MILITARY PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

"My point is that a sufficient number of cases have developed to permit Members of the Senate at least to wonder whether some of the military costs may not be padded..."

... 

"First, I should like to deal with the question of flight pay for flying personnel, particularly for officers assigned to ground duty. The system of extra pay for the flying forces developed, because of the high risk involved in the early days, in order to compensate for the extra hazard which the flyers incurred..."

... 

"Noncombatant air flight has become relatively nonhazardous, ...

"Combat flying is extra-hazardous; a case can be made on the hazards involved in the conditions under which operational, training, and test flights are made. However, administrative, maintenance, and proficiency flying are not much more dangerous than commercial flying and do not justify the flight-pay bonus. Flight pay is especially unjustified in the cases of those who are not primarily assigned to flight duties, but who pick up a few hours flight time per month to qualify for the extra $100 to $210 allowance."

... 

"Lately, a great weakness has developed in flight pay, in that it has been allowed to cover not only personnel actually assigned to flying, but also to personnel assigned to desk duty. All that is necessary to qualify for flight pay is to get in 4 hours flying time a month."

... 

"In many cases, it would be cheaper to give the flight pay without the necessity of putting in the flying time. For instance, one committee report during the Eighty-first Congress, pointed out that it cost the Government at that time about $200,000,000 in airplane and fuel expense to enable personnel to earn an extra $75,000,000 in flight pay."

"I shall offer an amendment which will make me still more unpopular with the Air Force, which will apply tighter restrictions to the application of flight pay. From estimates which I have made, the amendment will save between $50,000,000 and $100,000,000. The total in the budget for flight pay for the Air Force alone is $125,000,000. About one-fifth of it is for proficiency flying of desk pilots, 4 hours a month... That amounts to $25,000,000. With further restriction"
applying not only to the Air Force, but to the Navy as well, I believe we can save up to $100,000,000--perhaps more when the savings in gasoline and aircraft are considered."

Savings: $50,000,000-$100,000,000.

Source: Mr. Douglas, Senator from Illinois, Congressional Record, September 10, 1951, pp. 11315, 11315.

* * *

"The record with regard to limited service personnel is not impressive. Practically all of the airmen, in or out of 'chair corps' jobs, are physically and mentally qualified for full military duty. Replacement of these men would make available another division for our combat forces. Under conditions of full mobilization, we could not afford to waste our able-bodied men in administrative and clerical functions. We should not now waste time and money training men for duties which others will have to assume. The IV-F's will be badly needed. We should be training them now. The committee believes that the Air Force and the other services can eliminate from desk-bound ranks many men who are qualified for full military duty."

... ... ...

"Airmen typists were found using the 'hunt and peck' method. One good stenographer would be able to turn out the work now produced by three of these unqualified men."

"At March Air Force Base, a staff sergeant whose base pay is $139.65 a month, assigned for on-the-job training at the armament shop, was painting a one-strand wire lawn fence. A group of about 10 noncommissioned officers, supervised by a sergeant, were picking leaves off the officers' club lawn by hand."

... ... ...

"Many departments are overstaffed. The assignment of excess personnel for on-the-job training in the reason usually given for overstaffing. However, many of the on-the-job trainees complained that they were wasting their time as well as the time of operating personnel. This method of training can only be successful when closely supervised and controlled. It was obvious that in many cases the necessary supervision was lacking."
Savings: Amount unspecified.


* * * * *
Department of Defense, Civil Functions
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

General.

"The budget estimates, including a supplemental estimate... for items under the control of the Corps of Engineers total $624,259,843. The committee recommends an appropriation of $498,382,100, a reduction of $125,877,443 in the budget estimates and $120,182,250 below the amount for the current fiscal year.

"The reductions effected by the committee are predicated on three major factors. First, the committee does not feel that any new project should be started at this time when the Nation is strain- ing every effort to provide the necessary funds for its security and perhaps survival. Second, reductions are recommended for a number of existing projects in those instances where new features have been budgeted and where the elimination of those features will not interfere with the orderly completion of features presently under construction. Third, all funds requested for planning and surveys are eliminated. While the committee fully appreciates the desirability of retaining something in the way of planning and survey organizations it feels that it would be more expeditious and efficient for the Corps of Engineers to adjust its personnel to meet work requirements rather than to perennially seek planning and survey funds in order to provide work for a preconceived organization...."

Savings: $125,877,443.


* * *

"In 1944 the corps commenced the preparation of the Engineering Manual for Civil Works. It has not been completed, despite its importance in the planning of civil works projects and its need as a guide to the corps. This manual is constantly referred to in the definite project report procedure prescribed in orders and regulations. These require that provisions of the manual be followed in many important particulars. The chapters and parts of the manual prescribing general planning criteria have, in all but two instances, progressed only through the first draft and the first review...."
Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Committee Counsel in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Investigation of Corps of Engineers, Civil Works Program, Part 1, p. 113.

