Corpus Christi, Tex., water works and sewer revenue bonds, $8,900,000.

Tacoma, Wash., light and power revenue, $5 million.

Upper Moreland School District Authority (Pa), $1 million.

Tucson water revenue, Arizona, $3,110,000.

Falls Township School District Authority (Pa.), $3,450,000.

Fort Worth, Tex., water and sewer revenue bonds, $3 million.

Detroit, Mich., sewage disposal system revenue bonds, $2 million.

Omaha public power district electric revenue, Nebraska, $12 million.

Bloomington, Ind., water works revenue, $1,500,000.

Austin, Tex., electric, water and sewer revenue bonds, $15 million.

Purdue University revenue, Indiana, $10,250,000.

Michigan highway revenue, $10 million.

Cleveland, Tenn., water and sewer revenue, $1 million.

New Chicago, Ind., water revenue, $1,100,000.

South Bend., Ind., sewerage works revenue, $17 million.

Lexington, N. C., natural gas system revenue, $1,035,000.

Board of Regents, University of Utah, $1,800,000.

Central Dauphin County Joint School Authority (Pa.), $2,520,000.

Board of Regents of Kansas building revenue, $2 million.

Portland, Maine, water district, $1,300,000.

Port of New York Authority, $20 million.

Atlanta water works revenue (Ga.), $2,200,000.

Livonia, Mich., water supply system revenue, $1,500,000.

Los Angeles department of water and power, $15,000,000.

New Jersey Turnpike Authority 3s (second series), $27,200,000.

Bowling Green State University, Ohio, $2,350,000.

Rome, Ga., water and sewerage revenue bonds, $1,000,000.

Lafayette, Ind., sewer revenue bonds, $4,550,000.

Chicago, Ill., parking facility, revenue bonds, $4,900,000.

Detroit, Mich., sewage disposal system revenue, $3,722,000.

Metropolitan Utilities District, Omaha, water revenue, $6,000,000.

Pennsylvania State Highway and Bridge Authority, $20,000,000.

Connecticut expressway revenue and motor fuel tax bonds, $100,000,000.

El Paso, Tex., water and sewer revenue, $3,000,000.

State Teachers College Board, Indiana, $2,856,000.

Florida State Improvement Commission Revenue, $6,000,000.

County of Jefferson, Ky., school building authority revenue, $1,385,000.

Jacksonville, Fla., municipal parking revenue, $4,000,000.

Rockville, Md., water and sewer revenue, $1,300,000.

Georgia State Bridge Building Authority, $10,250,000.

Erie Sewer Authority revenue (Pennsylvania), $5,300,000.

Palmyra Boro Authority sewer revenue (Pennsylvania), $2,150,000.

Knoxville, Tenn., water revenue, $1,000,000.

Pasadena, Calif., electric works revenue, $6,000,000.

Saginaw, Mich., sewer revenue, $5,000,000.

Des Moines, Iowa, sewer revenue, $1,000,000.

State Board of Educaton, Florida, $26,692,000.

San Francisco Harbor revenue (California), $5,600,000.

New York State Thruway Authority revenue, $300,000,000.

University of Texas dormitory revenue, $3,042,000.

State Roads Commission of Maryland, $1,290,000.

Board of Water and Sewer Commission Mobile Revenue, Alabama, $6,000,000.

Lakeland, Fla., light and water revenue, $3,500,000.

Kokomo, Ind., sewer revenue, $1,250,000.

General State Authority, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, $30,000,000.

Jackson, Ohio, first mortgage water works revenue, $1,100,000.

Haverford Township (Pa.) School District Authority revenue, $3,525,000.

Granite City, Ill., sewerage bonds revenue, $1,335,000.

North Texas Municipal Water District revenue, $9,200,000.

Bradenton, Fla., utilities revenue, $2,200,000.

Salt Lake City Suburban District revenue, Utah, $6,000,000.

Consumers Public Power District revenue, Nebraska, $2,250,000.

Manitowac, Wis., electric bonds, $1,250,000.

Henderson, Ky., water and sewer revenue, $2,100,000.

Tampa, Fla., hospital, revenue, $4,500,000.

Gainesville, Fla., public improvement revenue, $1,000,000.

Lower Colorado River Authority, Texas, $27,000,000.

Puyallup, Wash., sewer revenue, $1,000,000.

Kansas City, Mo., Broadway Bridge revenue, $13,000,000.

