



5-27-1953

## Excerpt from Congressional Record Regarding Amendment Proposed by Representative Burdick to Reduce Appropriation to Corps of Army Engineers, May 27, 1953

US Congress

Usher Burdick

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/burdick-papers>

---

### Recommended Citation

US Congress and Burdick, Usher, "Excerpt from Congressional Record Regarding Amendment Proposed by Representative Burdick to Reduce Appropriation to Corps of Army Engineers, May 27, 1953" (1953). *Usher Burdick Papers*. 420.  
<https://commons.und.edu/burdick-papers/420>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Elwyn B. Robinson Department of Special Collections at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Usher Burdick Papers by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [und.common@library.und.edu](mailto:und.common@library.und.edu).

we cannot meet the competition that we must meet. At the present time there are 35 foreign ships hauling lumber from British Columbia to our Atlantic coast. Foreign lumber is coming in here while we are not permitted to load a ship and move lumber from the west coast to the east coast.

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

Mr. SCUDDER. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I believe my colleague, the gentleman from California, has a very worthy project. It is economical in the sense that it will provide for the shipment of a large quantity of virgin lumber from the northern part of California, which now cannot be marketed because of the lack of facilities in Humboldt Harbor.

Mr. SCUDDER. That is right. There is 1 lumber company from New York that invested \$3½ million and they are shipping lumber from there to the east coast. But they cannot fully load in that harbor and get it out because it costs an extra \$5,000 to \$8,000 per ship to move it.

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

Mr. SCUDDER. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. Do I understand as a result of this amendment by which you propose to spend \$500,000, the Federal Government will get back half again that much in a year's time in revenue?

Mr. SCUDDER. That is right.

Mr. HOSMER. This certainly seems like a good deal, and an economical and a sensible project.

Mr. SCUDDER. Eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars of lumber a year can be purchased in that area from the Federal Government, and the whole project calls for only \$500,000. I believe—I know that the Federal Government will make money on this project. You are simply allowing our natural resources to go to waste.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this is another meritorious project, but it is a new start, and therefore I do not believe it proper to appropriate funds for it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Scudder].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURDICK: On page 4, line 5, after the figure "\$254,123,000", insert "of which not more than \$250,123,000 shall be obligated during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1953."

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, the reason why the first amendment did not apply is that you boosted the amount during the debate. Now I have reduced the amount to which you boosted it by \$4 million.

If some of you gentlemen who wanted to get a project in your district had let me talk a little while before, you would have had some money to use. But you were determined to do all the talking. Now go and get the money.

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

Mr. BURDICK. I always yield to the gentleman from Cape Cod.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I might ask the gentleman from North Dakota just one question. I have tried to the best of my ability, which is not too much, I guess.

Mr. BURDICK. To which I agree.

Mr. NICHOLSON. To get something for my district here in the Congress. So far I have not been able to do it. If the gentleman from North Dakota will show me how, I certainly should use that method.

Mr. BURDICK. Well, if you will sit down I will try to show you.

When this project was authorized it provided for approximately 1,830 feet level of water. Everything was planned accordingly. I was in the Congress when that was done, and I wanted to make sure that our irrigation projects would be protected. So we wrote into that bill, as it passed this House, that the building of this reservoir should never at any time interfere with our operating the irrigation plants or the city of Williston. I thought that settled it. But now the Army engineers, of their own volition, have come along and they want 20 feet higher water. That means that the irrigation plants in the areas will be drowned out, and a city of 16,000 people will be drowned out, and the water system and the only railroad drowned out. Then they in turn say, "We will protect you. Don't worry about us. We are for you." Just like this committee is for you fellows. We are for you. Now they propose dikes. They propose to build dikes, and this very moment they are out buying land in my section of the country for the purpose of building dikes. A 1,830-foot flood will not fill up that reservoir until 12 or 15 years. So you are spending \$4 million this afternoon to buy land for dikes that this Congress knows nothing about. Now, if that is good business, go ahead and do it. I suppose you noticed this afternoon that I became very conservative. I voted against the attempt to raise this amount of money, and I voted with the Committee. Now I want the Committee to vote with me. I am cutting it down.

