothing, and the reduction is the full amount. The reduction is made by withholding funds for new construction within the project and funds for advance planning. It is pointed out that in 1951 the Corps of Engineers had available to them over \$2,000,000 as appropriated by the Senate, and the House offered \$1,500,000 for this project, yet under the conference agreement, which left the discretion for the money to be used in the Corps of Engineers, they spent only \$390,000, eliminating this very project in which the gentleman from Kentucky is so interested.

Mr. SPENCE. If the gentleman will yield further, the city of Covington, relying upon the assurance of the Government that this would be completed, bonded themselves to the extent of \$765,000, and they are paying interest on those outstanding bonds now. This included the whole project.

Mr. RABAUT. I realize that the bonds cover all the project, but still none of the projects is completed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: On page 7, line 3, strike out "\$268,009,900" and insert in lieu thereof "\$268,274,000."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I am not unmindful of the legislative situation which exists at this time regarding amendments to the bill. We have been trying to correct this bill all day. A few of us believe improvements should be made. We have been trying to make it a good bill. So far we have not yet been successful. This experience reminds me of an old Arkansas justice of the peace who was trying a case one day. At the conclusion of the evidence in the case the prosecuting attorney and the defense lawyer got to arguing as to how much time they would have within which to argue the case before the justice would render a decision. They could not agree, so after extensive argument as to how long they would have to argue the case, the justice of the peace pulled his glasses down on the end of his nose and said, "Well, gentlemen, just argue this case as long as you want to, and when you get through you will find my decision here on my desk. I have to go."

Possibly that is about the way it is here, but at least we will do the very best we can.

This amendment, if you adopt it, would add \$265,000 to the bill. It would be used on a project known as the Hardin drain, which is a tributary, technically I believe, of the Ouachita River. It extends through the center of Pine Bluff, Ark. During flood times the water overflows many of the streets of this city and Pine

Bluff is a city of about 40,000 population. It overflows many of the streets, a large number of the stores, shops, and the residential section; and even the school building at Pine Bluff is flooded. The water comes up as high as two or 2 or 3 feet in some of the school buildings and at times schools must be closed until the water recedes.

The local people have been obligated to raise about half of the money. They are obligated to maintain the project. I think they are ready to do that. It is authorized, but it is a new project.

I will say in conclusion if there is any item anywhere in the bill which is in the interest of national defense, and which is in the interest of our own Government, this is it, regardless of what the decision of this subcommittee and this House may be. I bring the matter before you, trusting that you will adopt it. If not, I do want to say to the subcommittee that I am going to follow the matter to the other body and I am going to do my best as a Member of the Congress to get that body to adopt it. Should I succeed, with the help of others, I hope the subcommittee and the House will be willing to go along in the concurrence of an amendment of the other body to allow these funds. Of course, I earnestly urge you to vote for this amendment.

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

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 3 minutes, and that I be recognized.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the Hardin drain project of Arkansas is strictly a local project. The engineers did not request any money for it except for planning. The benefits would accrue to solely local people.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I stated that it was a new project. It is an unbudgeted project, of course; but is it not true that the reason the Army engineers did not request any money for it was because the directive to the Army engineers directed them not to include funds for any new projects? That is the reason they did not request it.

Mr. RABAUT. Unless the project could be justified as a national defense measure; that is true. The gentleman's statement is absolutely true.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. On page 547 of part II of the civil functions hearings, one of the best arguments for not including this project is set forth. The testimony points out that a large portion of the Hardin drain project is in effect storm sewers for the city of Pine Bluff?

Mr. RABAUT. That is right.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. Is it not authorized as a Federal Government project.

Mr. RABAUT. Yes. It is authorized. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REED of New York: Page 7, line 3, at the end of line 3, strike out "\$268,009,900" and insert "\$268,044,400, the increased amount to be used for planning of the Wellsville, N. Y., flood project as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes, if I need that much time, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the fine speeches that have been made for different flood projects set forth in the civil functions bill. I have also noted the result of the adverse votes, so it is with some temerity that I come before the House. I would not do so if I did not feel that this is a most worthy project, affecting the lives and property of the people in a village of 8,000 population—Wellsville, N. Y.—where there are several very important defense plants. The village of Wellsville, N. Y., is frequently subjected to disastrous floods.

Sometimes the question is asked why is it that people do not move out of flood areas; why do they stay in a place that is flooded year after year?

Some years ago I stood on the hills looking down upon the beautiful city of Johnstown, Pa. I was with one of the distinguished citizens of that town. As we stood there he described in vivid language the Johnstown flood that stirred the emotions not only of the people of this Nation but of the entire world. When the flood came down through that city it was a major tragedy. My friend said, "I am the only surviving member of a large family." Then pointing to a distant cemetery, "You see those little monuments over there glistening in the sun?" I said, "Yes." He remarked, "I often wonder if my brothers and sisters and father and mother are buried there. I saved myself," he said, "by hanging on to a piece of timber, and when the flood receded a little group of us orphans sat down. We were hungry and wet. We debated whether we should leave this place where we had grown up and played together or go down to Pittsburgh and be bootblacks or sell newspapers." He said, "We all cried out 'Let us stay here. This is home.'"

Then my friend explained that "from that day on"—and he was then 60 years old or more—"I have never failed to make some contribution to the civic well of my home town."

That is one reason why people stay in a flood area. Then he pointed out

the beautiful buildings, playgrounds, and parks that had been established in this once-flooded district of his home city.

There is another illustration of why people refuse to desert their home town in its hour of flood disaster. The men who follow the lines of battle to bury our dead soldiers tell us that invariably the dying man reaches for the inner pocket for some little keepsake of his mother, wife, or loved one back home—all of which teaches us that our boys are not fighting because of abstract rights and responsibilities of international relations; they are fighting because of love of God and home and native land. Yes; it is love of God and home and native land that enters into the souls of our soldiers and makes their arms invincible. The stability of this Nation is in the homes in our villages and cities.

Why should this village of Wellsville, N. Y., a Christian community, whose sons are fighting for this country, whose sons are being killed and wounded, be denied this item of \$34,500 by this administration—and this item is all I am asking for—to carry on the preliminary work looking to the eventual relief of these people? Floods are costing them \$400,000 a year. Somebody here said that taxes are increasing. Yes; they are increasing in this community to the extent of \$400,000 in flood damages that this Government can save, if it will, and, having once saved this amount of damage, the people can pay taxes with less sacrifice.

I am interested in comparable flood projects, but I say—and I am not going into what I said yesterday with reference to the Wellsville, N. Y., project—but I do say that failure to furnish flood relief for this village is a reminder that "where there is no vision the people perish." People are perishing in our home communities from floods while the boys are fighting in Korea, and they are fighting not because of international problems; they are fighting, as I have said, for love of God and home and native land. That is why the boys are fighting and they do not want to come back to their flooded homes because of the indifference and neglect of their own Government. They do not want to return from Korea to find their loved ones flooded out because the Government for which they have been fighting refused to do anything to save their homes.

I cannot see why we should not put this item in the bill, in spite of the action that has been taken; it is justified in every sense of the word.

Yesterday I put in the recommendation of the engineers all the facts pertaining to this flood project, and I felt there was hope for favorable action on this amendment I have offered today. I have the utmost respect and affection for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]; he is an able man, and I know he is a man of integrity and a man who will not, I feel sure, go back on his word. When testimony was taken before this committee asking for this relief, this colloquy took place, as appears on page 4 of the hearings:

Mr. RABAUT. This project has a budget estimate?

Mr. REED. Yes; \$34,000.

Then the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] said:

I think they have made a good justification of it.

When he said that, I sent word out to the district that a distinguished member of this committee on the majority side had said that he agreed that it was a sound project; the people of Wellsville, N. Y., had reason to expect favorable action on their flood project.

As I say, I know that Representative RABAUT is a man of integrity, who will not go back on his word, and I now look to him to support me in getting relief in this matter of flood control.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 6 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER] is recognized.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I, like I am sure most of the other Members, was greatly impressed by the remarks of the gentleman from New York. There is nothing more discouraging, more devastating, nothing that is worse than the flooding out of towns and communities, but this frequently occurs. The gentleman from New York has made out an exceptionally sound case and I trust his amendment prevails.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I have often spoken with the gentleman from New York because there is something in his name that is very close to me. We salute each other generally as we pass in the corridors as cousins. We do not know that we are cousins. But my maternal grandfather was a Reed and like the forefathers of the distinguished gentleman from New York he was a ship's carpenter. So we feel very kindly toward one another.

Everything the gentleman stated as to what I said in committee is true. But you know what legislation is, you know what the activities are in the various subcommittees of the House. When it came to the point where we had not yet a unanimous bill, we had to abide by certain conditions. Those conditions I presented in general debate in my first talk yesterday.

These are the conditions, and I must live up to the conditions in presenting this bill to the House. So that the gentleman may explain what the maneuvering of a committee is when he goes back to his constituency, I recite the conditions as follows: No new projects in the bill, controversial projects are omitted, no unbudgeted projects, and here is where the gentleman is affected. No planning or surveys in this bill, with the idea that the engineers should complete the work in the vicinity of \$5,000,000,000 that they have on hand.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. May I say on behalf of the subcommittee that despite the fact the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] and myself have great affection and respect for the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] I feel that we must sustain the action of the subcommittee and the full committee in reference to this project. It is difficult, surely, to undertake that because of our feeling for the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]; however, we have had to sift the projects, keeping in only those which are the most meritorious and leaving out those that have lesser priority. Those who came before our subcommittee in support of the Wellsville project made an excellent presentation, but when you look at the complete number of projects individually and collectively it was considered one that simply had to be deleted or deferred at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REED of New York) there were—ayes 27, noes 47.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAMSAY: On page 7, line 3, strike out the figure "\$268,009,900" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$268,084,900 to aid in the planning and completion of the project known as the Wheeling flood-control wall."

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment restores to this bill the full amount requested by the budget for flood control. While I can appreciate the desire of the committee to economize, I hesitate to economize on flood-control projects. Most of these projects become even more vital in this period of partial mobilization, and that is assuredly true of the proposed Wheeling-Benwood flood wall.

Mr. Chairman, this project is sufficiently far along so that the engineers could complete all planning with an additional \$75,000, and could, during the coming fiscal year expend up to \$500,000 on construction. The construction funds were denied by the Budget Bureau.

Wheeling, located in the industrial Ohio Valley, is the location of a number of industries producing essential material. It is subject to periodical floods. When the river overflows its banks, many of these industries—steel mills, fabricating plants, and the like—are forced to close. We, as a Nation, lose this productive capacity. Transportation of coal and other important raw materials is brought to a halt. We know from experience, that every delay in production, even the least delay, adds a corresponding burden to our fighting men.

By offering this amendment, Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting that the Congress increase budget estimates; I am not suggesting that pork be added to this bill. I am merely suggesting that projects of vital importance to our national defense be permitted to go forward in an orderly manner.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 3 minutes, and that that time be reserved for the committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this project has a very low cost-of-benefit ratio, 1.01. That is about as low as you can get unless you lose money. This is a project dating back to the 1938 authorization for \$13,501,700. That is quite a while ago. I do not know what it would be now. It is true there was new money in here this year for planning, \$75,500, but that falls under the very same category as the project of the gentleman from New York that we just voted upon.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I think it should be pointed out to the members of committee that the cost-of-benefit ratio of 1.01 was based on 1948 figures.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. FORD. With the increase in costs now, I fear very greatly that the benefit-cost ratio will be thrown out of balance to a considerable degree.

Mr. RABAUT. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 7, line 3, after the word "control", strike out the semicolon and insert "to include flood control at Tyrone, Pa.," and change the amount to read "\$274,484,900."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, for the past several years I have appeared annually before the subcommittee handling the civil functions appropriation bill and like many other Members of the House who have flood-control projects in their districts, I have not reached first base.

The amendment which I offered concerns a flood-control project at Tyrone, Pa., which was authorized December 22, 1944, in the Seventy-eighth Congress. The project was estimated to cost \$6,650,000 and has not been initiated because of the lack of an appropriation, even though the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the borough of Tyrone have agreed to assume the local cost in the sum of \$335,400 for lands, rights of way, and utility changes.

When I realize it is the policy of the subcommittee that handled this bill that no money would be appropriated for the planning or starting of new projects and that a 20-percent reduction has been made in all appropriations for existing projects in all probability I am wasting my time and effort in offering my amendment.

Nevertheless, I want the Members of the House of Representatives to know that the citizens of Tyrone, Pa., and vicinity, are very much concerned about

the Tyrone flood-control project. In 1936 the residents of Tyrone were the victims of a disastrous flood that caused millions of dollars of property damage. Every year since, the community of Tyrone has been threatened and actually damaged with floods. In November of last year another disastrous flood struck Tyrone and inflicted property damage of approximately a million dollars.

The citizens of Tyrone realize that unless flood conditions are corrected they live in constant fear of other disastrous floods. The stream that is responsible for the flood cuts through the heart of Tyrone and with one flood after another it is impossible for the residents of that community to assume the losses that have occurred annually since 1936. To be frank, they cannot understand why other communities have had flood conditions corrected while their flood-control project is ignored.

I am vigorously opposed to any boondoggling projects and I assure you that a flood-control project like Tyrone, Pa., is not a waste of taxpayers' money but an absolute necessity.

I recognize, as do other Members of the House, the necessity for economy, but it should not be practiced at the expense of the health and welfare of our people.

At this point I would like to warn the Members of Congress that if we want to destroy the confidence and morale of the American people we can do so by practicing this type of economy.

No doubt this economy program will prevail while we continue to dole out billions of dollars in foreign aid to nations, some of whom have actually turned on us and call us imperialistic Yankees.

I hope that when the foreign aid bill reaches the floor of this House that the same economy program that is being applied to our own domestic problems will be kept in mind. However, I doubt that it will happen because we seem to have money for every foreign nation and ignore the problems of our own people.

In justice to the residents of Tyrone, Pa., and vicinity, I sincerely hope that my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 2 minutes, and I ask for recognition.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this is known as the Tyrone project in Pennsylvania, that was originally estimated at \$6,650,000. Not one cent was budgeted for planning. We cannot break all the rules. That is why I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WERDEL: On page 7, line 3, strike out the colon and insert "of which \$15,000 shall be utilized for the

study of the specifications used by the Bureau of Reclamation in connection with controls for laterals and sublaterals to distribute water from the Friant Kern Canal, and to estimate the cost of correcting specification errors."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, which I will reserve so that the gentleman may speak on his amendment.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman has reserved his point of order because I think I can make it clear that the amendment is germane.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know exactly how to approach this subject. I know that when I gradually began developing a degree of clumsiness, my mother discovered it was probably myself bouncing around the kitchen that caused the cake to fall, and I wound up out in the yard or out in the field with my father who, as a farmer, knew that if you knew the grade and you knew the volume of water that you had to move on that grade, then a 150-year-old almanac would tell you what size pipe you needed. I was not in the House of Representatives when you gentlemen discussed and passed an amendment requiring that Bureau of Reclamation officers be qualified engineers. Perhaps last year I should have said something when we had a flood from some of the streams over which the Bureau, through the Friant-Kern canal are conveying water from one watershed to another. The culverts are so small that the canal constructed by the Bureau backed water up for miles over the farmer's property out of the natural channel. It appears now that during the past 6 months the Bureau of Reclamation has constructed 25 miles of laterals and sublaterals conveying water to irrigation districts in various watersheds that the Army engineers are constructing flood-control facilities in at the present time. That would be the Kings River watershed, the Kaweah, and the Tule. There have been as many as 25 breaks in one day in one small section of these supply lines. There are hundreds of breaks already present in the laterals constructed. The contractor who constructed them is responsible for repairing the breaks under the contract for 1 year, and 6 months of that year have expired. To reconstruct these lines is costly. They have been constructed under the specifications of the Bureau of Reclamation. They have been put in the ground in accordance with their specifications. There are still 50 miles of laterals to construct, and 150 miles of sublaterals to construct. In addition to the breakage the Bureau has specified valves along the laterals which are not proper because they leak water; meters, which are costly and must now be reinstalled, because they are flooded and damaged. The water must be pumped out, new valves installed and new meters purchased and installed or repaired. When these repairs are done they are going to be paid for by the farmers. These municipal water districts have bonded themselves.