* * *

"The facts now established beyond dispute show that, of the total cost increase of $3,27 billion, $600 million, representing 30.6 percent of the authorization estimate of $2.6 billion, was attributable to insufficient engineering planning and estimating. The total cost increase is broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percent of Authorization Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price changes</td>
<td>$1,367,911,000</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorized project extensions</td>
<td>$576,814,000</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed local needs or situations</td>
<td>$134,515,000</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural and engineering modifications</td>
<td>$206,194,000</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unforeseen conditions</td>
<td>$279,524,000</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequacy</td>
<td>$188,975,000</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost increase</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,273,933,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Included in these figures are average increases of 177 percent for relocations of facilities, and 123 percent in cost and 42 percent in acreage for land acquisition."

1. Inadequacy

"Omissions in engineering planning on the part of the Corps of Engineers has exceeded 10 percent in 48 of the 182 projects in the 1951 program. The cost increases due to inadequacy total $175,914,140 for these 48 projects.

2. Unforeseen conditions

"That the corps' planning on 70 of the 182 projects was insufficiently developed in the survey report (upon which project authorization was based), is further graphically illustrated by the fact that unforeseen conditions in excess of 10 percent have been encountered in 70 of the 182 projects of the 1951 program. It is inevitable that unforeseen conditions will be encountered on large
construction jobs, but certainly not to the extent occurring in the projects constructed by the Corps of Engineers. On half of the 70 projects, the unforeseen conditions have been in excess of 40 percent. For the 70 projects the dollar cost has been $246,942,939.

"3. Structural and engineering modifications"

"It is abundantly clear that the Corps of Engineers does not develop the engineering features of a project prior to the time the definite project report is written and yet Congress was requested for funds to start construction in the case of 139 projects representing $4.9 billion of the $6 billion in the 1951 program before the corps prepared this report.

"In 63 of the 182 projects, structural and engineering modifications in excess of 10 percent were found necessary. Again, over half of these 63 projects involved modifications in excess of 40 percent. For the entire 63 projects, the modifications...total $226,638,209.

"4. Relocations"

"When river and harbor and flood-control projects are constructed, it is generally necessary to relocate public facilities, such as railroads, highways, bridges, utilities, and the like, and in some cases relocate entire towns."

"The cost increase for the 182 projects attributable to erroneous estimating of the cost of relocations has been excessive. The average increase for this item above the estimate in the survey report has been 177 percent. This average percentage of increase is bad enough, but it minimizes the gross miscalculations for the cost of relocations. The percentages of increase for individual projects have reached a high of 4,839 percent at the time that the relocation program was only 3 percent completed. Then there appear such items as 3,396 percent with the program 1 percent completed, and 2,253, 1,836, 1,212, and 1,013 percent at a time when the relocation program was not even started on individual projects."

"5. Land acquisition"

"The acquisition of land caused by the construction of civil works projects accounts for substantial portions of the cost increase of these projects."

"The fact that the cost of land acquisition has been underestimated in the survey reports is readily demonstrated. The average cost increase for lands has been 123 percent. It is recognized that the acquisition of real estate today is more expensive than heretofore."

But the criterion of engineering planning is found in the number of acres that the engineers estimated would be required for individual projects. The acreage has increased an average of 42 percent over the estimates in the survey reports for the 182 projects...."

Waste: Approximately $800,000,000.


"Recommendations"

1. To assure that Congress is provided with sound information upon which to consider the appropriation of construction funds for authorized civil works projects, the Corps of Engineers should prepare and furnish to the Appropriations Committees of Congress a new report, to be known as the planning report, which will embody reasonably reliable engineering estimating and planning.

2. With respect to all authorized civil works projects which are now under construction, the Corps of Engineers should by February 1, 1952, prepare and submit to the Appropriations Committees planning reports for them, in order that Congress have available reasonably sound and reliable data upon which to consider the appropriation of additional construction funds.

3. To provide Congress with a continuing check on the Corps' planning and construction performance, the planning reports are to be supplemented each year for all projects under construction by a statement of progress permitting ready comparison with the planning report. This statement should be prepared by the Corps of Engineers and filed with Appropriations Committees by February 1 of each year.

4. Since it is apparent that the Corps of Engineers has reached the saturation point in civil works projects because of the demands of military construction and the large number of civil works projects now under construction, no funds should be appropriated to initiate construction of new civil works projects, with the exception of projects involving considerations of grave import.

5. Construction funds for civil works projects now under construction should be limited this year pending submission by the corps early in 1952 of planning reports for those projects.

6. The Engineering Manual for Civil Works has been prescribed in the official orders and regulations of the Corps of Engineers as the basic guide for the planning and construction of civil works projects.
This manual has been in the course of preparation for more than 7 years and is far from completion. It must be completed at the earliest possible date."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Report of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Army Civil Functions of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Investigation of Corps of Engineers Civil Works Programs, p. 3.