State Roads Commission of Maryland, $25,000,000.

Elkhart, Ind., sewer revenue, $2,400,000.

Chelan County Public Utility District No. 1, Washington, $8,600,000.

St. John the Baptist Parish, La., gas and water revenue, $1,760,000.

St. James Parish, La., water revenue, $2,220,000.

Department of Water and Power of Los Angeles revenue, $19,500,000.

Jersey City Sewerage Authority revenue, New Jersey, $22,000,000.

Louisville and Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District, Kentucky, $8,000,000.

Bald Eagle Joint School Authority revenue, Pennsylvania, $2,050,000.

West Snyder County School Authority, Pennsylvania, $1,185,000.

Shelby, N. C., natural gas, $1,200,000.

Louisiana State Building Authority, $3,750,000.

Ohio major thoroughfare construction bonds, series "A" (fuel tax), $30,000,000.

Clarksburg, W. Va., water board, first lien water revenue, $1,776,000.

Lafayette, La., utility revenue, $3,000,000.

Wyoming Township, Mich., water revenue, $1,000,000.

Orlando, Fla., public-improvement revenue, $3,000,000.

Thomasville, Ga., gas revenue, $1,500,000.

Greenwood, S. C., public-utility revenue, $1,600,000.

Denton, Tex., electric revenue, $4,300,000.

Hollywood, Fla., sewer revenue, $4,150,000.

Kansas City, Mo., water revenue, $12,000,000.

Cleveland, Ohio, waterworks revenue, $6,000,000.

Cleveland, Ohio, electric revenue, $5,000,000.

Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, $7,200,000.

Alexandria Sanitation Authority, Virginia, $8,200,000.

Holland, Mich., water-supply system revenue, $2,700,000.

Colorado Springs, Colo., water, electric, and power revenue, $10,000,000.

Wheeling, W. Va., sewer revenue, $2,500,000.

Florida State Board of Education, $16,542,000.

Maryland State Road Commission, $180,000,000.

Board of Water and Sewer Commission, Mobile, Ala., $4,000,000.

State Public School Building Authority, Pennsylvania, $23,610,000.

New York State Thruway Authority, $50,000,000.

Orlando Utilities Commission, Florida, $4,000,000.

San Jose, Calif., offstreet parking revenue, $2,450,000.

Louisiana State Building Authority $2,500,000.

Florida State Improvement Commission revenue, $3,400,000.

Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, $12,500,000.

Department of Waterworks of Hammond, Ind., $3,600,000.

New York State Power Authority, $335,000,000.

Corpus Christi Tex. sewer-improvement revenue, $1,365,000.

Total, $1,774,377,000.

Issues, 128.

DESCRIPTION OF VARIOUS PUBLIC AUTHORITIES WHICH ISSUE REVENUE BONDS SECURED BY LEASES, ETC.

GEORGIA STATE SCHOOL BUILDING AUTHORITY

Bonds are secured by a prior lien on rentals received from county boards of education and governing bodies of independent school systems within the State pursuant to lease agreements. The rentals, payable each September 1, are sufficient to pay interest and retire bonds at maturity, to provide hazard reserve for insurance, maintenance reserve and operating funds. The State board of education, a party of all lease agreements between local units and the authority, pays the above rentals on behalf of local units directly to the authority.

GEORGIA STATE BRIDGE BUILDING AUTHORITY

Bonds are payable from pledge of rentals derived from lease to State highway department of certain bridges. Annual rentals cover debt service and cost of operating and maintenance costs of said bridges.

GEORGIA STATE OFFICE BUILDING AUTHORITY

Bonds secured by prior lien on revenues received from various State departments and State agencies. Rentals to be charged each lessee, $3.50 per square foot annually, subject to increase if inadequate, are payable quarterly until October 15 1978, or retirement of bonds, whichever is later.

GEORGIA STATE HOSPITAL AUTHORITY

Bonds secured by revenues from rentals and income received under terms of leases to the State board of health. Lessee agrees to pay quarterly an amount equal to bond requirements and reserve therefor.

STATE HIGHWAY AND BRIDGE AUTHORITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Bonds are secured by pledge of rentals payable by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania covering projects leased by the authority to the Commonwealth at annual rentals sufficient to meet the annual principal and interest requirements.