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

Mr. WERDEL. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Was this work planned by the Corps of Army Engineers?

Mr. WERDEL. No, this work is being done on the laterals and sublaterals by the Bureau of Reclamation in the watershed of the Kings River where the Bureau and the Army engineers are presently working on flood control.

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

Mr. WERDEL. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is it not a fact that the Army engineers are equally—perhaps not equally, but proportionately interested in the area with the Bureau of Reclamation and that since this is presumably an error on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation it would be desirable that the decision should be made by a disinterested group, that is, a professional engineering group like the engineers?

Mr. WERDEL. That is the reason I have drafted this amendment the way I have, and it is also the reason why I have asked for no additional funds.

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

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Since my amendment is a part of the same situation, involving a similar condition, would it be possible to offer my amendment and discuss both at the same time; permit me to speak 5 minutes before the decision is made on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chairman to express his own feeling, that the point of order pending against this amendment should be disposed of. If the gentleman's amendment to the amendment is along the same line, I presume it would be subject to a point of order also.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I make the unanimous-consent request that the point of order be withheld until the amendment to this amendment is disposed of?

Mr. RABAUT. May I be heard, Mr. Chairman? I feel constrained to speak to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this deals with the Reclamation Department of the Government and not with the Corps of Engineers. It involves a project in reclamation, and we are not talking about reclamation projects here at all.

I insist on the point of order. It is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. WERDEL. Speaking in opposition to the point of order, Mr. Chairman, the Friant-Kern canal mentioned

in the amendment is a part of the Central Valley project, designed to transport water from one watershed over several other watersheds and supply additional irrigation water into various watersheds as it passes. One of these watersheds is the Kings River, on which there is an appropriation in this bill for the Army engineers, in connection with the Pine Flat Dam. They are presently constructing a dam on Pine Flat, which will have not only flood-control benefits but will have irrigation benefits and will affect existing irrigation canals. The laterals and sublaterals that I mention in my amendment are used not only to carry water from the Friant-Kern canal to various pieces of agricultural property, but actually carry water from the Friant-Kern canal under and around various irrigation systems that now exist in the Kings River watershed.

There are other watersheds now being studied by the Army engineers between the Kern and Kings, in which all of these breaks would occur. So there is no doubt in my mind but that the subject is germane, and I have not asked for additional funds. I want the Army engineers to be able to study this problem and make a report as to what the errors in specifications were, and what the incidental damage is.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HARDY). The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair has examined the amendment. As far as any argument which he has heard is concerned, there is no reference to any authority which exists in law for this study and there is nothing in this bill on this subject.

Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have at the desk an amendment which will not now be offered. It would have included the same examination by the Army engineers as to the specifications used in making the cement pipe for laterals in the Coachella Valley, that is the distribution of water in the Coachella Valley. I am not constrained to oppose the point of order, although I personally think that this is a matter of interest to the Army engineers. If the same specifications are being used in other parts of the Central Valley concerning which the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] spoke, then it is desirable that the Army engineers discover the error immediately in the Bureau of Reclamation formula, and make the necessary corrections if they appear elsewhere. Whether or not that is to be done in this bill, perhaps it should be done in a separate bill, it is essential that something be done to discover why hundreds of thousands of dollars of pipe have been put into the ground and then to have it discovered almost by accident within the last few months that the pipe had split, making it necessary to replace the pipe.

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. I believe it would be well to note at this point that in my own district in the Madera irrigation dis-

trict the people recently held an election and voted to obligate themselves to the extent of \$8,000,000 for a similar type distribution system to be built by the Bureau of Reclamation. Those people there are beginning to wonder what the situation will be if that system begins to fall apart, who will have to pay for it, because \$8,000,000 is a terrific amount of money.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I may say to the gentleman from California that the question of who is going to pay for it answers itself. The farmers are going to have to pay for it and pay for replacing the pipe unless some investigation like this discovers the flaws in the specifications. I think it is very essential.

Mr. HUNTER. I think it is an excellent idea.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRAY: On page 7, line 3, strike out "\$268,009,900" and insert in lieu thereof "\$268,309,900," and add immediately thereafter the following: "of which \$300,000 shall be used for the construction of the Vincennes flood-control project, Indiana."

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, the reason that the Vincennes flood-control project is not in this bill is very simple. This project was approved by the Public Works Committee in 1948. In this bill the committee has not included any project that was not included in the report of the Bureau of the Budget. This year and last, on the advice of the President, the Bureau of the Budget did not include any new projects. The extreme need and utility of this project is accepted by all and considered of the highest priority by the United States Corps of Engineers. This item was added to the flood-control bill by the Senate last year, but was lost when the 10-percent cut was made. The basic error made by the Bureau of the Budget is that this is not, in a strict sense, a new project as my following remarks will show. It is to rebuild a section of the levee that is crumbling and inadequate.

Vincennes, which with its environs would be protected by this wall, is a city of 24,000 people. This city has been endangered by floods for a period of many years. It is, at this time, protected by a levee which was erected by the WPA. This levee is inadequate, is crumbling, and a portion of it must be replaced. If this levee gives way, more than 80 percent of this city will be flooded—damaged to the amount of probably \$20,000,000, in addition to all the suffering it will entail. There is at the present time more than \$20,000,000 of defense contracts in the factories of Vincennes, which a flood will stop. However, since this present levee, part of which must be rebuilt, was not built by the United States engineers, the Bureau of the Budget termed it a new project for purely technical reasons. The city of Vincennes is in a much more critical situation than in former years in that levees above and across the river have been built which funnel the water into Vincennes. This proposed flood wall fits in with the long-time plan for flood control on the Wabash. Vincennes

and Knox County are already bonded to the limit, and the State of Indiana cannot issue bonds. The flood in 1950 broke the city.

There are places in the country where floods only occur at very rare intervals. There are other places where, because of the great expense involved, adequate protection cannot be made against floods. This Vincennes case is neither. We know that floods return approximately every 7 years, and we know that the city can be protected adequately at a very reasonable cost. A serious flood, which cost a great deal of money to avert, occurred in 1943. Last year in 1950, a very serious flood occurred and the Government and the city of Vincennes spent more than \$400,000 sandbagging the levee and putting mud boxes on top of it to save the city, and countless volunteers labored day and night, and when victory was finally achieved over the flood, the church bells of the city rang in thanksgiving. That amount is \$100,000 more than we are asking at this time to rebuild this section of the flood wall. The Corps of Engineers in their budget, put in the sum of \$600,000 for the rebuilding of this critical section, which incidentally does fit in with the over-all planning for general flood-control work on the Wabash River, but after investigation I find that this following year we would not be able to spend more than this \$300,000. If the \$300,000 is granted it will be used to rebuild that half of the section that is the most critical. If another flood occurs similar to that of 1950 before this section is rebuilt, the entire city of Vincennes will be flooded, but probably before this levee gives way, the Government will spend a half million to a million dollars trying to save it. Is that economy?

In 1950 an entire battalion of troops was called from Fort Knox. It is "penny-wise and pound-foolish" to ignore this need. The Army engineers are spending approximately \$50,000 this year driving piling to prevent the levee from crumbling. We are for economy in the State of Indiana as much as in any State in the Union. We need many flood-control projects in Indiana, but the State has dropped all of them temporarily except for the Vincennes project. The Governor of the State and the Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission feel that the Vincennes project is a must. The secretary of the Indiana State Flood Control and Water Resources Commission came to Washington to the hearing before the committee, and I wish to repeat again every request for funds for various projects in Indiana has been dropped in the interest of the Vincennes project. We are asking now only \$300,000 which is less than was spent in trying to save the flood wall in 1950. I have been looking over the projects approved by the Bureau of the Budget. Millions and tens of millions of dollars are recommended for these various projects. It makes the small amount that the State of Indiana is asking for Vincennes seem utterly insignificant. Perhaps that is why the Vincennes project is overlooked. Perhaps it is that the State of Indiana is talking in terms of economy

instead of multimillions. We are not asking for a billion dollars to relocate the Wabash River. No, this is not a plan to spend millions to irrigate Timbuctoo, or to build flood walls in the Congo, it is merely a project to save a city—a city of loyal American taxpayers—by spending a sum that is less than we are spending to temporarily sandbag a section of its crumbling levee. Only here in the Congress can relief be given. Vincennes spent all of its money and borrowing power in trying to save itself in 1943 and in 1950.

This plan is just simple economy. In the next flood we will spend more than we are asking now, and then probably lose the city. All the State of Indiana is asking is \$300,000 to save a city of 24,000 people that is doing \$20,000,000 worth of defense work, and is a great heritage to America. It is the capital of the old Indiana Territory and one of the finest industrial cities of southern Indiana. If you turn this down, you are allowing the Bureau of the Budget, which is not elected by the American people and which is willing to give billions for any project on earth, to reject a most necessary expenditure.

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

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Do I understand the gentleman correctly that this is an item to repair damage that has been done to the flood wall and an emergency matter only?

Mr. BRAY. That is exactly what it is. They must replace that part of the wall because of faulty workmanship in construction. They have spent \$400,000 last year to sandbag it and we are only asking for \$300,000 now to construct part of the severely damaged wall.

Incidentally, this section to be rebuilt fits into the general long-term plan of flood control on the Wabash as planned by the engineers.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The city has suffered damage as a result of this situation and this is an emergency matter?

Mr. BRAY. Yes. The city is broke, they have spent every dime they have and it is bonded to the limit, in order to try to save the levee in past floods. Incidentally much of this critical condition is due to the levees above which have funneled the water into the city of Vincennes. Without this wall Vincennes cannot survive another flood.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes and that I be recognized to close debate.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the need for economy and I also appreciate the temper of this House as to all amendments to the flood-control section of this bill. But when there is a leak in your house I think it is poor

economy to wait until it rains and then start to repair the damage and attempt to stop the leak. It is much better to fix the leak while the weather is good.

That is exactly the situation you have with this Vincennes flood wall. During the WPA days a flood wall was constructed at Vincennes out of earth and part of it out of concrete. It was not built according to specifications employed by the Army engineers when they do this type of work and the workmanship was probably faulty, because the wall has begun to crumble and gave way. Every time there is a flood the Army engineers spend about \$50,000 to sandbag that levee. Just a short while ago they drove in some piling to hold up the wall and that cost approximately \$50,000. Every few years they have extremely high floods on the Wabash. They had one in 1950, and at that time the Government spent over \$300,000 to prevent the town from being inundated. There were thousands and thousands of volunteer workers, and locally \$90,000 was spent. Now that was a total of over \$400,000 spent at that time, and this amendment only calls for an appropriation of \$300,000. I am not adding the damage to property that would have occurred if the town had been flooded and the great loss of life and suffering that goes with such a disaster.

Vincennes is a town that has about \$20,000,000 worth of war contracts. It is on the main highway and the railroads running north and south from Chicago. This city is not in my district, but I am especially interested in this project, because if Vincennes is inundated, practically all of the north and south traffic in the western part of my district is stopped. In the appropriation bill last year \$600,000 was authorized for this project. It was taken out under the Taber-Thomas amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have not spoken to anyone who did not think this was a worth-while project and that it should be in the budget. They say it is a new project. This program was authorized under the Flood Control Act of 1946, because that is when the flood wall gave way; so it would have to be a new project. I think we are considering the form and not the substance, if we refuse to approve this amendment, because of rules the committee has laid down. It is not economical to spend \$400,000 to prevent a town from being flooded when you can start this present project for \$300,000. I think this is a very worth-while amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this is a flood wall project. In the bill for fiscal 1951 the Senate recommended \$600,000 for construction. The House allowed nothing, and there was no budget estimate. It is pointed out, therefore, that under the conference report, the Corps of Engineers, had they believed the project to fit the defense criterion, could have expended up to \$600,000 last year on this project. They chose to spend nothing. In the budget for 1952 the Corps of Engineers were allotted a certain sum of money by the Bureau of the Budget for

their budgetary planning. It is pointed out that the Corps of Engineers recommended to the Bureau of the Budget \$600,000 for this project in 1952. However, the \$600,00 was over ceiling previously established by the Bureau of the Budget, so after they had the amount established that they could use, they went in on a request for \$600,000 over and above the established amount. In other words, they did not choose to make this a specific project.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I simply want to say that our subcommittee was put in a difficult position. Whereas here is a project in excess of \$3,000,000, all that was requested was \$20,000 for planning, and the record shows that only 38 percent for the planning has been completed.

Mr. RABAUT. Thirty-eight percent of the planning.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes. It puts any committee charged with the responsibility for expending funds in a difficult position to go ahead and authorize the spending of money for construction when the planning has not even reached the half-way stage.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have made this motion reluctantly because I know the House wants to get on with this legislation, but I do feel it my duty to call attention to an omission from this bill which I think is due to a combination of unfortunate circumstances and not really to the fault of anybody. However, there is one item omitted from the bill for the further dredging of Portland harbor in my district. This is necessary for the completion of a project which was authorized in 1945, and which has actually been going forward for several years, and needs to be completed if the very large sums of money already spent are to accomplish their purpose.

The authorization in 1945 was for a 35-foot channel available for tankers, to obtain access to the Portland-Montreal pipeline, and to a large number of tanks at the head of our harbor, for a turning basin at the head of the harbor, for a breakwater at the entrance of the harbor, and for a 170-acre anchorage, 35-foot depth, at a point designated by the Army engineers. All other work as authorized has been completed, but no appropriation has been made for the 170-acre anchorage.

I should like to read into the Record the traffic which is involved in this situation.

In 1945 we had a net total tonnage of 4,848,696 and a tonnage of petroleum products of 2,704,151.

In 1946 the net total tonnage was 5,938,900 and the tonnage of petroleum products 4,730,413.

In 1947 the net total tonnage was 6,677,060 and the tonnage of petroleum products 5,501,825.

In 1948 the net total tonnage was 7,583,938 and the tonnage of petroleum products 6,450,535.

In 1949 the net total tonnage was 6,847,619 and the tonnage of petroleum products 5,957,582.