"One item which we could reduce is the proposed expenditure of $3,500,000 for future planning and investigations... This money is not for planning... projects which have already been authorized, but for which appropriations have not been made... However, the proposal to which I now refer calls for drawing up of plans for projects in addition to those which already have been authorized. The Corps of Engineers has a backlog of $5,300,000,000 worth of projects which have been authorized by the Congress but for which no appropriations have been made. That is enough work to keep the Corps of Engineers busy for 10 years... I do not propose that all of the $3,500,000 item be stricken from the bill; I would let the Corps of Engineers have $500,000 for the purpose. However, it seems to me that in this period of national emergency we could save at least $3,000,000."

Savings: $3,000,000.

Source: Mr. Douglas, Senator from Illinois, Congressional Record, August 15, 1951, p. 10244.

"It has come to the attention of the House Committee on Insular and Interior Affairs that in this bill/Department of Defense Appropriation Bill. is a sum in excess of $21,000,000 for the construction of a dam at Camp Pendleton, in California, and before our committee on Monday of this week General Hill testified that in the first place he did not know whether there was water in the river sufficient to fill that dam if it were built; and, second, that if the water were there, the Navy would own the water when it came down, but they wanted to go ahead and ask this committee to authorize $22,000,000 for the construction of that dam."

Savings: $21,000,000 - $22,000,000.

Source: Mr. Saylor, Representative from Pennsylvania, Congressional Record, October 10, 1951, p. 13149.
...three military installations were built in my State recently. The Corps of Engineers insisted that they burn bituminous coal, which has to be shipped 1,000 miles or more and at about three times the cost. Two of these installations are right in the heart of our lignite coal area, with mines all around them, and 600 billion tons there; and every state institution in North Dakota burns lignite coal satisfactorily, and every hospital burns it, and every public utility burns it, even the veterans' hospital built by the Corps of Engineers themselves, some 2 or 3 years ago, burns it. A new RBA $8,500,000 steam generating plant is going to burn lignite coal, and they will supply the current to at least one of these installations. But yet, they insist on importing this coal 1,000 miles, where they are sitting right on top of the coal bed.

"I forwarded to the Corps of Engineers from the Bureau of Mines a report pointing out that lignite is a satisfactory coal to burn."

...I would like to add that there is about 1 1/2 million tons of lignite coal taken from the Garrison Dam, in the construction, and piled on the ground now, and there probably will be 5 million tons there when they get through, and this is only about 40 miles from one of these installations, and all they would have to do is shovel it on a truck, and haul it over there and get it for nothing."

Waste: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Young, Senator from North Dakota, in Hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, Senate, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Supplemental Appropriations for 1952, pp. 201, 202.

* * *

Maintenance and Improvement of Existing River and Harbor Works.

"The bill includes $162,360,500 for rivers and harbors, a reduction of $37,618,343 in the budget estimates and $24,162,000 below the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year...the committee wishes to more specifically point out reasons for its action on a few of the items, namely:

"House Document No. 124 contains an estimate of $238,943 to reimburse local interests for modifications performed on the Lake North Inlet, Florida, project. The committee is not in accord with any
policy which permits the commitment of Federal funds on so indeterminate a basis as is involved in this instance. Authorizing legislation does not mean mandatory approval of subsequent requests for appropriations. The policy of reimbursing local interests for work performed by them should be discontinued. Items where similar reimbursement has been authorized should be cleared with this committee before Federal funds are in any way committed.

"The request of $18,000,000 to initiate construction on The Dalles Dam, Oregon is denied....To date no funds have been made available for the planning of this project. The committee does not feel that study of this project has sufficiently progressed for the Corps of Engineers to be able to definitely inform the Congress of the ultimate total Federal costs. In a treaty negotiated between the United States and the Yakima Tribe of Indians on June 9, 1855 (12 Stat. 951) the Indians were granted certain fishing rights on the Columbia River. These rights will be completely destroyed in direct violation of the treaty if construction of the dam is approved. Aside from the moral and legal treaty aspects, the present estimated cost of The Dalles Dam does not contemplate any payment to the Indians for their economic loss, estimated at $900,000 annually. The committee will not give further consideration to this project until the treaty matter is settled to the satisfaction of all parties concerned and until proper and final cost estimates are determined.

"The amount of $8,000,000 requested for beginning construction on the Old Hickory Lock and Dam, Tennessee, is denied. The data submitted to the Congress in justification of this project failed to show that, (1) navigation benefits, without construction of other dams, are significant, (2) power needs are urgent, or (3) the project has been adequately planned for construction.

"The bill does not include the amount of $4,000,000 requested for construction of the Ice Harbor Lock and Dam, Washington. Requests for funds to initiate construction of this project have been denied on two previous occasions on the basis of the unknown effect of the dam on the salmon fishing industry in the Snake River. The economic justification of this project is contingent upon the construction of three other dams, none of which are contemplated at the present time.

"The request of $3,000,000 for the Cheatham Lock and Dam, Tennessee, is eliminated because of the present indecision concerning power in connection with this project...."

Savings: $57,618,343.