GENERAL STATE AUTHORITY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Bonds secured by pledge of all rentals payable by State of Pennsylvania from its current revenues under leases covering projects leased by the authority to the State, which leases are to provide for payments at annual rentals sufficient to meet annual principal and interest requirements.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE PUBLIC SCHOOL BUILDING AUTHORITY

Bonds secured by pledge of leases between authority and certain school districts and which the school districts are obligated to pay out of their current revenues including taxes and reimbursements from the State. Rentals on all leases pledged are sufficient to cover 122 percent of the principal and interest requirements on all such bonds.

MARYLAND STATE ROADS COMMISSION

Bonds are secured by an annual tax consisting of such amounts as may be necessary of—(a) the proceeds of the 2-percent excise tax on the issuance of certificate of title for motor vehicles, and (b) a 50-percent share of the gasoline-tax fund allocated to the commission.

LOUISIANA STATE BUILDING AUTHORITY

State law provides for servicing of authority's bonds and prior charges from proceeds of the 1.47-mill State ad valorem tax on all taxable property within the State after payment of principal and interest on certain bonds of the State.

OKLAHOMA PLANNING AND RESOURCES BOARD

Bonds are secured solely from pledge of revenues from park system earnings as follows:

1. Specified minimum lease rentals from concessionaries or specified percentages of lessees' gross revenues, whichever is greater.

2. Gross revenues of facilities operated directly by the State, and

3. Pledge of State to collect, to the extent when necessary when receipts from (1) and (2) are insufficient, admission fees to improved areas of each and every State park.

DETROIT-WAYNE JOINT BUILDING AUTHORITY

Bonds payable from proceeds of fixed annual rentals by the city of Detroit and by Wayne County in amounts sufficient to pay interest and principal.

ALABAMA AGRICULTURAL CENTER CORP.

Bonds secured by pledge of resources of special agricultural center fund into which are deposited rentals paid by agricultural center board. Bonds carry an additional pledge of amounts, if needed, from a special agricultural fund deposited in the State treasury.

ALABAMA BUILDING CORP.

Bonds secured by leases to various State departments and agencies. Current debt service constitutes a prior claim on rentals, ahead of all other claims.

ALABAMA STATE DOCKS BOARD

Bonds secured by pledge of lease agreements with the city of Mobile. There is provision for accrual and maintenance of a reserve fund sufficient to pay principal and interest for 24 months in advance and for use of part of earnings under certain conditions for retirement of bonds.

FLORIDA STATE BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION

Bonds issued on behalf of counties and special districts are secured by the unit's distributive share of a statewide 2-cent-per-gallon tax on gasoline and other motor fuels, and are further secured by full faith, credit, and taxing power of the local unit.

FLORIDA STATE ROAD DEPARTMENT

Bonds are secured by leases of the various properties to the State of Florida. In the majority of cases the rental obligations are equal to aggregate debt-service requirements on lessor bonds issued in acquisition of the projects. All rental contracts between the department and the various instrumentalities provide for purchase by payment of the rentals; title to vest in the State on completion of the payments.

ILLINOIS ARMORY BOARD

Bonds are secured by leases of armories and assigned to a trustee. All rentals under these leases are paid directly by the State to the trustee, to be used for payment of principal and interest.

LOUISIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Bonds are secured as to payment solely by an irrevocable dedication of an amount sufficient to pay principal and interest on the bounds and any required reserves from the annual franchise tax on corporations levied by authority of the State legislature.

MAINE SCHOOL BUILDING AUTHORITY

Bonds secured by lease agreements with town and community school districts providing for rentals to be paid by the communities sufficient to pay principal and interest on certain administrative expenses. Further provision is made that if the municipality is delinquent in payments to the authority the State department of education "shall make payments to the authority in lieu of such town, city, or community school district from any amount properly payable to such town, city, or community school district by said department."

MEDICAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, by request, on half of myself, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes. This bill is requested by the Department of Defense, and is accompanied by a letter of transmittal explaining the purpose of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2720) to provide medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The letter of transmittal is as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., July 30, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is forwarded herewith a revised draft of legislation, "To provide medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes."

This revised proposal is in substitution of the proposal submitted to the Congress on January 13, 1955, and introduced in the Congress by you and Senator SALTONSTALL as S. 934.