I have no figures for 1950, but that traffic is constantly increasing.

The modern tanker is a big, deep-draft ship even in contrast with the tankers which were operating 5 or 10 years ago. The harbor has to be able to accommodate those tankers and it is important to the national defense, because Portland is the easternmost harbor on the Atlantic coast. A tanker went aground in our harbor only the other day. Portland was in the last war the site of a very important naval base. In any conceivable military operations, the necessity for getting these big tankers into Portland harbor would be absolute.

I appreciate what a very difficult time the subcommittee have had on this bill, and I do not criticize them. On the contrary, I congratulate them on the care and study they have given these matters. I think this item would probably have been in the bill if the Army engineers had seasonably brought it to the attention of the Bureau of the Budget, which for some reason they did not. I earnestly bespeak the consideration of the House for this project. I hope that when this bill gets into another body the necessary appropriation will be made, because, as I say, until this anchorage is provided, the millions of dollars which have heretofore been spent in improvements on this harbor will have been used to very imperfect effect.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SASSCER: On page 7, line 3, strike out "\$268,009,900" and insert "\$268,034,900, of which \$25,000 shall be used for planning and surveying flood control, Anacostia River and tributaries, with particular reference to conditions existing at Bladensburg, Md."

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I earnestly ask you to give me your attention for a few minutes, and if, from the facts I outline in that brief time, you feel I have made out a case for this \$25,000 item, I will very genuinely appreciate your support. The issue right now is whether I make out a case or whether on the basis of a yardstick we are going to put the item aside. The issue is whether this item merits passage and whether the House as a legislative body is going to work its will or on the other hand whether we are going to accept and rubber stamp, without thought or consideration, a general recommendation of the subcommittee that no items be included for planning.

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

Mr. SASSCER. I yield to my friend. Mr. BAILEY. Is it not true that after the severe rainstorm on last Friday night, traffic was blocked on one of the main highways leading into the National Capital, that is, the Defense Highway, due

to this very situation you are talking about?

Mr. SASSCER. In answer to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from West Virginia, it was rather tragic and ironical that the hearings were released, and the remarks made before the hearings probably gave some hope of relief, on this route No. 1, and on the very next day, Sunday, Route 1 at Bladensburg, at that point known as the Peace Cross, the water at the deepest point was 6 feet over the roadway with three main highways blocked there.

Mr. Chairman, I have the utmost respect and affection, as everyone in the House has, for the committee. They have performed a hard and arduous task and naturally when they take the position in committee that they are going to strike out all planning items, they maintain that position on the floor. But if the House is to completely accept that theory, then we have wasted 2 days here of valuable time in passing upon and discussing these items.

Mr. Chairman, to get on to the project in the 5 minutes I have, the Defense Highway and Route 1 converge at what is known as the Peace Cross, 1 mile from Washington. That point gets flooded about 12 times a year, and the floodwaters have increased as the section has grown up, blocking the roads for approximately half a mile. Had we had an atomic bomb attack on Sunday, or at this time when we are thinking about civilian defense, and certainly the National Capital is important—had an attack come during floodwaters, exit from the city of Washington would have been practically blocked with the bridges leading to Virginia clogged up and Route 1 blocked up by floods and the Defense Highway, leading to one of the nearest ports at Annapolis, blocked up by flood, and a third road, which has been used as a detour, also blocked by flood.

This is not a local project for Maryland. It is on Route 1, leading from the State of Maine all the way down the Atlantic coast. I wish I had time to show you the pictures of this point at flood time. Every time the road is blocked the automobiles of people from New York, Pennsylvania, and all points north are frequently stalled with baggage damaged. Even when they get on the other side, the brakes slip and they have to stop at a garage, delaying their trip.

What I say now is basically in the interest of defense. It is only a \$25,000 Federal contribution for planning of a project that was authorized in the last Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER] has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SASSCER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. When these main highways are blocked how long does it take to clear them, usually?

Mr. SASSCER. It all depends on the amount of the flood water. The last one was one of the worst; it could take 6 or 7 hours, or all night. I would say 12 hours is the usual extent of it. But even during the early periods of it, when people do get through, I have seen them with badly damaged brake bands, and they have to stop at garages and have the brakes tightened up so that they can proceed. In some instances people have had to remain in their cars all night.

I cite this to show the national scope of the item. Beyond that, there is a particular inconvenience to local people, many of whom work in the Federal Government and who should be considered.

This is not a new item. After a long and tedious fight which goes back to the time of my predecessor, the present Members of Congress at the last session of Congress authorized this project. The Bureau of the Budget has authorized simply \$25,000 for planning, and we are asking that it not be stricken out. We are asking the Members on both sides of the aisle if they think it is right to keep it in to express the will of the Congress and leave it in so that the State and local agencies can go ahead with their planning, as this is a responsibility of the Federal, State, and local governments, to which the Congress, by an authorization bill passed at the last session, authorized a Federal contribution of \$4,531,200, which is over half the cost of the project.

The law authorizing this Federal participation is already on the books and will continue there, with the remaining step the appropriation of the money. If we make this initial appropriation we will expedite the actual authorized construction and completion of the project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has again expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 3 minutes and that I be recognized.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, not one dime has been spent on this project. This Anacostia River project has a total Federal estimate of \$6,709,000. The request of the engineers was for \$50,000 for planning. There is no new planning in this bill. The budget allowed \$25,000.

Just how will we look to the Nation, refusing funds for planning in every district of the country, and then, because we are going to travel this highway, we say we will have to make an exception for this de luxe crowd. Will that not look fine? It would be the worst thing we could do. Where would I be in justice to the position of any man in this House who has approached me upon a similar project for his own district? We say, "No. We cannot do anything for

the folks back home, but we are going to do something right here in the shadow of the Capitol of the United States."

It is not the right thing to do.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I think this particular project fits in that category of a new project, very well. This is the first money we will spend, if the amendment is approved, on a \$6,709,000 project.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FORD. If we want to hold up some projects without harm to the project, we must stop at this point. We should defeat the amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SASSCER. Let me answer the criticism by saying that the project was broken down into road relocation and dredging. They felt that the road relocation part of flood control was the most important, and that is the part that this is directed to.

In answer to the statement of my beloved colleague from Michigan, I am not trying to get Congress out of Washington; most of us want to stay in Washington; what I am thinking about is in case of disaster with the clogging up of bridges on the south side of the city and the blocking of roads on the north side by floods the National Government is imperiled.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to compliment the gentleman. I am happy to find I can agree with him once. This planning business seems to me to be the height of absurdity; his party never needs any planning to spend more.

Mr. RABAUT. Why, the gentleman always agrees with me.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOLDEN: On page 7, line 3, after the words and figures "\$268,009,900", insert "also the further sum of \$1,500,000, to be used for the construction of the Barbourville, Ky., flood wall project on the Cumberland River, as authorized by law, and the construction of the Pineville, Ky., flood wall project on the Cumberland River, as authorized by law, said sum to be divided equally between said two projects."

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, we are all aware of the tremendous importance of economy at this time. We are also aware that a project should make a considerable contribution to the war effort in order to qualify. But I think in view of all the facts and evidence this body heard on yesterday and today that enough has been presented to impress this powerful and most respected committee that the people of America are entitled to some consideration when devastation is taking place by reason of floods every year. Last year

I had the pleasure of talking to Mr. Frank Pace, at that time the Director of the Budget of the United States. He said that because of the present emergency many worth-while American problems were not being solved, and that the Golden Age of America was passing away.

Most of these projects do not run into large figures. I think this committee and the entire Committee on Appropriations as well as the Members of the House ought seriously to question and think about the policy and the hard rules laid down by this honorable committee that prevents many worthy and needed projects from being approved by this present Congress.

So far as these projects that I am bringing before the Congress are concerned, I think that if there is any project that can qualify from any standpoint, such projects are in the great bituminous coal fields of southeastern Kentucky. The last figures I have concerning the three counties involved show that more than \$58,000,000 worth of bituminous coal was shipped to the plants and factories of America. The entire production of bituminous coal in America is approximately 500,000,000 tons per year. The territory concerned with these two flood walls contributes more than 20,000,000 tons of bituminous coal this year, and in times of emergency we can produce much more. In other words, by spending less than \$2,000,000 you can protect one of the great basic industries of America and we can keep the coal running into the war plants of this great Nation of ours. One-twentieth of all the coal of America is produced in this region. Yet floods flow down the streets of these two towns. Some Members have said that floodwaters encroach upon their home communities as much as 3 or 4 feet. The Cumberland River, when it goes on a rampage of destruction, goes into Barbourville, Ky., and Pineville, Ky., and floods all of the business section and 80 or 90 percent of the homes to a depth of from 7 to 10 feet. The loss of property is enormous. In 1946 the total loss in each of these towns was more than the total cost of giving us protection for each of the towns. We have floods practically every year.

There are more than 18,000 men working in these coal mines. There are something like four or five thousand railroad men who have their homes in and around the towns that can be protected by these flood walls. We occupy in the defense program of America a key position there in southeastern Kentucky. We are just 80 miles from the great bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

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

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact I have two projects involved here, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, we are contributing basic products. You cannot



make steel unless you have bituminous coal. I said here yesterday that the largest coal mine in America is located in my district and it will be protected by these flood walls. The United States Steel Corp. has a mine in Harlan County that produces a trainload of coal a day and every ounce of that coal has to come out on the Cumberland Valley Railroad through Pineville and through Barbourville. If we protect these towns that coal will continue to go into the steel mills of this great country. They do not sell it. They use it all for the manufacture of steel.

We furnish coal to the bomb plant at Oak Ridge, we furnish coal to all of the Tennessee Valley. This year the Kentucky Utilities, that furnishes power for most of Kentucky and some parts of Tennessee, has doubled the capacity of that great steam plant there just below Pineville, Ky., and has built a separate new transmission line right into the bomb plant over there in Oak Ridge, Tenn. They are now supplying large quantities of electricity for one of the most essential war plants in America. They have to have this coal.

Some two dozen coal mines every day take their entire output to the Kentucky Utilities. We furnish coal and we furnish power. It is not economy to let our people be destroyed year in and year out. We do make a notable contribution to the war effort and I think that these projects are justified.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on these two projects close in 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct in saying that the engineers asked for \$25,000 on the Barbourville project; but on the Pineville project they did not even ask for a cent. The budget allowed no money for the projects. It is true that they mine a very high grade of coal in that area and that we need coal for the defense effort. We need steel, and we have to run the great plants of America. I certainly know the devotion of the gentleman for his district. He has come before the committee and he has talked with us on other occasions. But, these two projects fall within the very category of the projects of the other gentlemen in the House from all over the United States. We just cannot go along with one of these projects any more than we can with the others.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GOLDEN].

The amendment was rejected.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I am of course very much disappointed that the committee did not see fit to

include in this bill the sum of \$209,000 for the flood-control project at Pueblo, Colo. I am not critical of the committee, however, as I fully realize the problems they faced. I am hoping that this item can be put in the bill before it is finally passed, as I feel that it is important to construct the same as soon as possible.

The project provides for flood protection at Pueblo, Colo., by the construction of a 10-foot levee as a protection against backwater, and at an estimated cost to the United States of \$209,000 and to the local interests of \$4,287, which includes rights-of-way.

Pueblo is our second largest city in Colorado, having a population of approximately 80,000.

I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that this project is entirely earthwork, and no critical materials of any kind will be used. It is an emergency project, and is necessary in order to complete the work done by the Army engineers in providing a small levee in 1948.

The city of Pueblo suffered a disastrous flood in 1921. Practically 3 square miles, including the center of the business district, were under water. I think the average depth was about 14 feet, and you can still see the watermarks on some of the buildings. Property damage was estimated at \$10,000,000, and it is known that 78 people lost their lives. It is the general opinion that many more perished as a result of that flood.

Following the flood, the city of Pueblo formed a conservancy district and constructed its own flood works, consisting of a floodway 10,000 feet long through the city, designed to carry a flow of 125,000 cubic feet per second. The cost to the taxpayers of Pueblo was about \$9,000,000. It was estimated that the previous flood carried about 103,000 cubic feet per second.

Now the immediate flood-control problem arises from the insufficient height of the backwater levee on the left bank of the river below the Santa Fe Avenue Bridge, and which would permit flooding of approximately 46 blocks within the city limits whenever the flow exceeds 27,000 cubic feet per second. That is due to the fact that the river has silted up, and for other causes.

I want to quote from the House Document No. 327, Eighty-first Congress, which is the report of the Army engineers, on this Pueblo project and includes this statement:

There is urgent need for further protection of this area.

And another statement:

The district engineer finds that there is a critical flood problem in the city of Pueblo, Colo., due to an inadequate backwater levee on the left bank of the Arkansas River downstream from the Santa Fe Avenue bridge, for a distance of approximately 3,000 feet.

The report further states that the survey "indicates an economic ratio of 1 to 1.7. The proposed improvement is economically justified."

I understand that is a very high ratio as compared to some other projects. I am not going to say more about the engineering features of this project; it has

been approved by the Army engineers, and you have their statement, which I have just read, that there is urgent need for further flood protection of this area.

I understand that it has been the policy of the Bureau of the Budget to refuse to approve the starting of any new construction unless it is connected with the national defense program. Therefore, I would like to say just a few words in support of our contention that this project is definitely tied in with national defense, and that it would be most disastrous and unfortunate if we should have another flood before this project could be completed. I will try to point out just what such a flood would mean to the defense activities in the Pueblo area.

First, Pueblo is an important defense city, perhaps one of the most important in the western part of the country at this time. The Pueblo Ordnance Depot is located there, and about 6,500 people are employed at present. This is one of the largest and most important depots in the United States, and is now being enlarged. It is a distribution depot, serving some 10 States, and supplying many military installations with equipment and supplies.

The Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. has a steel works at Pueblo, known as the Minnequa steel plant, employing about 4,500 men. The production of this plant is almost 100 percent for defense. There are many smaller corporations in Pueblo which have defense contracts. One is the Triplex Corp., employing some 750 people, making pistons for the aircraft industry, and also for tanks and jeeps.

Pueblo is a very important railroad center. There are four major railroad lines into Pueblo, and from these photographs you can see some of the tracks and roundhouses. The Santa Fe Railroad passes through Pueblo with its line to Denver. The Santa Fe just recently spent over \$2,000,000 in extensive improvements to its yards and facilities at Pueblo.

The Colorado & Southern Railway runs through Pueblo. This is a most important operation from Denver to Dallas.

The Missouri Pacific main line from the East has its terminal in Pueblo. The Denver & Rio Grande Western Railway passes through Pueblo with its line to Salt Lake City.

Those railroads would be completely out of commission if there should be another flood like the one occurring in 1921. This would stop the flow of supplies of ore and other raw materials into the steel works, which would, of course, be compelled to suspend operations as a result.

Shipments of military equipment and supplies from the Pueblo Ordnance Depot would be stopped.

We feel very strongly that this work should be completed as quickly as possible. We consider this an emergency project. We feel that it does have a direct bearing on our national defense effort. I have mentioned the important defense projects which are located in Pueblo and the serious situation that

would develop if the railroads in Pueblo ceased operations because of their tracks being washed out. We feel that a real hazard exists and that the construction of this flood-control project should be completed as soon as possible.