This association protests current proposals before Congress for the appropriation of Federal moneys for the construction of Ice Harbor Dam on the Lower Snake River in the State of Washington for the following reasons:

"1. The construction of Ice Harbor Dam cannot be economically justified without the construction of four other structures on the Snake River; namely, Lower Monumental Dam; Little Goose Dam; Lower Granite Dam; and Hells Canyon Dam. The construction of these dams across the Lower Snake River will result in terrific damage to the Columbia River Salmon fishery resource and the practical elimination of the river salmon fishing industry.

"2. There does not exist at this time any necessity for the initiation of the construction of these dams upon the basis of—

(a) National defense
(b) Production of hydroelectric power
(c) Establishment of a river navigation system
(d) Reclamation of arid lands
(e) Flood control

"3. Available Federal funds for Columbia Basin development should be so appropriated as to assure the earliest possible completion of projects now under way rather than be spread among old and new projects."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Collars, Executive Secretary, Columbia River Salmon and Tuna Packers Association, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Senate, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Civil Functions, Department of the Army Appropriations 1952, p. 240.

* * * *

"In the first place, $50,000,000 of the $123,000,000 of increase are not connected in any direct sense with flood control, but are included in the recommended appropriations for rivers and harbors primarily navigation projects, and will not give any immediate protection against floods."

* * * *
"It is reported that this project [Demopolis lock and dam, Alabama] is one of the three locks and dams on the Inland waterway system most needing to be replaced. The other two are the Cheatham lock and dam on the Cumberland River and the Keokuk lock and dam on the upper Mississippi River. It is noteworthy that even though these three are said to be of high importance, the Corps of Engineers has not requested funds to replace the Keokuk lock and dam. Therefore, why go ahead on this project?... If the project is deferred, the estimate for 1952 can be reduced by the $4,500,000 requested and probably some funds already allocated be saved."

"This [Jim Woodruff Dam, Fla.] is an illustration of a project that in my judgment can be deferred. The budget calls for spending another $7,000,000 on the Jim Woodruff Dam in Florida... Florida is not a mountainous country; power won't be available there for another 2½ years...."

"...It is now proposed [for the Intracoastal waterway, Jacksonville to Miami, Fla.] that at an additional cost of $16,750,000 the channel be deepened to 12 feet and widened to 125 feet... Traffic over the waterway decreased from a high in 1939 to a low in 1946. Traffic in 1948, the last year of published record, was about midway between the two; 436,000 tons... Of the 35,000 motor vessels using the waterway, approximately 32,000 drew 6 feet or less; of the 2,200 barges, less than 10 percent drew over 6 feet."

"...Air Force materials could move over the existing 8-foot channel. In the absence of a real defense need, it would appear that the project could readily be deferred with a reduction in appropriation of $2,300,000."

"However, the House cut off $1,300,500 for the project at Jacksonville Harbor, Fla. would postpone initiation of new work (entrance channel and ship channel dredging). This work can easily be postponed and the House figure should be adhered to."

"Essentially a new start [on the Buford Dam, Ga.] can be stopped [saving $900,000]."

"Power not available until December 1955 (40,000 kilowatts) can be postponed as House has done."
"Funds requested for 1952 /for the Illinois Waterway, Illinois/ total $300,000 for additional dredging in the Starved Rock to Lockport reach. The work could probably be deferred, although the amount is not great and safety on this waterway may be relatively important."

...It would appear that the work on the Missouri River, Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa project could again be shut down /$3,000,000/ and maintenance funds should be adequate to prevent serious loss.

"This is not flood control, the item for which comes under flood control. It is navigation."

"A thirty-foot channel is available in this waterway /Calcasieu River and Pass, Louisiana/ although a 35-foot channel is authorized and is under construction /for which the budget request is $1,025,000/. However, the small number of ships using such depth does not indicate that the increase is urgently needed."

"Of the $4,300,000 requested /for the Gulf Intracoastal waterway (Algiers cut-off), Louisiana/ only $100,000 is for continuation of work underway in 1951. Apparently $4,800,000 of the amount requested could be deferred without physical damage to the work already in place.

"On the basis of the presentation /for the Pearl River, Miss., and La., project/ it would appear that the full amount requested, $957,000, could be deferred without physical damage to the work in place. It is stated that full benefits cannot be expected until the work is completed. It is not, however, clearly set forth that no benefits would materialize from the work already in place."

"...The presentation /for the St. Anthony's Falls Project, Minneapolis, Minn./ does not make it clear that there is any real defense value or necessity of the project. It could be assumed, therefore, that the amount requested /$3,000,000/ could be deferred."
"...This request \( \text{for the project on the Missouri River,} \) 
Kansas City to mouth is for \$2,300,000 and elsewhere in these 
estimates the amount of \$2,852,000 is requested for maintenance. It 
would appear that this new work...could be deferred."

"This is navigation not flood control."