Since the submission of our proposal in January, the Department has had further discussions within the executive branch of the Government and with certain other interested groups and it has been concluded that the proposal should be broadened to provide the more detailed program for dependent medical care which would be authorized by this proposal.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that the draft of bill would be in accord with the program of the President. Technical improvements in all probability may be proposed and certain questions will be further considered, such, for example, as the coverage of widows and other dependents of deceased military personnel and the extent to which military personnel may be authorized on their own option to move in and out of insured status.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This proposed legislation would authorize the Department of Defense to provide medical care for all eligible dependents of military personnel wherever located. Heretofore, medical care has been largely confined to those living near military medical installations. Although those living at a distance have been eligible for such care, as a practical matter adequate medical attention could not be provided them. Additionally, in congested areas, military medical facilities are often inadequate to meet the needs.

On April 1, 1953, the Secretary of Defense established a Citizens Advisory Commission on Medical Care for Dependents of Military Personnel to study this problem. The Chairman of the Committee was Dr. Harold G. Moulton, president emeritus of the Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C. Other members were Thomas L. Parkinson, president of the Equitable Life Insurance Company of America, New York City; Dr. Lewis Webster Jones, president of Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.; Mrs. Eugene Meyer, student and writer on social problems, Washington, D. C.; and Dr. George William Bachman, senior staff member in charge of health studies of the Brookigs Institution, Washington, D. C. In June 1953 the Commission submitted its report and recommendations, copies of which were sent to the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate.

Basic recommendations of the Commission are incorporated into this proposed legislation. Some of the salient features of this revised proposal are:

1. Dependents of members of the Armed Forces would be authorized medical care in accordance with specific limitations set forth in the bill and as implemented by regulations as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense and approved by the President under the following optional plans:

(a) In military medical facilities, subject to the availability of space, facilities, and capabilities of the medical staff;

(b) Through an insurance plan; and

(c) Through civilian medical sources for dependents of members of the Armed Forces not participating in an insurance plan, provided no military medical facilities are available to such dependents.

Under option No. 1, the Secretary of Defense would be authorized to establish charges for subsistence provided dependents of members of the Armed Forces in connection with medical care in military facilities. Further, as a restraint on excessive demands for medical attention in military medical facilities, additional charges may be imposed for outpatient care, but such charges would be limited to such amounts as are established by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to special findings that such charges are necessary.

Under option No. 2, members of the Armed Forces would be entitled to participate in an insurance plan wherein the cost of the insurance contract would be apportioned between the member of the Armed Forces concerned and the Federal Government. The contribution by the member of the Armed Forces would not exceed 30 percent of the monthly cost, nor a maximum of $3.00 per-month, estimated at the time of his filing of a request to participate.

Under option No. 3, dependents of members of the Armed Forces who do not elect to participate in an insurance plan and who are in need of medical care for which military medical facilities are not available because of inaccessibility, lack of space, facilities, or capabilities of the medical staff would be authorized to receive medical care from licensed physicians and facilities under civilian control. However, under this option no funds would be expended for professional service except in accordance with schedules of maximum fees and costs of such professional services established by the Secretary of Defense. As a restraint on excessive demands under this option, dependents receiving medical care in civilian medical facilities would be required to pay 30 percent of the first $100, plus 15 percent of the remainder of the cost of inpatient care and 30 percent of the cost of outpatient care. However, in cases of protracted periods of illness or other hardship cases, the Secretary of Defense might provide for the transfer of such dependent to a military medical facility or take such other appropriate action to alleviate such hardship.

2. The medical care provided heretofore has not been complete, and it has differed in extent in the three Services. The limiting factor in general has been the availability of facilities, but at the same time certain types of illnesses have been excluded. The Commission recommended uniformity in practice throughout the Armed Forces as well as strict limitations with respect to the illnesses covered. Specifically excluded from the bill are the following: Hospitalization for domiciliary care and chronic diseases, and chronic mental and nervous disorders, the provision of prosthetic devices, hearing aids, orthopedic footwear and spectacles (however, overseas and in remote areas of the United States where if available from military stocks prosthetic devices, hearing aids, orthopedic footwear and spectacles may be provided at prices equal to the cost to the Government), ambulance service, except in acute emergency, and home calls, except in special cases as determined by the cognizant physician. Dental treatment is restricted to emergency dental care except outside the United States and in remote areas where adequate civilian dental facilities are not available. In such cases dental treatment might be provided from military dental sources, but would depend upon the availability of space, facilities and capabilities of the dental staff. The bill specifically provides that dental treatment would not be authorized at Government expense through civilian dental sources, except as a necessary adjunct to medical or surgical treatment.