We have been fortunate in that we have not had another large flood in the last few years. However, such a flood may occur at any time, because no one can predict just when these floods will strike.

Again I want to impress upon the committee that this project would involve the use of earthwork only. It would provide for the employment of a few men, but it does not call for any critical materials which are in short supply.

We feel that we should finish the job that the Army engineers started in 1948, when they constructed a smaller levee out of emergency funds—there was no direct appropriation. The district engineer in Albuquerque made a special survey of this flood situation in Pueblo, as I recall, late in 1948. They recognized that emergency work was necessary and did the job at a cost of about \$20,000 out of their emergency fund.

Now we would like the Army engineers to go ahead and complete this project. We feel that a real danger exists and there is a great deal of apprehension over the constant threat of another flood.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. 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. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I had planned to offer an amendment to this section of the bill which would have provided funds to start the construction of the Eagle Gorge flood-control project in my congressional district. Several weeks ago I appeared before the subcommittee on appropriations for Army civil functions and urged that funds be approved for this project. At that time the chairman informed me that the committee had adopted a policy of not approving funds for any new project or for any project which was not included in the budget. The policy was adopted because of our national emergency program which necessitated reductions in nondefense spending. With this policy I could not find much criticism. Yet it was my feeling that as the Representative from my district I should do everything possible in behalf of the needs of that district. Therefore, as I have said, I had planned to offer an amendment seeking funds for this particular project.

In view of what has transpired here today, however, I have now decided not to offer the amendment. Several other Members with flood-control projects as needy as mine have offered amendments similar to mine and they have all been rejected. The House has supported the policy adopted by the subcommittee and has refused to approve any amendment. To offer mine now would be but a futile gesture, as I am sure it would meet the same fate as the others. I shall seek to have my project approved by the Senate which will consider this appropria-

tion bill at a later date. That body may approach this flood-control problem on a different basis. It is my hope that it will do so for the reason that many projects are badly needed by the various communities affected.

#### ALBENI FALLS DAM

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 hope to give the Committee in the time allotted me a better understanding of one project that has been omitted from this bill—the Albeni Falls power dam project in the State of Idaho.

The Albeni Falls Dam is one of the dams included in the Columbia River projected system of power dams. It is the smallest and least costly of all these dams; yet it is one that will return a higher profit in power production than any dam which has been built or which are projected for construction on the Columbia River.

The United States Army engineers asked for \$10,000,000 for the construction of the Albeni Falls Dam. They said that with this \$10,000,000 they could, within the brief period of 13 months, get the Albeni Falls Dam so far near completion that by August 1952, only 13 months from now, this dam could be producing 100,000 kilowatts of electricity.

I know of no power dam that has ever been built in this country where so large an amount of electricity as 100,000 kilowatts has been produced for the small expenditure of \$10,000,000.

Most power dams require 40 to 50 years to pay for themselves. If the engineers can, as they claim, produce 100,000 kilowatts of electricity at an expenditure of only \$10,000,000, and I believe they can, the Albeni Falls Dam will be the most profitable Government-owned power dam in the country.

The engineers say that the ratio of benefits to cost on the Albeni Falls Dam is 4.47 to 1. I know of no river and harbor or flood-control project where the benefits are so high compared to the cost. It is not, therefore, in my opinion true economy to leave the Albeni Falls Dam out of this appropriation bill.

I, however, am not offering an amendment to put the Albeni Falls Dam in this bill. Every amendment that has been offered today to get a new project into this bill has been defeated. I am fearful that any amendment to include the Albeni Falls Dam in this bill, judging from today's temper of the House, probably would suffer the same fate.

I do, however, hope that when this bill goes to the other body that the Albeni Falls Dam will be added to the list of projects included. I hope that the committee meanwhile will give further study to this Albeni Falls project. When they come to understand that the Albeni Falls Dam when built, if \$10,000,000 is appropriated for its construction, that it, by increasing the electricity production of the Columbia system, will pay for itself

not in 40 or 50 years but in from 10 to 20 years.

It is not true economy to eliminate such a power-producing dam from this bill.

Some projects have been eliminated by the committee on the ground that they were new projects. Albeni Falls Dam does not fall in this category. Work already has started on it. A total of \$2,900,000 was appropriated last year for this project.

Other projects were rejected because they were not considered necessary to the defense effort. Electricity, particularly in the region which is a heavy producer of aluminum, is a defense need. Therefore, Albeni Falls Dam does not fall in the category of not being a defense project.

Some projects have been rejected because the cost was too high compared to the benefits. The Albeni Falls Dam is not in this category because the engineers estimate its benefits as \$4.67 for every \$1 spent in its construction.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERNANDEZ: On page 7, after line 17, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Flood control, Middle Rio Grande, N. Mex.: For continuation of work on Jemez Canyon Reservoir in accordance with the Flood Control Act of 1948, \$900,000."

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hard and fast task of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], and his subcommittee in opposing every amendment, and I realize that we face a situation here where the program is not to allow a single change in the bill, on the grounds that if the committee has made a mistake it can still be corrected through action of the Senate and the conference committee.

There are other items in my State which were approved by the Bureau of the Budget, but were eliminated by this committee, on which I am not going to offer any amendment, and I would not offer any amendment on this except for the fact that I am satisfied that our good committee is making a grievous error in stopping a project which is right in the middle of construction. The over-all Rio Grande program was approved as late as 1948, and yet because of the emergency character of it, this committee and this Congress appropriated money to start construction of this particular part of it last year. They are right in the middle of it now. They have 110 men on the job this very day, on a continuing contract, and if this money is not appropriated, then that work will be chopped off right in the middle of it and that contract cut off in the midst of it. It means that what they have already done would be wasted and lost. That is the situation.

The gentleman from Michigan yesterday said that the committee tried to be fair, and I am sure they are fair, everybody agrees to that, but they do not claim that they are infallible. In this case I think an error has been committed through misapprehension. My colleague, the gentleman from New Mex-

ico [Mr. DEMPSEY] yesterday called attention to that misapprehension, and I think this is an occasion on which the committee could very graciously and conscientiously agree to let this amendment go in. When the news came out to New Mexico that this project, which is in the midst of construction, had been left out, there was consternation. I hold in my hands a large batch of telegrams from people who realize how vital this project is and who realize the disastrous situation that will result if it is stopped right in the middle of it.

I am not going to take time to read them all, but I do want to read one:

The following information is from sources we deem reliable, and work on Jemez Dam at present includes placing of concrete for the intake tower, placing of concrete for the barrel of the outlet conduit, which is about one-fourth completed, and excavation for the stilling basin. There are 110 men employed on the job.

Shut-down of work for considerable period of time would expose the partially completed conduit to damage and covering by possible slides from the steep hillside adjoining it and, under certain conditions, could involve considerable expense preparatory to resuming work.

Excavation in the stilling basin is being carried on at a considerable depth below normal water table, which requires unwatering. If work were shut down for a considerable period of time, the water would either have to be allowed to rise in the excavation, which would result in considerable sliding of the banks when it was again pumped down, or this area would have to be continually pumped during the entire shut-down period, which would be quite expensive. In either case, whether the pumping is continued or the water allowed to return to its normal level, the stilling-basin excavation would be subject to filling from slides, since the north side of it also is against a steep slope.

The cost of stopping all work for a period of approximately 12 months would exceed \$200,000 under normal weather conditions, and in the event of flash floods, heavy rain, or snow this loss would increase proportionately.

If a flood did come down, the work that has already been done there would be destroyed. This is not economy. As I say, I am satisfied that the committee rejected this item only through misapprehension. I plead with the committee to adopt this amendment, which is only for nine hundred thousand, and, of course, has the full approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which is offered by my colleague the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] is not for some new project which has not been started, and it is not for a project that has not been budgeted. We have already expended through the generosity of Congress \$1,200,000 upon this small dam. Outlets are being constructed at this time. I was informed this morning by Colonel Potter of the Army engineers that this was a continuing contract for the completion of the outlets and, if the outlets are not completed, they will not only be destroyed but, in addition, because of this continuing contract, it will be necessary to buy up the contract and pay the contractors for not completing it.

This Rio Grande project is an important one. It affects the States of Colorado and Texas and the country of Mexico. That river provides 60,000 acre-feet of water annually to Mexico under a treaty signed during the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt.

If we cannot get these silt-control dams that are necessary, the water cannot get down to Mexico or Texas. Today New Mexico owes the State of Texas about 250,000 acre-feet of water not because we have used the water but because of lack of a channel. Due to silting of the channel, filling it in places, when we have any rain, the runoff is so rapid it cannot be carried off properly because there is no channel available. This was explained to the committee by the Army engineers. Central Avenue in Albuquerque is lower than the Rio Grande Channel. As a result of this condition water is wasted. What we are trying to do is continue a program this Congress has authorized and for which this Congress has appropriated money. It is a program for which the Bureau of the Budget has recommended the amount the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] wishes to restore.

Only 4 days ago the chief engineer at Albuquerque said:

We feel that the prospects are very good that work on the dam will proceed without interruption.

Colonel McNutt said the \$900,000 now is incorporated in the appropriations bill which is before Congress. Action on the bill is expected this week.

The \$900,000 now awaiting congressional approval will provide sufficient funds to complete the outlet structures.

On those structures that he is trying to complete, there is a pending contract for their completion. We have spent \$1,200,000 already, which money will be wasted.

Mr. Chairman, I think the committee has tried to do a good job, but I do not consider the committee to be infallible. They have not shown that to be the case in this instance. I have talked to different members of the committee, and I am sure they realize they have made a mistake, but sometimes it is difficult to get people to correct a mistake. All we ask here is fairness in connection with this appropriation. I hope the Congress will restore the cut in the appropriation which has been made by the subcommittee, because I am sure it was made without a thorough understanding of what is involved.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. On this project the budget estimate was \$900,000. The recommendation was to delete the \$900,000. This project is only 17 percent completed, and the committee does not feel that its economic benefit or its relationship to national defense is such that the Corps of Engineers should proceed with the construction at

the present time. The cost-benefit ratio here for the entire basin program is only 1 to 1.22, and the economic benefits of the Jemez Canyon are directly related to the over-all program. At the present time no other projects in the basin are being planned.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes, of course, there are other projects in the basin which we are willing to have postponed. But here you have authorized the work. The work has been started, and it is being stopped right in the middle of it. I think it is uneconomical, to say the least, to stop it in the middle of the work.

Mr. RABAUT. The economic ratio is tied to the entire system and that ratio is very low. It is 1 to 1.22. It is a very low ratio.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman says that this project has no reference to the national defense. That is not what the Army engineers stated to the gentleman's committee. They said quite the opposite of that. It has a definite connection with our national defense. On this very river is the Sandia base, which is one of the most important projects today in America.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DEMPSEY) there were—ayes 17, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Emergency fund for flood control on tributaries of Mississippi River: For rescue work and for repair or maintenance of any flood-control work on any tributaries of the Mississippi River threatened or destroyed by flood, in accordance with section 9 of the Flood Control Act, approved June 15, 1936 (36 U. S. C. 702g-1), \$500,000.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois: Page 8, after line 9, insert the following new paragraph:

"Flood protection, Beardstown, Ill.: For prosecuting work on the project for flood protection at Beardstown, Ill., including modification of the existing Lost Creek, South Beardstown, and Valley Drainage and Levee District projects, in accordance with section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950, approved May 17, 1950, \$2,976,000, to remain available until expended. No part of the sum appropriated pursuant to this paragraph shall be expended without prior approval of the Bureau of the Budget."

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the authorization for flood protection at Beardstown, Ill., was authorized during the second session, Eighty-first Congress, House Resolution 5472, Public Law 516. It was authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Report 332, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,976,000.

The Civil Functions Subcommittee was as considerate as they possibly could be as they gave Beardstown citizens and myself about 30 minutes to testify in behalf of the appropriation. The reason given me for not including the amount in the civil functions appropriation bill was because we did not have budget approval. This is an old project, needing repairs and about to cave in the river.

We asked Mr. Donald MacPhail, assistant to the Director of the Budget, to give us the approval. Our office was led to believe we would receive an answer of some kind by noon today. Our office did receive a letter signed by Director F. J. Lawton rejecting our request.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1951.  
HON. SID SIMPSON,  
House of Representatives,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SIMPSON: This is in reply to your letter of June 5, 1951, to Mr. MacPhail of this Bureau requesting favorable consideration to an appropriation for flood control at Beardstown, Ill.

I regret to advise you that in the light of the necessarily restrictive policies covering public works followed in the preparation of the 1952 budget this office would not be able to recommend the funds for the initiation of the Beardstown project.

The President's budget contained no recommended funds for initiating construction of any projects in the river and harbor, flood control or reclamation fields except for a limited number of multiple-purpose projects, all of which would provide substantial power benefits essential to the defense effort. Decision to include these projects came after a careful review of power requirements for the defense effort, particularly in areas where the power shortage appeared potentially critical.

I appreciate knowledge of your interest in the authorized Beardstown improvement and can assure you that should changed conditions permit an adjustment of the present budget policies any estimate submitted by the Department of the Army for Beardstown will be given every consideration by this office.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. LAWTON, Director.

I also insert a letter from the White House dated July 21, 1950, to the Secretary of the Army, directing executive agencies to conduct detailed review of programs:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, July 21, 1950.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In my message of July 19 to the Congress, I announced that I was directing the executive agencies—

“\* \* \* to conduct a detailed review of Government programs, for the purpose of modifying them wherever practicable to lessen the demand upon services, commodities, raw materials, manpower, and facilities which are in competition with those needed for national defense. The Government, as well as the public, must exercise great restraint in the use of those goods and services which are needed for our increased defense efforts.”

In order to adjust the programs of the Federal Government, I am writing to you and the heads of the other agencies whose programs involve substantial use of materials and other resources needed for the defense effort. Please reexamine your pro-

grams, giving particular attention, to the extent applicable, to the following:

(1) All civil public works, both direct Federal programs and grant-in-aid programs, should be screened with the objective, as far as practical, of deferring, curtailing, or slowing down those projects which do not directly contribute to defense or to civilian requirements essential in the changed international situation set forth in my message.

(2) Consistent with the restrictive policy already in force for housing credit, other credit programs should be tightened. The only exceptions should be those which directly contribute to meeting our defense and international responsibilities.

(3) Procurement of supplies and equipment should be held to minimum amounts, especially purchases of motor vehicles, typewriters, and other equipment using critical materials. Inventories should be reduced to the lowest practical levels, and excess supplies and equipment should be made available immediately to the General Services Administration.

In addition, I shall expect that in the reexamination of the programs of your agency you will give first priority to those activities which contribute directly to national defense, including requests of other agencies for assistance.

I am asking the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to work closely with you in this review and to report to me on the steps which you have taken in revising your program to meet these objectives.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

Mr. Chairman, I feel my record for economy during the five terms I have been here is as good as anyone's. The word economy, according to the dictionary, has several meanings besides the general implication of economy. One of the meanings, a theological one, is “the Creator's plan; the design of providence.” In my opinion it is not the design of providence or the Creator's plan for the wake of man-made barges to wash the ground from under the foundation of a sea wall protecting the city.