"The funds requested \( \text{for the Buffalo Harbor, N.Y. project} \), 
\$305,000, would provide for deepening the harbor. The project is re-
quested on the basis of safety and ease of navigation. Since it pro-
vides only an alternate entrance to the harbor it can be deferred."

"Funds requested of \$1,000,000 \( \text{for the Cleveland Harbor,} \) 
Ohio project consist of \$75,000 for improvement of channels and \$925,-
000 for replacement of a bridge. It is not clear why replacement of 
the bridge is essential at this time...."

"This project \( \text{on the Schuylkill River, Pa} \) authorized in 
1946 is estimated to cost slightly more than 12\( \frac{1}{2} \) million...The 1952 
program of \$1,900,000 contemplates further work on disposal areas, 
the initiation of dredging of one pool and the initiation and comple-
tion of dredging of a second of the three pools into which the river 
is divided for the purposes of the project. The project is to remove 
from the river the great masses of culm, which have gathered through 
the years as waste products from the coal mines...Since no work on culm 
removal has started the project can be considered a new project."

"This project \( \text{on Cheatham Dam, Tenn} \) on the Cumberland River 
is considered necessary to relieve a bottleneck in navigation. While 
over \$10,000,000 of the \$11,000,000 total cost is yet to be appropriated, 
it is not clear from the justifications the extent to which the addi-
tional \$3,000,000 must be made available at this time."

"...The data submitted to the Congress in justification of 
\( \text{Old Hickory Lock and Dam, Tenn} \) failed to show that (1) navigation 
benefits, without construction of other dams, are significant (2) 
power needs are urgent, or (3) the project has been adequately planned 
for construction."
"The funds requested for the Houston Ship Channel, Texas, $1,500,000, would provide for completing one reach of channel being started with funds available during the current year and for the initiation and completion of a second reach. The reach to be completed extends to an ordnance depot slip.

"The immediate need of deepening the existing channel to 36 feet in the reach to be started and completed in fiscal year 1952 is not obvious from the presentation. It may be that this item could be eliminated for the time being without serious inconvenience or loss... Since the last annual report for 1949 shows only two out-bound steamers as having drafts of 34 feet and only one in-bound vessel with a draft as much as 32 feet, it would appear that doubt might be resolved in favor of deferral."

"The Department requests $1,000,000 for further preparation of plans on nine projects which are estimated to cost a total of over $1,300,000,000. The amount requested can be eliminated without disrupting any construction, since the projects involved have not yet been started...

"The budget includes a request totaling $69,835,000 for funds in the category of current expenses... It would appear that any reduction Douglas recommended a reduction of $9,835,000 made would have to be based on a rule of thumb percentage reduction, recognizing that some maintenance might then need to be deferred and some of the less worthy projects carried forward in a less completely maintained status.

"Uneconomic projects can be abandoned. This was done in the case of the Hennepin Canal in Illinois, and it can be done in other places."

Savings: $55,008,500.

Source: Mr. Douglas, Senator from Illinois, Congressional Record, August 13, 1951, pp. 10062-10063, 10065, 10066-10067.

* * *

"...yesterday... I made efforts to reduce by $50,000,000 the appropriations for the rivers-and-harbors section of this bill. We were defeated... we wish to return today with a proposal to save 10 percent of the amount which the committee has voted to allocate, or to make a reduction of approximately $21,500,000 in this item."
"...Surely not all of these projects are so essential that they must be carried out in a period of national emergency and in a period in which there will be a big national deficit."

Savings: Approximately $21,500,000.

Source: Mr. Douglas, Senator from Illinois, Congressional Record, August 15, 1951, p. 10224.

* * *

"...When this bill is returned to the Appropriations Committee, the subcommittee will be able to sit down with the Engineers, obtain their advice, and then cut $50,000,000 from an increase of $122,000,000 which was placed in the bill over and above the House figure...."

"The Senator from Michigan has no desire at all to destroy flood-control or rivers-and-harbors projects....But the Senator from Michigan believes that there are other items in this bill in which reductions could well be made. For example, the item for rivers and harbors alone is $213,932,613; and for general flood control alone $334,717,600. The general emergency fund carries an item of $10,000,000. This year as a supplement, we appropriated $25,000,000 to that same fund, which at that time had a carry-over. For the Mississippi River, alone, for flood controls, there is an item of $61,000,000 while the emergency fund for the Mississippi River is $500,000. The item for the Sacramento River in California alone is $1,000,000. The total of the appropriations for public works is $621,160,213. The balance of $16,134,000 includes cemetery expenses and the item of the Canal Zone Government. The cut of $50,000,000 proposed in the motion to recommit would come from the entire bill."

Savings: $50,000,000.

Source: Mr. Ferguson, Senator from Michigan, Congressional Record, August 14, 1951, p. 10152.