3. Medical care under the terms of the bill would be limited to the following: diagnosis; treatment of acute medical and surgical conditions; treatment of contagious diseases; immunization; and maternity and infant care.

4. The proposed legislation incorporates various safeguards, and would give the Secretary of Defense the authority to promulgate regulations and to fix such charges as he might deem appropriate in order to implement this legislation fairly, and to prevent excessive demands for medical care. This legislation is also designed to be flexible enough to provide a basis in law for the needs in this area during peacetime and in times of national emergency.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The following tabulation represents estimated costs covering a year of operation under the proposal using the estimated number of dependents as of December 31, 1954:

Insurance plan

1. Total dependents in United States as of December 31, 1954	2,204,000
2. Dependents to receive care in other than military hospitals—43 percent x 2,204,000	947,720
3. Dependents to receive care in other than military hospitals who will elect to participate in a private insurance plant—95 percent x 947,720	900,334

Estimated costs

4. Gross cost of medical care to be performed in other than military hospitals (includes 10 percent administrative overhead)	$88,000,000

Estimated costs—Continued

5. Less insurance participant contribution of $3 per month per family	$15,000,000
6. Net cost to Government	73,000,000

Estimated cost of medical care for dependents who receive medical care in other than military hospitals who will not elect to participate in a private insurance plan

1. Gross inpatient care	$2,800,000
2. Less patient's contribution—30 percent of first $100 plus 15 percent of remaining bill	600,000
3. Net cost to Government for inpatient care	2,200,000
4. Gross outpatient care	1,400,000
5. Less patients' contribution—30 percent of cost	520,000
6. Net cost to Government for out patient care	880,000
7. Net cost to Government for inpatient and outpatient care	3,000,000
Estimated total cost to Government to implement legislation	76,000,000

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT TRIPP ROSS.

PROPOSED MISSOURI BASIN COMMISSION AND COMPACT BOARD ACT

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Missouri Basin Commission and Compact Board. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, in connection with the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2728) to establish a Missouri Basin Commission and Compact Board to provide coherent and unified direction for the development of the Missouri Basin's natural resources, to give responsible direction to the resource development activities of the Federal Government in the Missouri Basin, and for coordinating those activities with resource development activities of the States, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The statement presented by Mr. HENNINGS is as follows:

I am today reintroducing my bill to establish a Missouri Basin Commission and Compact Board for the comprehensive development of the land and water resources within the Missouri Basin. This measure was introduced in the last Congress, and I regret that it was not acted upon. I regret Congress failed to act because the problems of water resources are increasingly of great importance. The fact is that we always find ourselves in some kind of an emergency with respect to water problems. Either we are confronted with the devastation of a flood or we are faced with a prolonged and destructive drought. I do not say that we should not take emergency measures to meet emergency situations. I do say, however, that emergency action is no substitute for a carefully planned, well-thought-out program that will insure a lasting solution to our long-term problems. In my judgment, the longer we postpone taking any real and effective action to conserve our land and water resources, the more serious will be our situation and the greater will be the economic loss accumulated year after year—all because we lack the courage and vision to put aside our sectional and jurisdictional differences and act for the good of the Nation as a whole.

My bill deals with the Missouri Basin—a vast section of our country comprising one-sixth of our total land area. I can see no reason, however, why the policies proposed in this measure could not serve as a pattern for land and water resource development in other parts of the country, or for a national land and water resources policy. We have spent many, many years debating these issues. We have had a plethora of studies and investigations; we have had task forces and committees and conferences and commissions. We have taken millions of words of testimony and published millions of pages of reports. But we don't have a policy. We have literally picked the best brains in our country. We have had the advice of competent engineers, of experts in agriculture and irrigation and reclamation, of qualified spokesmen in water pollution and fish and wildlife conservation and power and navigation. And now we have a President's Cabinet Committee, and the Hoover Commission, and the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations studying the same problems all over again. But we still don't have a policy.

This just doesn't make sense. We know that effective use of our land and water resources isn't something that can just happen overnight. It takes years—generations even—and though we are blessed with great riches in our Nation, we cannot go on indefinitely squandering our resources in this reckless and profligate fashion.