Beardstown has 6,000 people in it, railroad shops, a large flour mill, and a defense manufacturing plant. Above all, it has homes and houses of worship. In my experience, along the Illinois, Mississippi and Sangamon Rivers in the Twentieth Illinois District, it does not make any difference to floodwaters whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, a Protestant or a Catholic, Jew or Gentile, colored or white. It comes just the same. Floods make no exception of legislative bodies, appropriation committees or the Bureau of the Budget. Old Man River does as it pleases.

The seawall protection at Beardstown is in danger of collapsing. This is caused by the wake of barge lines and other boats, churning the ground loose from under the foundation of the wall. Two years ago a 20-foot section caved in and has been temporarily repaired.

I have offered my amendment subject to approval of the Bureau of the Budget. What could be fairer than such a proposal? Some political subdivision is going to have to help or floodwater is going to wash Beardstown into the Illinois River. It is the most needed flood protection between Chicago and the 275 miles length of the river.

Are not 6,000 lives, homes, and churches in Illinois and the United States as important to protect as the lives of starving people in India? As far as I am concerned they are more important.

Mr. Chairman, this body can and has voted \$50,000,000 for the rehabilitation of Korea. To my knowledge, not a single United Nations member has made any proportionate authorization. Mr. Speaker, this body has voted untold billions for good will all over the world. Under such circumstances, I do not propose for my part, Mr. Chairman, to let a city of 6,000 people float down the river.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 2 minutes, and that I be recognized.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois is absolutely right; this is a project that deals with the homes of 6,500 people. It calls for an estimated cost of approximately \$3,000,000. It is unbudgeted; not a nickel has been spent on it; it falls in the category of so many other projects of my worthy colleagues who have spoken here today.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote and that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during these troublesome years of increasing Government expenses and increasing taxes I have given considerable thought to our Federal flood-control program. I am of the opinion that that program is essential and that it is one of the things that will have to be carried on at a reasonable rate of speed.

A sound flood-control program is necessary if we are to preserve our productive facilities. An efficiently run private business which is ever so zealous to cut down overhead costs does not and cannot refuse to pay out necessary money for maintenance and repair of its productive machinery. Flood control falls in a similar category in regard to our national economy.

When no floods are threatening, and none have occurred recently, it is easy to suggest that flood control be cut out entirely. When citizens drown, when bridges, highways and roadways are washed away and homes are flooded, when industrial plants are inundated and millions of dollars of precious soil is washed away people change their mind about the necessity of flood control.

Flood control is not just another Government expenditure. Flood control is not the creation of a new department of government. It does not mean just more bureaucracy. Expenditures for flood control are not a means of handing out Government money to individuals who are able to provide for themselves.

Flood control is a public necessity. It is a public improvement. If the program is sound it constitutes necessary protection just as we must protect our communities against fire and other hazards.

Flood control is one program that cannot be returned to the States. The reason for this is obvious. Our rivers are interstate. Torrential rains and flood walls know no State lines. The rain falls and the snow melts in a far-off mountainous State and the water may flow through several States before it reaches flood height. The program of controlling floods is likewise interstate. A dam and reservoir in one State brings protection and safety and increased productivity to areas in States far below it. Floods and flood control are interstate. It is the type of program that must be handled by the Federal Government. By its very nature it is a public problem that calls for a public program.

Mr. Chairman, wide areas in the district that I have the honor to represent have again faced damaging floods. The entire south edge of Nebraska is menaced by floods. That part of southwest Nebraska included in the Republican Valley suffered a great deal throughout the years. A program of flood control and irrigation by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers is well underway. In several localities adequate protection has become a reality. This program must and will be carried on. It has been one of my chief concerns in the years that I have served in this Chamber.

Considerable of the Republican Valley flood protection is being carried on by the Bureau of Reclamation. The main construction by the Army engineers in the valley now is the Harlan County Dam. Closure of the dam will be made this summer. The construction of the Harlan County Dam is 92 percent complete. At the end of June this year there will be an unexpended balance of previous years of about \$1,500,000. The Army had secured approval of the Bureau of the Budget for a new appropriation of \$3,344,000. The committee in this bill has recommended the sum of \$2,000,000. I have been in touch with the Office of the Chief of Engineers. They informed me that they believe that the job can be completed with this \$2,000,000. We are very grateful for this.

In recent years all of southeast Nebraska has been subject to severe and reoccurring floods. Because I believe in these programs and because the need has been so urgent in this area as well, I have consistently worked for flood control.

In June 1944, after conferring with the local people in regard to their flood problem, I introduced the necessary resolutions which called upon the Army engineers to make an investigation and bring in a report and a plan for flood control for Salt Creek and the Big and Little Nemaha Rivers. These resolutions were approved by the House Committee on Flood Control on the 21st day of June 1944, and the Army engineers were assigned the job of formulating a flood-control program for these areas. The report of the Army engineers on Salt Creek has not yet been forwarded

to Washington. I understand that the tentative proposals met with local opposition. To date, no final report by the engineers has been made to the Congress but one is expected by November 15, 1951.

Neither has the Army engineers report on the Nemaha and the Little Nemaha been transmitted to Washington. It is my information that these plans call for small dams and levee and channel improvements on both of these Nemaha Rivers. The report is not expected to reach Congress before December 1951. Congress cannot act until a report is officially transmitted to it.

The Army engineers have completed their studies and a plan has been submitted to Congress for local protection work at Hubbell, Nebr., on Rose Creek which flows into the Big Blue River. This is a small project consisting of a levee and channel improvements on Rose Creek.

Likewise, the Army engineers have submitted a plan for local protection work at Beatrice, Nebr., where Indian Creek joins the Big Blue River. The plan calls for levee and channel improvements on the Big Blue River and on Indian Creek and the removal of a low dam on the Big Blue River, which seriously reduces the channel capacity at that point.

The report on the Beatrice and Hubbell projects was not transmitted to Congress until June 21, 1950. This was after the last flood-control authorization bill. This bill was of May 17, 1950. After the Army engineers make a report the Congress must pass an authorization act before any money can be appropriated to carry out the engineers' recommendations. These authorization acts embody projects in all parts of the country. There is usually only one such authorization act every 2 or 3 years. It was unfortunate that the engineers' recommendations for local protection at Beatrice and Hubbell were so long delayed in reaching Congress. This was due to other parts of the Kansas River report dealing with Kansas projects which were exceedingly controversial.

The Department of Agriculture has a flood-control program which is important. It involves soil practices, land treatment, and water-retarding structures too large or too difficult to be handled by the individual farmer or his soil-conservation district, yet not of the size and cost of those built by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Congressman STEFAN and I have introduced and secured the passage of a resolution by the Public Works Committee which directs the Department of Agriculture to bring in a flood-control program for the Salt Creek-Wahoo Creek Basin. This work by the Department of Agriculture is under way and it is expected that a report will be forthcoming before many months.

Likewise, I have introduced a resolution for agricultural flood survey for the Big Blue. This was referred to the Public Works Committee. I am informed that within the last few days a favorable recommendation on my resolution has been obtained from the Department of Agriculture. It is expected that the

Public Works Committee will take up this resolution very shortly and I urge its passage.

Likewise, Representative BUFFETT and I have introduced a resolution calling for an agricultural flood survey for the Little Nemaha. This was referred to the same committee and likewise the Department of Agriculture has approved the resolution. We will press for early and favorable action by the Public Works Committee so that the technicians in the Department of Agriculture can bring in definite recommendations to lessen the flood damage in the Little Nemaha Basin.

Mr. Chairman, in many ways these flood problems become more acute each year. There are other rivers and creeks that have a considerable flood-control problem that I have not taken time to enumerate. I believe that the entire Missouri River Basin faces a flood problem.

This work is necessary. The loss of topsoil runs into millions of dollars. Almost every year several lives are lost and property is damaged. In my opinion, flood control is a necessary Federal function. I believe that a lot of hand-outs, both foreign and domestic, can be eliminated that will save many billions. I believe that we have other Government services that we can get along without. I do not know how we can ignore the ravages of floods and be fair to ourselves or those who follow us. We must conserve the good earth and hand it on a little more productive than we found it.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 104. The Governor of the Canal Zone and the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, are authorized to employ services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), in amounts not exceeding \$15,000 for the Canal Zone government and not exceeding \$150,000 for the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army: *Provided*, That the rates for individuals shall not exceed \$100 per diem.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 15, after line 7, add a new section as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply:

"(a) To not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies.

"(b) To positions filled from within the agency.

"(c) To offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(d) To seasonal and casual workers.

"(e) To employees in grades CPC 1 and 2.

"(f) To employees paid from trust funds.

"(g) To employees of the Canal Zone government.

*Provided further*, That when any department or agency covered in this act has reduced their employment rolls to 80 per cent of the total number on their rolls as of July 1, 1951, this limitation may cease to apply."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a similar but not an identical amendment as those I have offered to four previous

appropriation bills and which were adopted by the House.

I shall explain the exemptions in this amendment.

With reference to seasonal and casual workers, the amendment will permit the Army engineers to hire extra help in cases of flood and other emergencies; also for extra seasonal and casual help for the cemeteries provided for in this bill. Trust funds which are for the Old Soldiers Home are exempt under this amendment. Employees of the Canal Zone government are also exempted.

The budget requested \$136,658,788 for personnel salaries. They requested salaries for 200 officers and for 37,163 civilian employees. The civil functions part of the Army engineers' duties does not have anything directly to do with our war effort except as a part of their duty is to keep floodwater off of land that produces food, feed, and fiber. Construction items have been materially reduced by the committee, hence it is proper to reduce administrative costs also, regardless of other reasons for doing so.

If my amendment is finally made law it will save the taxpayer at least \$15,000,000 in the fiscal year 1952. The Bureau of the Budget requested funds to cover salaries for 37,163 civilian employees and for 200 uniformed officers. Uniformed officers are not affected by my amendment. It only covers civilian employees. In fact not a single employee now on the payroll is affected by this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment, as applied to the civil works functions of the Corps of Engineers, would have a drastic effect upon the authorized work of the corps, seriously curtailing essential services, and increasing the final costs of construction work as a result of construction delays.

If this amendment passes I am going to ask for a roll call, because I think it very necessary that the implications of this amendment be understood by the Members of this House. Take one little example. This is going to affect the harbor of New York. If that is not related to the defense effort, there is nothing relating to the defense effort in this country that I know of. Now let us get our feet on the ground. This is important. This does not fall within the ordinary fabric of things, and I hope you will listen to what I have to say.

This effect is particularly drastic on the Corps of Engineers because of its high rate of turn-over of personnel. Because of this high turn-over rate the full 20 percent cut would be effected during the first 4 or 5 months of the fiscal year inasmuch as the expected turn-over rate will exceed 50 percent during the year. During the 12-month period March 1950 to February 1951, the turn-over rate in the Corps of Engineers average over 4½ percent per month, or over 50 percent for the year. Some factors which have contributed to the turn-over rate are the establishment of new and expansion of present Government agencies in connection with the defense program, expansion in private industry, and unfavor-

able Federal pay schedules as compared with private industry. These factors are equally applicable to agencies other than the Corps of Engineers. It may be expected that the rate will increase during the coming year under existing circumstances.

To illustrate specifically the effects of such a cut, operations and maintenance work and new construction work may be taken as examples. The operations and maintenance work would include operation and maintenance of dredges and other floating plant, navigation locks, and multiple-purpose dams. Through constant efforts to decrease costs, the crews of these operations already have been reduced to the absolute minimum.

If the number of personnel on such operations were cut an additional 20 percent, dredges would be insufficiently manned to comply with navigation laws and thus would be unable to operate at all or would be operated at less than full capacity. As an example, the seagoing hopper dredge *Essayons*, under the jurisdiction of district engineer, New York district, is operating 24 hours per day 7 days per week. Extensive studies have indicated that this type of operation is practicable and the most efficient considering the investment in the plant and the magnitude of the project. The normal crew for such operation should be 123. Due to normal turn-over of personnel, it is possible to maintain a crew of only 110 to 115 full-time employees, with the difference being made up by overtime work by some individuals and reassignment of crew members to the more important operations. A further cut of 20 percent would reduce the personnel aboard the *Essayons* to approximately 90—you need 123 and you are going to cut it down to 90—which would be insufficient to keep the dredge operating on its present schedule in New York Harbor and still comply with navigation laws and operating regulations. A reduction in number of days operation per week and number of shifts per day would be mandatory, with resulting increase in the per unit cost of material removed by the dredge and a reduction in the amount of vital dredging performed in New York Harbor.

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

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the number of hours of operation of locks would have to be curtailed in order to spread available crews, resulting in the tie-up of navigation during some hours of the night, which would interfere seriously with the flow of interstate commerce, and all operations at multiple-purpose dams, including power production and distribution, flood control, and navigation, would be seriously affected.

To cite only one instance, power output at powerhouses would have to be curtailed, as the highly complicated power production and distribution equipment must be attended by trained oper-

ators. Such a curtailment would have a serious effect upon the defense effort, as the operation of these powerhouses is of vital importance to the defense production program.

The problem on construction work might not be cessation or curtailment of activity, as in dredge, lock and dam, and powerhouse activities, but delay in completion through inability to utilize sufficient construction and inspection personnel. This would result in higher construction costs.

If we are talking about economy, let us realize the situation as it exists.

The foregoing examples are limited to some of the direct effects of the amendment on actual operations. The total effect would be even greater, as the 20 percent reduction would also apply throughout the engineering and service activities of the Corps.

As indicated by the above discussion, the provisions that only 25 percent of all vacancies can be filled, and that the amendment is inapplicable after July 1, 1951 force is reduced to 80 percent, are of no value in easing the efforts of the amendment. Further, the exception for positions filled by transfer within an agency would be of extremely limited value, as the net result in each case will be reduction of one position at some equally critical point in the agency.

An additional factor which must be considered is the problem of operating and policing the proposed amendment, which would require considerable manpower to insure that all payments to personnel were legal. Since the amendment precludes the employment of additional personnel, the personnel necessary to administer the amendment could only be obtained by a further reduction in operating personnel, resulting in a still further curtailment of important functions.

Mr. Chairman, this is a dangerous amendment to a proposition dealing so intimately with the defense problems of the Nation and dealing with navigation and power and with things worth while for the conservation of America. I ask for the defeat of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been reduced in the Corps of Engineers, rivers and harbors item, from \$220,000,000 to \$162,000,000. The flood control item has been reduced from \$328,000,000 to \$268,000,000. The Mississippi River item has been reduced from \$61,000,000 to \$59,000,000. Yet, there is nothing in the report or in the bill to indicate exactly what personnel are reduced.

If you want to get a picture of what the situation is, look at the green sheets which have been furnished by the Bureau of the Budget. Here we have engineers, ranging 10 to 11 thousand dollars: for 1950, 5; for 1951, 6; for 1952, 7. Down a little further you find—Engineers for an average pay of \$8,500: in 1950, 16; for 1951, 19; and for 1952, 21. Then you go down a little further and you get more engineers—39 for 1950, 40 for 1951, and 41 for 1952, with an average pay of \$8,000.