* * *

"...I asked for this time to inquire of the chairman of the committee if the project which is partially in my district, known as the New Cumberland lock and dam, was taken out, as I asked that it should be..."
"...It certainly is not necessary at this time... we can certainly get along without it, because the Ohio River Channel is sufficiently deep to carry the shipping on it. If the project is brought up at some time when we need employment, it might be a good proposition. This project now would build a new dam to replace two perfectly good dams which operate satisfactorily..."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Hays, Representative from Ohio, Congressional Record, October 17, 1951, p. 13656.

* * *

Alteration of Bridges Over Navigable Waters.

"The request for $900,000 in connection with the alteration of the Belt Line Railroad Bridge at Norfolk, Virginia, is denied. Testimony received by the committee failed to disclose the military necessity for this project and construction should be withheld until such time as the military indicate in writing that it is needed in the interests of national defense..."

Savings: $900,000.


* * *

Flood Control, General.

"The amount of $5,000,000 was requested for beginning construction of Gavins Point Reservoir, Nebraska. Under provisions of the conference report on the general appropriation bill, 1951, up to $500,000 could have been made available for beginning construction of this project. The Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget did not apparently consider the dam as meeting the criteria established by the aforementioned conference report, and no construction funds were allocated to the project. The committee does not see sufficient change in the previous circumstances surrounding this project to justify its construction at the present time."

Savings: $5,000,000.

"The committee notes that funds are proposed for application in fiscal year 1952 for initiation of construction of the last wall and levee section of the project. The committee feels that this unit can be initiated at a reduced amount from that proposed within the budget and House allowance for this project. Accordingly, a reduction of $200,000 from the amount included by the House for Maysville, Ky., is recommended.

Savings: $200,000.


* * *

"The committee has determined that the minimum requirements of this project [Harlan County Reservoir, Nebr.] for the fiscal year 1952 can be met with an appropriation of $1,000,000. Accordingly, it is the recommendation of the committee that the amount of $2,000,000 allowed by the House be reduced by $1,000,000.

Savings: $1,000,000.

Source: Report of the Committee on Appropriations, Senate, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Civil Functions, Department of the Army Appropriation Bill, Fiscal Year 1952, p. 28.

* * *

"...the Army engineers, without authority in law, proposed a dam at Garrison with a flood area of 23,000,000 acre-feet; they planned and began a program of irrigation; they began construction of the diversion of waters of Devils Lake, N. Dak., by the purchase of land for that purpose.

"In putting in a flood pool of 23,000,000 acre-feet it required more land; and the Army engineers, without authority in law, went ahead and bought land to accommodate a pool of that size. To obtain that pool 90,000 acres of additional land had to be obtained, and this land was at or near Williston, N. Dak. In that vicinity there are three presently operating irrigation projects but this extra land which the Army engineers wanted, and for which they had no authority to buy, would cover all these going irrigation projects and endanger
the city of Williston, and would destroy 90,000 acres of the best land in North Dakota. If the Army engineers had been content with a pool of 17,000,000 acre-feet, as they originally proposed, and as the law authorized, all this damage and expense could have been saved.

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Burdick, Representative from North Dakota, Congressional Record, August 20, 1951, p. 10586.

* * *

"I am appearing here on behalf of the Kansas Conservation Association in opposition to the flood-control plan of the United States Army engineers for Grand (Neosho) River and its tributaries. The Kansas Conservation Association is composed largely of residents of the Neosho Valley."

* * *

"The proposed plan contemplates the construction of four dams, the location and estimated cost of each of which are as follows:

Council Grove-------------------------- $9,155,500
Marion----------------------------- 6,697,320
Cedar Point------------------------- 4,967,660
Stream----------------------------- 17,909,200
Total-------------------------------- $38,669,680

"The dams, if constructed, would result in the destruction of 31,370 acres of fertile bottom land, a substantial portion of two towns, Hartford and Neosho Rapids, portions of the Missouri-Kansas-Texas and A.T. & S.F. Railways, State highways, county, and township roads, telephone and power lines, and interstate gas pipelines transporting natural gas from the Hugoton fields in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, to Indianapolis, Ind., and other terminal points. The land which will be destroyed has been in cultivation for almost a century and is presently producing corn, wheat, alfalfa, and soybeans. The classes of livestock produced are cattle, hogs, and poultry. The annual recurring loss by reason of the destruction of the land will be $2,711,579, based on 1947 prices for livestock and crops. If present high prices continue, the annual recurring loss will very substantially exceed this amount.

"The contemplated flood-control plan will displace 1,603 persons, of whom 1,112 will be removed from farms and 491 from the town of Hartford."

* * *
"...the Army engineers' plan of flood control is, by their own admission, insufficient, and it is our position that much more adequate flood control can be provided at a much lower cost by the construction of smaller reservoirs, and we can establish this fact by the Army engineers' report itself."

Savings: $38,669,690.

Source: Mr. Cosgrove, Kansas Conservation Association, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Civil Functions, Department of the Army, Appropriations for 1952, Part 2, pp. 688, 689, 690.

* * *

"Mr. Rabaut. From information that you have furnished the committee I see that The Dalles Dam was certified as a national defense project for planning only.