In this connection, I would like to call the attention of the Senate to an article by Peter F. Drucker in the June issue of Harper's. Commenting on this precise issue, he stated in his article:

"The geography textbooks have it that the United States is favored above all nations with natural resources. It is certainly true that our food-producing capacity is so great that we will be able to feed even the very much larger population of 1975 out of domestic resources—and at a higher standard of nutrition. And while, 20 years hence, the United States will be a net importer of most industrial raw materials on a gigantic scale, it will still produce a much larger share of its basic needs than other Western countries. But there is one natural resource in which the United States, compared to Western Europe, has always been badly supplied. It is a basic one: water. Not only is rainfall over large parts of the country deficient, and abundant rainfall limited to small areas in the northwest and southeast, but because of geography, geology, or soil structure far too much of the rainfall we get seems to be lost in run-off rather than stored up in the subterranean water table for future use.

"During the past 15 years, the signs have multiplied that we are living off our water capital—running the risk of repeating with our water resources the orgy of destruction we indulged in with our soil. Water tables, once depleted, are even more difficult to restore than eroded and depleted soil. Yet we continuously pour new population and new industries into areas of marginal water supply, inviting disasters that we should have experience enough to forestall."

The situation in the Missouri Basin combines all the aspects of our natural resources problem. We find ourselves repeatedly in a state of emergency growing out of water—too much of it, or lack of it. I have spoken in the Senate and elsewhere in great detail about the land and water problems in the Missouri Basin, so I shall not again go into all of the details at this time. Suffice it to say that repeatedly, over many years, we have had recurring and terrible floods; we have had extended and disastrous droughts; and we have been severely handicapped by the lack of any adequate organization of all the diverse agencies and groups concerned with the problem. What we so urgently need is a program large enough in scope, in leadership, in responsibility, and in authority, to match the size of the tasks in the basin.

The bill I am introducing today would, I believe, provide such a program and it would offer a sound basis for the orderly development of the great land and water resources in the Missouri Basin.

The bill recommends the establishment of a Missouri Basin Commission with authority to coordinate the activities of the various agencies operating in the basin—beginning at the planning stage and carrying through beyond the installation of the projects. It also includes a provision that would grant consent to the Missouri Basin States for the establishment of an interstate compact board. This provision assures a method whereby the various States would formally participate in the program, share in planning, review proposals of the Commission, and exercise a distinct function in approving or disapproving the programs and budgets for resources development which the Commission would submit to the Congress.

From time to time, I have discussed on the Senate floor and elsewhere many of the problems arising out of the lack of a coordinated program in the Missouri Basin. These problems are not new. Ever since the Louisiana Purchase of 1803, early settlers and residents of the basin have periodically fought a losing battle to protect rich farm lands, communities, and industrial centers against the natural hazards of flood and drought. The records indicate that one of the worst floods in the basin occurred in 1844, but it was not until 100 years later, in 1944, that the Congress, in a belated effort to do something about the repeated losses in lives, crops, livestock, and residential and industrial property, authorized the highly controversial compromise proposal known as the Pick-Sloan plan. The plan evolved from the fact that the many diverse interests represented in the basin—the various governmnetal agencies concerned with land and water problems, the executives of the several States, the residents of the Valley—had failed to come to any substantial meeting of the minds as to the best method of solving a highly complex and technical problem. Now, after more than a decade and the investment of billions of dollars, there is still little real agreement as to the best means for effectively meeting the water resource needs of the area.

The Task Force on Natural Resources of the first Hoover Commission in its report in January 1949 stated: "The authorized Pick-Sloan plan is essentially a hydraulic engineering approach to solution of the Missouri problems, designed to contribute whatever water control on streams can accomplish. Upstream watershed control, water and soil conservation on farms and ranches, general review of land use, development of mineral and other raw material sources, and social and economic measures for diversification and stabilization of means of livelihood are included only to a limited extent. Although directed toward a cooperative approach, there is no means provided for an integrated, dynamic view of the region as a whole."

That there has been general recognition of the need for coordinated and integrated planning and development of our Nation's land and water resources has been clear for many years. Almost half a century ago President Theodore Roosevelt in a message to Congress on December 8, 1908, said:

"Until the work of river improvement is undertaken in a modern way, it cannot have results that will meet the needs of this modern Nation.

"These needs should be met without further dillydallying or delay. The plan which promises the best and quickest results is that of a permanent commission authorized to coordinate the work of all the Government departments relating to waterways, and to frame and supervise the execution of a comprehensive plan.

"Under such a commission the actual work of construction might be entrusted to the Reclamation Service; or to the military engineers acting with a sufficient number of civilians to continue the work in time of war; or it might be divided between the Reclamation Service and the Corps of Engineers.