In other words, with a lessened activity, the payroll has been built up in the higher grades. Is it not time for us to look at this situation and let them manage their business so that the lower activity which will result from the reduction that the committee has made in the flood control and river and harbor activities will reduce their personnel where they do not need them, and that we can save some money and get some results for the people of the United States out of the money that is spent? That is the object of this amendment, and it is a painless operation that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has provided.

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

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it not a fact that due to the work of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] with this same amendment on previous appropriation bills, the other body yesterday saw fit to institute something along the same order, or having the same thing in mind, that is, a reduction in the personnel of this Government to a great degree?

Mr. TABER. If we do not reduce the personnel of this Government and get it down to earth, we are going to be in terrible shape in this country, and we are never going to be able to control it. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is entitled to a lot of credit for offering it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do I get the argument right that while we are cutting the amount of money for their operation, we are giving them more employees, and that this amendment is designed to cut that out?

Mr. TABER. The employees in the upper grades are being increased at a time when the responsibility that was given them by the Bureau of the Budget was being reduced.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that the gentleman who preceded you said this would affect the defense of our country?

Mr. TABER. It will not.

Mr. JENSEN. And the gentleman did not say a word about all the cuts he made in flood control, where waters are covering the finest land in America and affecting the defense of this Nation?

Mr. TABER. They ought to be using the money to take care of the rivers and harbors and flood control, and not try to keep people on the payroll where they do not need them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 80, noes 92.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. JENSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 89, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARDY, 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. 4386) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back with the following amendment: Add a new section on page 15, line 7, as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to seasonal and casual workers;

"(e) to employees in grades GPC 1 and 2;

"(f) to employees paid from trust funds;

"(g) to employees of the Canal Zone Government.

*Provided further*, That when any department or agency covered in this act has reduced their employment rolls to 80 percent of the total number on their rolls as of July 1, 1951, this limitation may cease to apply."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 92, noes 109.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 170, nays 165, not voting 97, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

YEAS—170

Abernethy	Fulton	Ostertag
Adair	Gamble	Patterson
Allen, Calif.	Gathings	Phillips
Allen, Ill.	Gavin	Pickett
Andersen,	Gossett	Potter
H. Carl	Graham	Poulsen
Anderson, Calif.	Greenwood	Prouty
Andresen,	Gross	Quinn
August H.	Gwinn	Radwan
Angell	Hagen	Rankin
Arends	Hale	Reece, Tenn.
Armstrong	Hall,	Reed, N. Y.
Auchincloss	Leonard W	Rees, Kans.
Ayres	Halleck	Riehlman
Bakewell	Hand	Rogers, Mass.
Bates, Mass.	Harden	Sadlak
Beamer	Harrison, Va.	St. George
Bender	Harrison, Wyo.	Saylor
Bennett, Mich.	Harvey	Schwabe
Berry	Heselton	Scott,
Betts	Hill	Hugh D., Jr.
Bishop	Hillings	Scrivner
Blackney	Hinshaw	Scudder
Boggs, Del.	Hoeven	Seely-Brown
Bolton	Hoffman, Mich.	Shafer
Bow	Holmes	Sheehan
Bramblett	Hope	Simpson, Ill.
Bray	Horan	Sittler
Brown, Ohio	Hull	Smith, Va.
Brownson	Hunter	Springer
Budge	Jackson, Calif.	Stanley
Buffett	James	Stefan
Busbey	Jenison	Taber
Bush	Jenkins	Talle
Butler	Jensen	Taylor
Byrnes, Wis.	Jonas	Thompson,
Canfield	Kean	Mich.
Case	Kearney	Tollefson
Chenoweth	Keating	Vail
Church	Kilburn	Van Pelt
Clevenger	Latham	Van Zandt
Corbett	Lovre	Vaughn
Crawford	McConnell	Velde
Crumpacker	McCulloch	Vorys
Cunningham	McGregor	Vursell
Curtis, Mo.	Mack, Wash	Welchel
Curtis, Nebr.	Martin, Iowa	Werdell
Dague	Mason	Wheeler
Davis, Ga.	Miller, Md.	Whidall
Denny	Miller, Nebr.	Williams, Miss.
Devereux	Miller, N. Y.	Williams, N. Y.
D'Ewart	Morton	Wilson, Ind.
Dolliver	Mumma	Withrow
Dondero	Murray, Tenn.	Wolcott
Donovan	Nelson	Wolverton
Ellsworth	Nicholson	Wood, Idaho
Engle	Norblad	Wood, Ga.
Fellows	O'Hara	
Fenton	O'Konski	

NAYS—165

Abbutt	Burleson	Eberharter
Addonizio	Burnside	Elliott
Albert	Burton	Evins
Allen, La.	Cannon	Fallon
Andrews	Carlyle	Feighan
Anfuso	Celler	Fernandez
Aspinall	Chatham	Fine
Barden	Chudoff	Fisher
Baring	Combs	Fogarty
Barrett	Cooley	Forand
Bates, Ky.	Cooper	Ford
Beckworth	Cox	Forrester
Bennett, Fla.	Crosser	Frazier
Bentsen	Davis, Wis.	Fugate
Blatnik	Dawson	Furcolo
Boggs, La.	Deane	Garmatz
Bolling	Delaney	Gore
Bonner	Dempsey	Granahan
Boykin	Denton	Granger
Brown, Ga.	Dollinger	Grant
Eryson	Donohue	Green
Buckley	Dorn	Gregory

Hardy	McCormack	Riley
Harris	McGrath	Roberts
Hart	McGuire	Robeson
Havener	McKinnon	Rodino
Hays, Ark.	McMillan	Rogers, Colo.
Hedrick	McMullen	Rogers, Fla.
Heller	Mack, Ill.	Rogers, Tex.
Herlong	Madden	Sasser
Hollifield	Magee	Shelley
Howell	Mahon	Sieminski
Jackson, Wash.	Marshall	Smith, Miss.
Jarman	Mills	Spence
Javits	Mitchell	Staggers
Jones, Ala.	Morgan	Steed
Jones, Mo.	Morris	Stigler
Jones,	Multer	Stockman
Hamilton C.	Murdock	Tackett
Jones,	Murphy	Thomas
Woodrow W.	Norrell	Thompson, Tex.
Karsten, Mo.	O'Brien, Ill.	Thornberry
Kelly, N. Y.	O'Brien, Mich.	Trimble
Kennedy	O'Neill	Walter
Keogh	O'Toole	Watts
Kerr	Passman	Welch
Kilday	Perkins	Whitaker
King	Philbin	Whitten
Kirwan	Poage	Wickersham
Klein	Polk	Wier
Lane	Price	Willis
Lanham	Priest	Wilson, Tex.
Larcade	Rabaut	Winstead
Lesinski	Reams	Yates
Lucas	Redden	Yorty
McCarthy	Rhodes	

## NOT VOTING—97

Aandahl	Gillette	Moulder
Bailey	Golden	Murray, Wis.
Baker	Goodwin	Patman
Battle	Gordon	Patten
Beall	Hall	Powell
Belcher	Edwin Arthur	Preston
Bosone	Hays, Ohio	Rains
Breen	Hébert	Ramsay
Brehm	Heffernan	Reed, Ill.
Brooks	Herter	Regan
Burdick	Hess	Ribicoff
Byrne, N. Y.	Hoffman, Ill.	Richards
Camp	Irving	Rivers
Carnahan	Johnson	Rooney
Chelf	Judd	Roosevelt
Chipperfield	Kearns	Sabath
Clemente	Kelley, Pa.	Scott, Hardie
Cole, Kans.	Kersten, Wis.	Secrest
Cole, N. Y.	Kluczynski	Sheppard
Colmer	Lantaff	Short
Cotton	LeCompte	Sikes
Coudert	Lind	Simpson, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	Lyle	Smith, Kans.
DeGraffenried	McDonough	Smith, Wis.
Dingell	McVey	Sutton
Doughton	Machrowicz	Teague
Doyle	Mansfield	Towe
Durham	Martin, Mass.	Vinson
Eaton	Meador	Wharton
Elston	Morrow	Wigglesworth
Flood	Miller, Calif.	Woodruff
Gary	Morano	Zablocki
George	Morrison	

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Camp against.  
 Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Preston against.  
 Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Teague against.  
 Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Lantaff against.  
 Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. deGraffenried against.  
 Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Dingell against.  
 Mr. Elston for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.  
 Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Patten of Arizona against.  
 Mr. Ribicoff for, with Mr. Clemente against.  
 Mr. LeCompte for, with Mr. Carnahan against.  
 Mr. Reed of Illinois for, with Mr. Byrne of New York against.  
 Mr. Brehm for, with Mr. Flood against.  
 Mr. Short for, with Mr. Moulder against.  
 Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Mansfield against.  
 Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. Hays of Ohio against.  
 Mr. Baker for, with Mr. Gordon against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Zablocki against.

Mr. Merrow for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.

Mr. Meader for, with Mr. Chelf against.

Mr. Golden for, with Mrs. Bosone against.

Mr. Goodwin for, with Mr. Brooks against.

Mr. Smith of Kansas for, with Mr. Heffernan, against.

Mr. McVey for, with Mr. Rooney against.

Mr. Chipperfield for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. Johnson for, with Mr. Machrowicz against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. McDonough.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Wigglesworth.

Mr. Regan with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Hardie Scott.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Battle with Mr. Cole of Kansas.

Mr. Doyle with Mr. Cotton.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may we have the well cleared so we can see who changes his vote?

The SPEAKER. If we are going to start that procedure now we will follow it on every vote hereafter. There are just as many on one side as the other.

The Members will retire from the well to their seats.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?

The CLERK. The gentleman is recorded as voting "yea."

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I change my vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I change my vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?

The CLERK. The gentleman from Texas is recorded as voting "nay."

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?

The CLERK. The gentleman from Maryland is recorded as voting "nay."

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?

The CLERK. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recorded as voting "nay."

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I qualify and vote "nay."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I vote "nay."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it necessary on this vote that Members qualify?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. HALLECK. I did not hear the gentleman say that he could qualify under the rule.

The SPEAKER. Which gentleman?

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No, Mr. Speaker; I was not here in the beginning.

The SPEAKER. Members to qualify must have been in the hall listening when the roll was called and not heard their names called.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?

The CLERK. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recorded as voting "nay."

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?

The CLERK. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recorded as voting "nay," Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I change my vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, am I recorded?

The CLERK. The gentleman from Maryland is not recorded.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I cannot qualify.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?

The CLERK. The gentleman from Wisconsin is not recorded.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I qualify and vote "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report back the bill, H. R. 4386, with an amendment which is on the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 15, insert a new section as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to seasonal and casual workers;

"(e) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;

"(f) to employees paid from trust funds;

"(g) to employees of the Canal Zone government.

*Provided further*, That when any department or agency covered in this act has reduced their employment rolls to 80 percent of the total number on their rolls as of July 1, 1951, this limitation may cease to apply."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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.

CLERK AUTHORIZED TO CORRECT SECTION NUMBERS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk have authority to correct section numbers in the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members



may have an opportunity in the proper place in the RECORD to extend their remarks in reference to the change of the name from the Buggs Island Dam to the John H. Kerr Dam.

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

There was no objection.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 304, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report the gentleman from California, Mr. MCKINNON, to fill an existing vacancy thereon.

#### RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 13, 1951.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
United States Capitol.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives to be effective immediately in order to accept an appointment to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

WILLIAM A. BARRETT.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

#### ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 254) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That WILLIAM A. BARRETT, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Banking and Currency.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 255) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That CLARE MAGEE, of Missouri, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Public Works.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROTECTING CONSUMERS AND OTHERS AGAINST MISBRANDING AND FALSE ADVERTISING

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 256, Rept. No. 573), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2321) to protect consumers and others

against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### AMENDING AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 257, Rept. No. 574), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3263) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. KERSTEN, be granted leave of absence for today on account of official business.

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

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include a description of the National Paraplegia Foundation.)

#### THE NATIONAL PARAPLEGIA FOUNDATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Public Health Service tells us that there are 85,000 paraplegics in the civilian population of the United States. Paraplegics are paralyzed from the level of a spinal injury on down. These are the forgotten men and women, boys and girls among the Nation's paralyzed.

The Paralyzed Veterans of America have set out to help them and established the National Paraplegia Foundation to do this job. The National Paraplegia Foundation is a non-profit corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of Illinois.

Briefly the purposes for which the National Paraplegia Foundation was organized as stated in their corporate charter are to form a national foundation for the benefit of all persons who have suffered injury to the spinal cord. They want to set up adequate rehabilitation programs for these people, the majority of whom are not now receiving care and training. The program has been endorsed by Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association.

The foundation has a board of directors composed of prominent business leaders and paralyzed veterans to manage its affairs. Its president is Jerry Giesler, an attorney from Los Angeles, Calif. The duties of the Board are to manage the affairs of the corporation and to raise funds to carry on the program to help paraplegics resume their normal place in their communities and to become self-supporting.

The National Paraplegia Foundation has a medical advisory committee to direct its activities from a medical standpoint and to set the standards for its research programs. The chairman of the medical advisory committee is Dr. Leslie W. Freeman, director of surgical research, Indiana University Medical Center in Indianapolis. Also on the board are Dr. E. Glen Spurling, professor of neurological survey at the University of Louisville School of Medicine and formerly Chief Consultant in Neurosurgery to the Veterans' Administration. Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, vice president of the University of Illinois and nine other equally prominent medical men make up the board that advises the foundation's board of directors on establishing its program and carrying out its researches.

At the present time the National Paraplegia Foundation is operating a medical-fellowship program utilizing available medical school laboratories across the Nation. Doctors are given an opportunity through this program to carry research projects in connection with spinal cord injury and the basic physiology of the spinal cord. Spinal cord injuries are received through many types of accidents ranging from accidents at birth through sports activities and falling down steps at school and on into automobile and industrial accidents as well as accidents around the home.

The support of all Americans is needed for this worthy cause. Money is needed to help the National Paraplegia Foundation help these people who would otherwise not receive aid. An understanding attitude by the general public will help paraplegics to resume their occupations and trades and to become self-supporting independent and happy individuals.

The following is a brief description of the National Paraplegia Foundation:

#### WHY THE NATIONAL PARAPLEGIA FOUNDATION WAS FORMED—HOW IT IS ORGANIZED

The Paralyzed Veterans' Associations of America (now Paralyzed Veterans of America) was formed in 1947. One of its goals was adequate care for civilian paraplegics (about 85,000 in the United States<sup>1</sup>) and

<sup>1</sup> Public Health Service figures.

the advancement of research into conditions of the spinal cord resulting from injury and culminating in paralysis from the level of the injury down, including loss or impairment of bodily functions.

During 1948 we decided that the program we had planned to assist civilian paraplegics, who outnumber the veterans 34 to 1, and our research activities could best be handled by a separate organization. Accordingly the National Paraplegia Foundation was incorporated as a nonprofit benevolent corporation under the laws of the State of Illinois.