"Colonel Potter. Yes, sir.

"Mr. Rabaut. In the face of this why are you asking for funds for construction?

"Colonel Potter. This item is in the budget; the President placed this item in the budget, sir..."

... ... ...

"Mr. Davis. I wonder how much good we are doing, as far as navigation goes, by starting this particular dam at this particular time."

... ... ...

"You say this power is needed for an emergency. Would it not be better to spend money on another project that is scheduled for an earlier completion than on the Dalles project, which will not be finished for 5 or 6 years?"

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Davis, Representative from Wisconsin, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Civil Functions, Department of the Army Appropriations for 1952, Part 1, pp. 196, 197, 205-207.
"Mr. Ford. Why, in this kind of a project, do you force the local interests to pay for relocations, and in the other cases which we have discussed this afternoon the railroads make the Federal Government pay for relocation?

"Colonel Potter. In the first place it is the law. The law specifically states that in a local protection project this will be done, and it is based on the fact that the benefits accrue only to the area protected. This project gives nobody downstream or upstream any benefits. It is all localized within the periphery of the flood wall.

"Mr. Ford. But that is the point I was talking about earlier, about the railroads getting benefits and at the same time getting relocation funds for their stretch of the railroads. In other words, I think they are closely akin, and if the law is wrong, it ought to be changed."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Ford, Representative from Michigan, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Civil Functions, Department of the Army Appropriations for 1952, Part 1, p. 539.

...I must oppose the $1,500,000 appropriation contained herein for the starting of construction on the Colegah Reservoir. This money is actually the down payment on the $33,040,000 project and with the adoption of a provision for this money, Senators will obligate the Government to complete construction of the entire project.

...Hundreds of farm homes would be bought up by the Government at a cost of more than $6,000,000. The taxable values in that area would be forever lost, and in their place would be the huge flood pool. Wherever possible flood basins are located in areas where cheap, eroded, or submarginal land exists, yet in this case the area comprises one of the rich valley sections of our State.

...So in effect, the economy of this section would be destroyed, embracing 72 miles of the river channel, to protect the lower 90 miles of the stream. We would remove from home ownership 75,000 acres of good land, spend $33,040,000 for construction of the dam, and receive
a net gain of only 18,000 acres. The 93,000 acres below the dam would be protected at the sacrifice of the 75,000 acres required for the project including the 41,900 acres required for the actual flood pool.

"One of the reasons why this project has been so highly questioned is that the flood pool would cover an oil field in which an estimated 10,000,000 barrels of oil are yet to be recovered."

"At this time, when every dollar is needed for national defense and when flood-control projects must be closely examined for their absolute necessity, it is a poor time to be considering such questionable projects as this Oolegah Dam."

Savings: $1,500,000.

Source: Mr. Monroney, Senator from Oklahoma, Congressional Record, August 15, 1951, pp. 10236, 10237.

"Mr. McGrath. In view of the fact that you must acquire land because the farmer wants to dispose of it--naturally, if you take his good land, he wants to dispose of his poor land--is any effort ever made to dispose of this excess land which you acquire?

"Colonel Potter. Those lands that anybody will lease are leased. As to whether we have ever sold any of it, at the present time we cannot dispose of any land whatsoever because the present law prohibits disposal.

"Mr. Rabaut. I do not see why you do not recommend to the legislative committee that a law be passed so that some of this land could be sold..."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Rabaut, Representative from Michigan, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Civil Functions, Department of the Army Appropriations for 1952, Part 1, p. 387.
Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries.

"The committee recommends $59,000,000 for this item, a reduction of $2,000,000 in the budget estimates and a decrease of $2,400,000 in the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year. The committee believes that the tempo of the work on the lower Mississippi can be slowed down in the minor degree indicated by the reduction in the interest of making every provision for more vital National Defense needs..."

Savings: $2,000,000.


* * *

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project.

"...I had thought it was axiomatic that we cannot have our butter and our guns too. Yet that is exactly what is proposed in the President's recommendation for the proposed St. Lawrence waterway-hydroelectric project. At a time when we are faced with perhaps the greatest crisis ever to confront this country, at a time when our young men are being taken from their homes and their schools, at a time when record-breaking taxes are to be imposed upon the people, we are asked to embark upon this fantastic undertaking whose ultimate costs, you can rest assured, will total more than a billion dollars; which would require the diversion of materials and labor so badly needed for defense, and which, if the claims of its proponents even approximate the truth, would bring about an economic dislocation to a great part of our country. I say it is preposterous."

Savings: More than ($1,000,000,000).

Source: Mr. Flood, Representative from Pennsylvania, Congressional Record, February 5, 1951, p. 1037.

* * *

...Incidentally, there is included in my proposed reduction, the elimination of the St. Lawrence Seaway project, which would ultimately cost the taxpayers $600,000,000 if it were authorized and constructed, although the initial appropriation is $15,000,000."
Savings: $15,000,000 (initially) - $600,000,000 (eventually).