"The essential thing is that the work should go forward under the best possible plan, and with the least possible delay. We should have a new type of work and a new organization for planning and directing it."

More recently this same need was reemphasized in a report dated February 19, 1951, submitted by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission. This Commission had made an exhaustive study of our Nation's water resources, and in volume 2 of its report entitled, "Ten Rivers in America's Future," it devoted at least 100 pages to the problems of the Missouri Basin. The report pointed out the tremendous importance of the proper use of water in the whole economy and well-being of the Missouri Basin—and I think summed up the essence very well in the following sentences:

"Water—or lack of it—is the basic cause of Missouri Basin difficulties. It is at the root of many of its special economic difficulties. Floods long have plagued settlement along the river. From one end of the basin to the other they have exacted an enormous toll in money and lives. They have carried away homes and possessions. They have destroyed crops and drowned livestock. Transportation has often been disrupted. Even the land itself has been destroyed or made useless, and cities no less than the smaller hamlets and farms have felt their fury.

"Droughts have left their mark on the basin. Lands have been abandoned, wheat fields have become dust bowls for periods. Cattle have died of starvation and thirst, and people have been forced off the land. Once flowing wells now are pumped; many dug wells have become dry."

The report then went on to say:

"One of the principal missing items for efficient planning of operations is the absence of a measure or guide to the relative importance of the many various interests involved in most of the projects. * * * The many interests involved in the basin program will require coordination for maximum efficiency and beneficial results. Care must be taken that operation of projects is not allowed to get out of balance in favor of any one interest or any one locality or region. A close balance must be maintained with respect to all needs and beneficial effects."

I have long been convinced that without real coordination it would be infeasible if not completely impossible to control and effectively utilize the vast water resources within the Missouri Basin. I have witnessed, as have many of my colleagues in the Senate, the terrible devastation caused by the raging waters of the "Mighty Mo." We have witnessed the equally distressing loss caused by prolonged drought. The fact that we have done nothing to solve these problems is certainly not to our credit.

It was with these thoughts in mind that I introduced a bill in August of 1951 to establish a Missouri Basin survey commission to make a full and complete study of this complex question. As I have said, however, many studies have been made and if the job ended there, nothing new would be contributed to our thinking. My resolution, therefore, provided further that the commission be charged with the duty of formulating an integrated program based on the total land and water use of the area, and still further, the commission would be directed to make positive and specific recommendations for carrying out such a program.

While my proposed resolution was never acted upon by the Congress, the commission was, nevertheless, established by Executive order of President Truman. The commission appointed by the President included Members of the Senate, the House of Representatives, and public members, and was truly a bipartisan or, I might better say, a nonpartisan commission. President Truman recognized and pointed out again the need for an overall program for the basin instead of the present piecemeal approach which we have been following. In establishing the commission he said:

"There is general agreement that these previous plans contain much that is valuable and sound today. There is also general agreement that there is a need now for a thorough reevaluation of the whole problem, in order that all who are concerned with the basin—Federal, State, and local governments, and private groups and individuals—may have the benefit of an expert and authoritative judgment on what are the most important steps that should be taken in the future, and which of them should be taken first.

"That is why I have established this Commission. I want them to review the many different kinds of problems that exist in the large area of the basin—ranging from high, arid plains and mountains on the west to the humid, level lands along the lower river. I want them to give the country their advice as to the best way to achieve an orderly, businesslike development of the resources of the basin—a development that places first things first and provides for the greatest resulting benefits for all the people of the basin and the Nation."

The Commission on which it was my privilege to serve as Vice Chairman had been given a tremendous task. Our assignment was to prepare recommendations for the better protection, development, and use of the land and water resources of the Missouri Basin. The scope of our study was to be far broader than flood control and drought. It included irrigation, navigation, and hydroelectric power development, pollution control, recreation, fish and wildlife conservation, as well as the highly controversial question of the allocation of costs for each of the aspects of resource development. As I said, this was a big assignment. In the first place, the Missouri Basin includes all or parts of 10 States. It embraces 529,000 square miles in the heart of our Nation.

The Commission heard more than 400 witnesses at 17 separate hearings. In addition, we studied reports from Federal and State resource agencies and the activities which they regulated. We met in a great many executive sessions to hear spokesmen from these agencies. As a result of our hearings and our further detailed study over many months, it was apparent that there had to be some agency with authority (1) to determine the scope of operations of the various Federal bureaus and departments and (2) to bring these agencies together in