Briefly, the purposes for which the foundation was organized, as stated in our corporate charter, are to form a national foundation for the benefit of all persons who have suffered injury or diseases of the spinal cord. We will also advocate, foster, and maintain complete and effective programs of medical care and rehabilitation for all paraplegics. The majority of them are not now receiving such care and training.

We need your help. We need your moral support, and your contributions will make this ambitious program a success. Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association, has heartily endorsed this program.

Each chapter of the Paralyzed Veterans of America (formerly Paralyzed Veterans' Associations of America) has 1 member and 1 vote on the board of directors for a total of 6 votes; 5 prominent men were chosen to bring the board up to a strength of 11 members. Mr. Jerry Giesler, a Los Angeles attorney, was made president. Mr. H. Barry McCormick, president of the Chicago firm of McCormick & Henderson, was made vice president. Mr. Henry Slavik, vice president of Albert Schwill & Co., of Chicago, was made treasurer. Mr. Alfred L. Gore, of the Chicago Book Bindery Co., and a paralyzed veteran, was made secretary of the foundation, but has no vote on the board of directors. Mr. Fred Levinthal, president of Allure Fabrics Corp., of New York, and Mr. R. W. McKee, secretary-treasurer of the Maywood Glass Co., a division of Anchor-Hocking Glass Co. in Los Angeles, were also named as members of the board of directors.

William H. Schwarzschild, chairman of the board of the Central National Bank of Richmond, and Dr. W. T. Sanger, president of the Medical College of Virginia, were recently elected vice presidents, and Mr. Schwarzschild was named assistant treasurer of the foundation. At the present time they are acting with the executive director as the executive committee.

The duties of the board of directors are to manage the business of the corporation, and to raise funds to carry on the research activities of the foundation. Such activities as the medical board may recommend will be carried out by the board of directors.

We have a medical advisory committee to tell us how we can best spend the funds that are available. We believe that from the standpoint of active medical personnel, we probably have one of the most outstanding medical groups in the United States.

Dr. L. W. Freeman, director of surgical research, Indiana University School of Medicine, 1040-1232 West Michigan Street, Indianapolis 7, Ind., is chairman. You will find the entire medical board listed at the bottom of the first page. Probably some of the names are already familiar to you. Each of these doctors will be glad to answer any questions you may care to ask concerning our program.

In the back of this pamphlet is a copy of our medical program as it was formulated by our medical advisory committee.

Our objectives are:

1. To train and rehabilitate all paraplegics to the point that they will become self-supporting citizens.

2. A cure for paraplegia.

The second objective is idealistic, but we believe it is attainable. It is an expensive

program. Ten medical fellowships (which should be our minimum) will cost about \$45,000 per year. As the store of knowledge concerning the spinal cord is added to by these doctors, the care and treatment of the persons suffering from spinal injury will be improved gradually until the ultimate objective is reached. All applicants for fellowships are screened, and their qualifications evaluated by the Medical Advisory Committee. Only the best are chosen.

We hope to be able to give grants-in-aid to laboratories and medical schools from time to time to carry on research in the various phases of the physiology and pathology of the spinal cord.

It is, indeed an ambitious program for 1,600 paraplegic veterans. We need all the help we can get. We are doing our best and we solicit your assistance. If a group becomes interested in our program and wants to learn more we will try to make arrangements for Dr. L. W. Freeman or some other member of our Medical Advisory Committee to meet with that group.

Your dollars are needed to make this program effective. Checks should be made payable to the National Paraplegia Foundation and may be sent directly to the national office, or through one of the officers of the foundation in your locality.

Don't forget that spinal injury can come from sports activities, such as diving and football; it can come from automobile accidents, and industrial accidents; persons have become paraplegics by falling down steps in their own homes. It is the goal of the foundation, toward which your contribution will be used, to improve the medical situation of paraplegics to the extent that they can all live self-supporting, useful lives.

We hope that we shall hear from you in the near future.

BERNARD E. SHUFELT,  
Executive Director.

#### THE NATIONAL PARAPLEGIA FOUNDATION MEDICAL PROGRAM

##### I

Scope of the activities of the foundation:

A. To seek means of expanding the present facilities for the care and rehabilitation of paraplegic patients.

B. To increase the knowledge of the physiology and pathology of the spinal cord, of pathological conditions arising out of disease or injury of the spinal cord, and of the techniques of rehabilitation.

##### II

The program for rehabilitation:

A. It is proposed that the Federal Government make its present facilities for rehabilitation of paraplegic veteran patients available to all citizens, and that these facilities be expanded to meet the additional load. It is proposed that the expense be borne by State, local, and private funds in the same manner that tubercular and mental patients are cared for.

1. An act of Congress is required for this to be realized.

(a) A survey of the number of patients now suffering from paraplegia (and the rate at which new cases are occurring) must be carried out.

(b) An educational program to impress lay and medical groups with the need for such legislation must be carried on.

B. The number of trained personnel for paraplegia centers must be increased.

1. An educational program to stimulate interest by the medical profession in the treatment of paraplegia is required.

##### III

The program for medical research:

A. The interest of the proper men in the specific problems of paraplegia must be stimulated.

1. This increased interest can best be created by close association of medical schools

and paraplegic patients. It is suggested that all paraplegic patients in the acute phases be treated in hospitals connected with medical schools, thus permitting students, house staff members, and younger attending men to meet the problems at first-hand.

2. Another means is to facilitate dissemination of information regarding present activities in treatment and research.

##### IV

The program for fellowships:

A. Fellowships are one of the best means available for creating interest in the problems of paraplegia and for the provision of personnel training.

1. It is suggested the National Paraplegia Foundation establish 10 fellowships ranging from \$3,000-\$6,000 a year for 3 years' duration each, for work in the fundamental disciplines of science and medicine.

2. The medical advisory committee will make these appointments.

##### V

The organization and duties of the medical advisory committee:

A. Chairman, Dr. Leslie W. Freeman.

B. General plan of duties:

1. To participate in the educational program by speaking on behalf of the medical program of the foundation.

2. To assist in the preparation of material for the local medical societies and the lay public in regard to the medical program.

3. To assist in the preparation of material of interest and instruction for the general practitioner of medicine.

4. To assist in the collection of data regarding paraplegia from the standpoints of therapeutics and research.

5. To assist in obtaining grants-in-aid for specific research projects.

6. To administer the fellowship program of the foundation.

C. Composition of committee: 1. To include representatives of the major specialties concerned with the care and rehabilitation of paraplegic patients.

D. Miscellaneous: 1. Meetings will be held as often as necessary, judged principally by the progress made, and by specific needs as they arise.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MORRIS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PRICE ROLL-BACK ON CATTLE IS PROVING UNFAIR, UNWISE, AND, UNWORKABLE TO CONSUMERS, PRODUCERS, AND PROCESSORS ALIKE

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the OPS order rolling back cattle prices, which took effect on May 20, is not helping consumers and is doing serious damage to producers and small packing houses. As I pointed out in a radio forum discussion with Mr. Erickson, Chief of the Beef Division of OPS, 2 or 3 weeks ago, the order will lead to a less and a more irregular and undependable meat supply for consumers. It will result in reduced feeding operations where a third of the weight of live cattle for market is added. It is resulting in severe hardships to producers, small operators, and to thousands of feeders who were caught with inventories when the roll-back order was issued.

Already these facts are unfolding: When the order was announced many producers and feeders rushed their cattle to market, many before they were finished, to avoid the drastic roll-back. Markets were flooded for a while. Since then, receipts in the markets have slumped considerably and there is a vir-

tual meat famine in many cities today, and the housewives are still paying about the same price, or even more in some instances, for their meat.

#### SMALL PACKERS BEING FORCED OUT OF BUSINESS

Many small packing plants have already been forced out of business. The largest meat-packing plant in Lubbock, Tex., closed the other day for the duration of the Government's present controls on meat marketing. I have just received a communication from the Mills County Commission Co., of Goldthwaite, Tex., one of the thousands of sales outlets for this Nation's beef, advising that it will probably be forced to close shop in view of the adverse effects of the roll-back order.

I have received numerous letters from small operators who say they cannot continue to operate under the order. Let me quote briefly from one, to illustrate the point. This is one of thousands over the Nation similarly affected. This comes from Mr. E. G. Eggemeyer, of Miles, Tex.:

I would like for you to let me know what I should do with some steers that I have fed for the market. I have fed out from 10 to 15 head each year for the past 14 years. These cattle are ready to go to town in about a week. Some local buyers have looked at them and told me they could not pay more than Commercial price for them. It has been dry here and feed was very high. \* \* \* There are several small feeders around here like myself.

I am not opposed to price controls on cattle, but if I sell them for Commercial at \$27.30 I could not make any money. \* \* \* Let me know at once what you think about this situation as I am intending to get out of this work if it will not pay me.

Let me explain what Mr. Eggemeyer means by "Commercial." Under the OPS order the roll-back applies to grades of meat, designated as Prime, Choice, Good, Commercial, Utility, and Canner and Cutter. Each has a different ceiling, and there is a differential in the amount of the roll-back as applied to each.

There is a differential of \$4 per hundred pounds between meat graded Commercial and that graded Good; between Utility and Commercial, \$5.50 per hundred pounds. When a Government grader goes into a slaughterhouse or a packing plant and inspects a carcass he makes a decision whether the meat he inspects is Utility or Commercial or Good, and so forth, and what he says will have a lot to do with the price the packer-buyer can afford to bid for the animal before he buys and slaughters it. A mistake in judgment might easily cost him as much as \$5.50 per hundred pounds on the animal. If the steer weighs 1,000 pounds, that would mean if he misjudged, or if his judgment should not be the same as that of the grader, he would stand to lose a lot of money. So the buyer is naturally going to render every doubt in favor of himself and against the producer who brings the cattle to market and who is at the mercy of the purchaser's offer.

That illustrates why the buyers are afraid to pay Mr. Eggemeyer more than \$27.30 per hundred pounds for his steers he has been feeding for months. They want to be safe and they will naturally

render every doubt against Mr. Eggemeyer in order to protect themselves against possible heavy losses. The result is that the producer is caught in the squeeze. In practice this will actually often mean an additional roll-back in prices to the producer below what he might be entitled to receive under the OPS orders. He becomes a helpless victim of a condition over which he has no control.

#### MANY NEW MEAT INSPECTORS WILL BE INEXPERIENCED AND SUBJECT TO CORRUPT TEMPTATIONS

This situation is further complicated by the fact that the Government is planning an additional five or six hundred meat inspectors to help carry out the order. Many of them will, of course, be inexperienced, and their whims and prejudices may enter the picture when decision on grades are made, particularly where decisions are close. Moreover, imagine the room and the temptation for corruption in that field on the part of this new army of meat inspectors who will go on the Government's payroll to inspect meat. This simply points up one of the many problems involved in this program no matter what care is used in the selection of these men.

#### TOTAL ROLL-BACK MAY BE AS MUCH AS 34 PERCENT AS APPLIED TO RANGE CATTLE GROWN IN TEXAS

Another valid criticism of this drastic roll-back order was made by Mr. Ray Willoughby and Hon. Joe Montague, president and general counsel, respectively, of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association, when they recently appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture. They pointed out that the effect of the roll-back order will be to actually reduce the price of cattle graded Commercial by 18 percent instead of the 10 percent average on the initial roll-back. And if the same proportion is carried out in the next two roll-backs, the total will amount to 34 percent. Others before the committee put the total at 27 percent. Since Texas and the Southwest produce cattle on the range, most of them will be graded Commercial. Therefore, the order is most severe and indefensible as applied to that segment of the industry.

#### WHY ROLL BACK PRICES ON ONE INDUSTRY AND NOT ON OTHERS?

Mr. Speaker, another just criticism of this order is the obvious discrimination that is involved. Why pick out one single segment of our economy and roll the prices back? There is no similar order applying to any other commodity. There is no roll-back on labor costs to the producer. There is no roll-back on skyrocketing feed costs, nor on transportation costs, nor on taxes, nor on commission, nor on the cost of living to the producer. And there is no roll-back on the terrific drought conditions that have plagued the Southwest during the past year, adding immeasurably to the cost of production.

It will be recalled that last December there was an order rolling back the prices of new automobiles. But it was soon lifted as a result, in part at least, of pressure from the CIO's United Automobile Workers because it would have

caused workers to be laid off and would have interfered with wage increases that were in the making. Since then there have been increases allowed for new automobiles and there have been many instances of wage increases over the country.

Indeed, at about the time of the cattle roll-back, a 10-percent increase in wages for slaughterhouse workers was granted by the Government. Mr. DiSalle has said the initial roll-back on cattle was primarily for the benefit of the packing houses. Yet not a single packing house or slaughterer came before the House committee to testify on the subject. Can it be that the real purpose was to enable the packers to pay higher and higher wages, at Government sanction, to the workers who are members of powerful labor unions? Certainly the consumers are not benefiting from the initial roll-back.

#### PRODUCERS KNOW ABOUT DANGERS OF INFLATION AND ARE READY TO HELP FIGHT IT

I know that every producer and processor is concerned about the dangers of inflation. They know the disastrous effects of inflation and the resulting damages to their savings, the value of their dollar, their cost of living, the Nation's security, and to the millions of people with fixed incomes. They know that to fight the cause of inflationary forces we must have credit controls, less deficit financing by the Government which increases the money supply, and above all more and more production. High prices result from people bidding against each other for a limited supply of goods. By passing a law, we do not even touch the real causes of inflation. It may provide what appears to be a sort of narcotic treatment, but it does not get at the cause.

Beef prices are admittedly high. The producers can help by producing more and more cattle and the feeders can help by stepping up their operations. Therefore, a Government order that has a tendency to discourage production, to reduce incentive, may very well add to rather than reduce inflationary causes that lead to high beef prices.

Let us take a brief look at what has happened in the past. Back in the thirties there were fewer than 67,000,000 cattle in the United States. There was not much money and there was not much demand, so not many cattle were grown. Then preceding World War II the demand increased, and to satisfy a more healthy market, the producers raised more cattle, until now there are nearly 85,000,000 head. Last year, with prices good, there was a net gain in cattle numbers of 4,100,000, the highest increase in any one year in history. On last May 17 the Secretary of Agriculture estimated that if the trend continued it would "carry cattle numbers to as much as 95,000,000 or more head within 4 or 5 years."

Then came the general freeze order of January 25. At that time the average price of cattle stood at 23 cents per pound. The packers knew they couldn't pay more for cattle than they could afford to pay and sell beef at the freeze level to consumers. But they paid more anyhow, at their own risk. The price went up to an average of 30.2 cents in

April. Mr. DiSalle said his order was to bail out the packers because they could not absorb that increase which they, themselves, had brought about. The roll-back carries those ceilings back not only to the date of the freeze but includes two additional roll-backs of 4½ percent each to be effective on August 1 and October 1, making a total of 19 percent average.

#### WHY DID NOT DISALLE ACT LAST FALL?

If Mr. DiSalle was determined to freeze the price of cattle, then why did not he do it last fall when prices were comparable to prices that prevailed before the war in Korea? He had the authority then. If he was going into the field, why did not he freeze those prices at the January 25 level as he did other prices? Why wait until investments were made, ranches were leased, production plans were advanced and inventories were built up, if he planned to apply price controls to live cattle?