Source: Statement by Mr. Robert C. Hendrickson, Senator from New Jersey, March 31, 1951, p. 2.

* * *

"Today we find ourselves involved in another world crisis, and as usual the age-old statement is again being bandied about that our security rests in no small degree on construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project."

* * *

"...In estimating the cost of construction, there has been little said concerning the cost of defending the St. Lawrence project. Military experts, however, are of the opinion that it will require over $1,000,000,000 to erect the necessary defenses at strategic locations along the 1,677-mile front. In addition, the maintenance cost of these defense posts cannot be ignored. For the maintenance cost of the channel and locks alone, more than $20,000,000 will be expended annually for the seaway part of the project.

"When we consider the cost of construction estimated to exceed $1,000,000,000 and add another $1,000,000,000 for the erection of defense posts requiring additional millions for maintenance costs, we can readily see that this proposed St. Lawrence project is destined to cost us billions of dollars. I am sure you will agree that this is a tidy sum of money to saddle on the already overburdened taxpayers of America, who are now paying the tax collector 35 cents out of every $1 they earn."

Savings: Billions of dollars.

Source: Mr. Van Zandt, Representative from Pennsylvania, Congressional Record, February 26, 1951, pp. A1013, A1014.

* * * * *
GOVERNMENT AND RELIEF IN OCCUPIED AREAS

"The committee recommends $21,800,000 for this item, a reduction of $5,200,000 in the Budget estimate. The significant reduction in the request for fiscal year 1952 as compared with 1951, when $288,000,000 was appropriated, is principally occasioned by the elimination of economic aid for Japan..."

"With respect to Japan, the requested amounts for personal services and for the exchange of persons program are reduced. Absence of funds for economic aid should lessen, more greatly than indicated, the need for economic personnel. The exchange program should be restored to the fiscal year 1950 level.

"The committee feels that the economic aid for the Ryukyus has been overstated, both from the standpoint of commodity requirements and the ability of the native economy to help itself, especially in view of our military expenditures on the islands. The requested amount is reduced by $2,650,000. Costs of administration are reduced by $1,000,000. It should be pointed out that while economic aid for the Ryukyus Islands is reduced by more than 60 percent since fiscal year 1950 the costs of administration and orientation is estimated with only a 20 percent reduction for the comparable period.

"In line with current efforts to reduce costs wherever possible, the committee is recommending a reduction in the request for the Office of Occupied Areas in the departmental service. It is believed that the reduction in this activity has not been commensurate with the reduction in the occupation activities serviced by the departmental organization."

Savings: $5,200,000.

PANAMA CANAL

Canal Zone Government.

"...The committee is well aware of the fact that in times past it was necessary to charge low rental rates as an inducement for skilled workers to live in the Canal Zone. It has been obvious for many years now that the need for such inducement no longer exists. The Secretary of the Army is, therefore, urged to take immediate steps to increase the rentals to provide for more rapid amortization of costs of construction and the entire cost of maintenance. It would even not seem abhorrent for the Government to make a small profit on the operation and establish some sort of contingency fund for the housing operation. In keeping with this thought the appropriation for housing has been reduced by $73,000.

"The estimates envisage $200,000 for civil defense in the Canal Zone. The committee is deleting this item in the belief that it is a proper function of the military to provide a civil defense organization for the Zone.

"The amount of $125,000 was requested for the rehabilitation of refrigerated and dry storage facilities at Gorgas Memorial Hospital. The committee is deleting the request of $25,000 for dry storage facilities in the belief that the present facilities are adequate."

Savings: $298,000.

Department of the Interior
PERSONAL SERVICES

"With the exception of the appropriation for Health and Safety, Bureau of Mines, the committee has applied a minimum of a 10 percent reduction to the $117,370,276 estimated for personnel other than operation and maintenance personnel. This reduction amounts to a minimum of $11,382,399 below the budget estimates for such personnel. By virtue of the size of reductions proposed by the committee in the total appropriations requested for Construction and Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration, for the Fine Arts Commission, and the elimination of the item for power and energy studies, New England and New York, the reductions in the estimates for personal services in these instances is more than a 10-percent reduction below the budget estimates, increasing to $12,143,227 the total reductions below the 1952 budget estimates for personal services...."

"The committee directs that the 10 percent reduction in the estimates for personal services, excepting operation and maintenance services, be applied to personnel in the District of Columbia and to personnel engaged in the field in the same ratio as departmental personnel and field personnel are set up in the Detail of personal services schedules appearing in the appendix to the 1952 budget."

"In effecting reductions of 10 percent or more in budget estimates for personal services, it is the expectation of the committee that these savings will be reflected administratively in proportionate reductions in expenditures which are incident to personal services."

Savings: $12,143,227.


"The average cost of issuing purchase orders in the Department of the Interior was $9.95. Thirty-six percent of these were for purchases of less than $20 such as the 50-cent order for a copy of the August 1950 issue of 'Esquire' for the office of the..."