#### PRODUCERS WERE LED TO BELIEVE THERE WOULD BE NO ROLL-BACK

Moreover, the producers were given assurance they would not be thus singled out and victimized. At least they had a right to assume that to be the case from a broadcast made by Mr. Eric Johnston, head of the Economic Stabilization Agency, in a speech made to the Nation on March 9, 1951. Then in referring to the subjects of roll-backs, he said the consumers might cheer such roll-backs "if you could really get the steak or the suit you want. But the chances are you couldn't. They'd disappear from the butchers' counters, and from the racks in your clothing stores. You might find plenty of beef, yes. Plenty of beef in the black market—and all at fantastic bootleg prices."

Now, is not it only fair to say that even though Mr. Johnston in the same speech indicated there might be some roll-backs, he did not intend to allow any such roll-backs to be applied to cattle? He made a good argument against roll-backs on meat, and the producers and feeders had a right to take what he said at its face value and plan accordingly.

#### FACTORY WORKERS CAN BUY MORE BEEF FOR AN HOUR'S WORK THAN PREVIOUSLY

Mr. Speaker, it is claimed that cattle prices are too high and that they should be rolled back for that reason. I am sure they are too high, but so are many other things. The CIO, which represents many factory workers, yells the loudest for roll-backs on meat, contending that the workers cannot afford to pay the high prices. They overlook the fact that some meats are available at much lower prices than is beef. Pork is selling at below parity prices. Poultry is quite reasonable. Both of these can be greatly increased in quantity almost overnight, if it is desired. It takes more time to plan and step up beef production. But can the factory workers afford to buy beef at pre-roll-back prices? Let us take a look at that picture for a moment.

To begin with, there has been a great increase in meat consumption in this country. In 1940 the average American consumed 54.7 pounds of beef. Back in

1930 it was 48.6 pounds. Last year the average meat consumption hit 144.5 pounds, including 63 pounds of beef—the highest in history, when the demand for beef was at an all-time high. The Secretary of Agriculture has pointed out that in 1909 an average factory worker could buy .9 of a pound of round steak with 1 hour's work. Steak was cheap then, but so was labor. Today the average worker can buy 1.5 pounds of round steak for 1 hour of work—almost twice as much. Back in 1929 the average factory worker could buy three-tenths of a pound of steak less than he could last year for an hour of work. That simply means that the wages of factory workers have increased even more in proportion than has the price of beef.

#### EFFECT OF ROLL-BACK WILL BE TO RETARD PRODUCTION

Mr. Speaker, there are many other arguments that could be made against the discriminatory and unrealistic roll-back order as applied alone to cattle, but I shall not belabor the point. We know that with the high beef prices that prevailed last year we got the highest increase in cattle produced in history. We know that this was the result of increased incentive and a healthy and expanding market for cattle. And we know that production will increase more in the future if the production is not knocked out of balance by drastic Government controls. Such controls will mean fewer cattle fed in the feed lots, where one-third of the weight is added that consumers buy. The drastic roll-back will mean that more and more of the small producers, the small feeders in particular, and small packers, will be forced out of business. It will mean that more and more meat will be sold through channels that are not legal ones, as was the case in OPA days after the end of the war when 86 percent of cattle were sold outside of Government-inspected packing houses.

#### DISALLE'S PROPOSAL TO LICENSE BUSINESS IS UNTHINKABLE

Only recently Mr. DiSalle announced that he will ask for the right to license all businesses, large and small, in order that if one of them violates OPS orders their right to continue to do business may be canceled. If that should be permitted, do you think General Motors, or United States Steel, or Chrysler Corp. would be shut down because of an infraction of OPS orders? Of course not. Their production is too important to the preparedness program. The victims, I fear, would, in the main, be the small operators, the little one-horse packers and retail stores. Such a system as advocated by Mr. DiSalle is, in my opinion, unthinkable and contrary to the traditional American way of doing things. We have courthouses in this country to adjudicate individual rights, and we need less and less control over the lives and rights of our people in the hands of bureaucrats in Washington. Unless there is a change in policies and methods employed by the Office of Price Stabilization, it should be discontinued.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his re-

marks in Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'TOOLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter he addressed to Hon. James Mead.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. DEMPSEY (at the request of Mr. FERNANDEZ) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a short radio broadcast.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter in each instance.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a commentary from Radio Commentator Robert F. Hurley, of Chicago.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other a short statement.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address given by the president of Georgetown University at the commencement exercises.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an article by ex-Governor McKelvie on the question of meat price roll-backs.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article, The Problem of China, Background of Tomorrow.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Times-Herald.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "Food Needs and Price Controls" from the June 1951 issue of the Nation's Agriculture, the official publication of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McGUIRE (at the request of Mr. HAYS of Ohio) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in

three different instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three different instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement made on June 7 by President Truman.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution which was adopted by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on June 12, 1951, and also to include two acts relating to the procedure concerning the expenditure and rehabilitation and betterment costs of certain reclamation projects.

Mr. GRANAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Francis J. Myers.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include quotations.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by Dr. John Steelman.

Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. PICKETT (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of Texas) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a radio address.

Mr. STOCKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include two letters, and also to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOEVEN and Mr. BEAMER asked and were given permission to extend their remarks and include editorials.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware and Mr. WOOD of Idaho asked and were given permission to extend their remarks.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. SCHWABE and Mr. JENSEN asked and were given permission to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Messrs. DOYLE, HÉBERT, CLEMENTE, ELSTON, and HESS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

To Mr. MORANO (at the request of Mr. SADLAK), for today, on account of illness.

To Mrs. BOSONE (at the request of Mr. KLEIN), for Wednesday, June 13, on account of official business.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 178. An act for the relief of Zdenek Marek;

S. 249. An act for the relief of Ruzena Pelantova;

S. 361. An act for the relief of Herk Vlsnapuu and his wife, Naima;

S. 362. An act for the relief of Tu Do Chau (also known as Szetu Dju or Anna Szetu);

S. 364. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suzanne Wiernik and her daughter, Genevieve;

S. 435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 648. An act for the relief of Evald Ferdinand Kask.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 14, 1951, 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:

515. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 3, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on Oyster Creek, Tex., with a view to determining if it is advisable to modify the existing project by constructing a lock at one of the points where the projected local protection levee crosses the channel. This investigation was requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on June 2, 1949; to the Committee on Public Works.

516. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John, and St. Croix, and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

517. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of certain resolutions adopted by the Legislature of Hawaii during its recent session; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### 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. REDDEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1733. A bill to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes; with amend-

ment (Rept. No. 553). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BREEN: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 157. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; without amendment (Rept. No. 554). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 301. A bill to extend certain veterans' benefits to or on behalf of dependent husbands and widowers of female veterans; with amendment (Rept. No. 555). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 302. A bill to redefine the eligibility requirements for appointment of pharmacists in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; with amendment (Rept. No. 556). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committees on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 1072. A bill to amend the existing law to provide the privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium-term policies of United States Government life insurance; without amendment (Rept. No. 557). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOYKIN: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2995. A bill to amend the joint resolution of August 8, 1946, as amended, with respect to the appropriations authorized for the conduct of investigations and studies thereunder; with amendment (Rept. No. 558). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REDDEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3100. A bill to repeal the act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1243; 49 U. S. C., sec. 353); with amendment (Rept. No. 559). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3193. A bill to establish a rate of pension for aid and attendance under part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 560). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3205. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10-percent or more degree of disability within 3 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service-connected; without amendment (Rept. No. 561). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3549. A bill to modify eligibility requirements for payment of pension to certain widows of veterans of the Civil War, Indian wars, and Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection; without amendment (Rept. No. 562). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3830. A bill to authorize the construction and equipment of a geomagnetic station for the Department of Commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 563). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3861. A bill to extend to June 30, 1953, the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct home and

farmhouse loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes with amendment (Rept. No. 564). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3932. A bill to amend subparagraph (a), paragraph I, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to provide more equitable rates of disability and death compensation for disability or death incurred in service on or after June 27, 1950, and for other purposes, with amendment (Rept. No. 565). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4000. A bill to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewals of level premium term insurance for successive 5-year periods; without amendment (Rept. No. 566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4108. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 877, 80th Cong.), as amended, to include persons whose service-connected disability is rated not less than 40 percent; without amendment (Rept. No. 567). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4233. A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans or cash payments in lieu thereof, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 568). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4387. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents, and to preclude exclusions in determining annual income for purposes of such limitations; without amendment (Rept. No. 569). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4394. A bill to provide certain increases in the monthly rates of compensation and pension payable to veterans and their dependents, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 570). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1025. An act to expand the authority of the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation to include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 571). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. In compliance with the provisions of the act approved July 6, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); without amendment (Rept. No. 572). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 256. Providing for the consideration of H. R. 2321. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs; without amendment (Rept. No. 573). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 257. Providing for the consideration of H. R. 3283. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 574). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4431. A bill to extend and revise the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H. R. 4432. A bill to promote on the retired list enlisted men and officers who were decorated and recommended for promotion for gallant or distinguished service and subsequently wounded and who have not attained the rank to which recommended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 4433. A bill to amend section 304 (relating to the marking of imported articles) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 4434. A bill to double pensions of dependent widows of veterans of all wars in which the United States has been or is being engaged; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 4435. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4436. A bill to provide for the establishment of a separate immigration quota for nationals of Pakistan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 4437. A bill to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), cheese, and rice and rice products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4438. A bill to provide appropriate lapel buttons for parents of members of the Armed Forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 4439. A bill to authorize certain additional appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4440. A bill to provide for the payment of increased special pensions to persons holding the Congressional Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4441. A bill to provide additional compensation for members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force during periods of combat duty in Korea; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 4442. A bill to extend to certain individuals serving on active duty in the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 4443. A bill to prevent the entry of certain mollusks into the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4444. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., a parcel of land in the said city of Macon, containing 2 acres, more or less, to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 4445. A bill to provide for the erection at the Memorial Avenue entrance to the

Arlington National Cemetery of the sculptural piece known as The Last Farewell, and for the establishment of the Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 4446. A bill relating to the income restrictions placed upon the payment of certain pensions to the widows and children of veterans of World Wars I and II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4447. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 4448. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4449. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to persons who sell or otherwise transfer marijuana to minors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 4450. A bill to amend section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 4451. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 4452. A bill to amend section 2 of the Clayton Act so as to make it applicable to discriminatory sales to the United States and to any State or political subdivision thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. J. Res. 269. Joint resolution to provide for the reestablishment of a postal branch station at West Medford, Mass.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, a memorial was presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 34, relating to refusal of passage of H. R. 3348; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4453. A bill for the relief of Emanuele Ferrigno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4454. A bill for the relief of Maria Alexandra Banescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 4455. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Buchanan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4456. A bill for the relief of Vincent F. Leslie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 4457. A bill for the relief of NG Shuk-Ying, NG Shuk-Jen, NG Wai-Ming, and NG Wai-Kuen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 4458. A bill for the relief of Tibor Kálmán Jalsoviczky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 4459. A bill for the relief of Lodewyck Bruckman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4460. A bill for the relief of Valentin M. Sara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 4461. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Coluccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4462. A bill for the relief of David Helmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 4463. A bill to effect the entry of a minor child adopted by a citizen of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 4464. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Regina Hansen McEntee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD of Idaho:

H. R. 4465. A bill for the relief of Angela Moniz McCracken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 4466. A bill for the relief of Rahel Zakar Peters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

315. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution adopted by National Retail Lumber Dealers Association with reference to the continuation of certain Government restrictions and controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

316. Also, resolutions adopted by the New Jersey Bankers Association opposing the enactment of the proposed 20 percent withholding tax on dividends and on interest on savings accounts and United States Government savings bonds and urging the adoption of legislation requiring the payment of taxes by savings and loan associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

317. By Mr. HART: Petition of local 988, Union City, N. J., of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, urging a discontinuance of the present method of paying salaries of postal employees on a semimonthly basis. Payment on a weekly basis is the accepted procedure; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

318. Also, petition of local 483 of Jersey City, N. J., of the New Jersey Federation of Post Office Clerks at a conference assembled in Jersey City on May 19, 1951, condemning vigorously any attempts to increase the 40-hour workweek in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

319. Also, petition of local 988, Union City, N. J., New Jersey Federation of Post Office Clerks desire to go on record as favoring enactment of House bill 2241, and Senate bill 1015; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

320. By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of the Burbank, Calif., Chamber of Commerce to the Congress of the United States to reject amendments to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as introduced by Congressman SPENCE (House bill 3871), and Senator MAYBANK (Senate bill 1397); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

321. By Mr. SADLAK: Petition of the Connecticut State Industrial Council, Waterbury, Conn., containing many signatures urging the Connecticut Members of Congress to exert every effort to amend the Defense Production Act so that it will accomplish the purposes for which it was intended and attaching seven suggested amendments; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

XCVII—412

## SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 14, 1951

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, Thou searcher of men's hearts, from whom no secrets are hid: Help us in this opening moment of a new day's council to draw near to Thee, in tranquillity, in humility, in sincerity. With Thy benediction may we face the toil of this day with honest dealing and clear thinking, with hatred of all hypocrisy, deceit, and sham, and in the knowledge that all great and noble service in this world is based on gentleness and patience and truth. Setting a seal upon our lips, so that no thoughtless words of ours shall sting or harm another, valiantly may we meet the tasks that await us with laughter and kindness and cheerful good will. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 13, 1951, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 14, 1951, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

- S. 155. An act for the relief of Victor G. Lutfalla;
- S. 277. An act for the relief of Lily Pfannenschmidt;
- S. 291. An act for the relief of Claudio Pier Connelly;
- S. 297. An act for the relief of Tsung Hsien Hsu;
- S. 348. An act for the relief of Jacoba van Dorp;
- S. 355. An act for the relief of Edith Winifred Henderson;
- S. 363. An act for the relief of Irmgard Kohler;
- S. 463. An act for the relief of Alice de Bony de Lavergne; and
- S. 548. An act for the relief of Freidoun Jalayer.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4386) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. TOBEY was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate next week.

#### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. SPARKMAN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly, were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

#### REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF PANAMA CANAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Annual Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 14, 1951.

#### PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from the President's Patriotic Council of Salt Lake City, Utah, signed by Mrs. J. R. Wilson, president, praying for the enactment of legislation providing that Fort Douglas (Utah) Cemetery be made a military cemetery, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 71) relating to the compensation of employees of the House and Senate press, periodical, and radio galleries, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 420) thereon.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 14, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

- S. 178. An act for the relief of Zdenek Marek;
- S. 249. An act for the relief of Ruzena Pelantova;
- S. 361. An act for the relief of Herk Visnapuu and his wife, Naima;
- S. 362. An act for the relief of Tu Do Chau (also known as Szetu Dju or Anna Szetu);
- S. 364. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suzanne Wiernik and her daughter, Genevieve;
- S. 435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; and
- S. 648. An act for the relief of Evald Ferdinand Kask.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTON:

S. 1679. A bill for the relief of Stephen Gorve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.