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

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. TABER. How do they propose to get the water that seeps through the dike back into the river?

Mr. BURDICK. Of course they will never do it. This Congress knows nothing about dikes built on the quicksands of the Missouri River. I have lived up there all my life and I know all about it. You cannot build a dike on that formation that will not seep water, and you cannot protect those irrigation plants, because that water will seep through and destroy all of the agricultural land. There will not be a basement in Williston that will not be full of water. Of course, the center of business activity is not going to the south at all. It is going to Williston. I think this is just a conspiracy to try to drown out our town ahead of time. What is the use of putting all that money out 12 years before you need it?

If you strike this out—this has been a burning political question in North Dakota; there are a lot of people for it and an awful lot of them against it, and I know in congressional battles those who have been for a high dam are still up there.

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

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Is not this the same issue that Mr. Lemke fought, bled, and died for on the floor of this House for a long time?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes; and I did everything that he did except die.

When Congress gets a chance to hold hearings on this question of a larger pool and a higher water level, and the possibility of dike protection to our irrigation projects, the city of Williston and the Great Northern Railroad I am sure Congress will not authorize any such fantastic enterprise, and in the meantime this reduction in the appropriation will keep the Army engineers from going any further, without authority, to seize land around the Williston and drive the owners off, when this river bed will not be raised to an 1830 level for the next 12 to 15 years. We have time enough to have Congress understand what the Army engineers are trying to do, and time enough to investigate the feasibility and the necessity of their proposed dike projects.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. KRUEGER].

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]. It is undoubtedly apparent that the senior member of the congressional delegation from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], is the larger half, but I am speaking frankly when I say I represent the greater portion of the population of North Dakota.

The sum which my colleague would take out of the bill he says is the sum necessary to acquire land that might possibly be flooded when the Garrison Dam is filled to its full height of 1,850 feet level.

Personally, I do not blame my friend, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], a great deal because he has a personal interest in the matter. May I point out that he is in error in the matter of representation. He says he represents a whole lot of North Dakota people although there are some who are against it. I assure you that the great majority of the people of North Dakota are for the higher dam level and the Congress has approved it several years ago.

The Army engineers thoroughly investigated the design of the dam and reservoir; those matters were approved long ago. The proposed appropriation for Garrison Dam has already been twice reduced. The so-called Truman budget approved \$39 million; the revised budget reduced the amount to \$31 million; and the committee in its effort to curtail expenses and exercise economy reduced it further to \$27 million. Now the gen-

tleman from North Dakota, my friend Mr. BURDICK, comes along and wants to reduce it by an additional \$4 million. The \$27 million is necessary at this time to proceed in the construction of the Garrison Dam in an orderly manner.

Much of the dam is already completed. The closure ceremony is scheduled within a few days. Many of you Members have been invited, and I have replies saying that you will attend the closing ceremony at Garrison Dam. I think you who go there will see and hear for yourselves that the higher level of the dam, which has long been approved, is no longer an issue. This matter of prohibiting the acquisition of land which may be inundated by the higher level is a back-door entrance to prevent the construction of the dam at Garrison to the higher level. I am opposing the amendment and I hope it is defeated.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this project is over 70 percent completed. Other Congresses have passed on this matter of the height of the dam. The Corps of Engineers has given us assurances with respect to their ability to handle the construction of the dikes in this area.

This is not a saving of money, because every dollar this would save now would deprive the Federal Government of \$7.50 in revenue that would be obtainable annually as a result of the increased elevation of the pool. I think it would be unwise to adopt the amendment.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. Is the gentleman prepared to tell this committee that the building of those dikes is a practical and a safe proposition for the people and for the agricultural land as well as the city of Williston?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is the assurance we have had in testimony by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. BURDICK. Is that the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not an expert on it.

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman has not had a hearing on it?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. BURDICK. Who was there besides the Engineers?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The Corps of Engineers testified on this particular project and there was a statement filed with the committee at a subsequent date on the very point.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 126, noes 67.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAGNUSON: On page 4, line 5, after the sum insert "an

additional sum, \$14,079,000, to be allocated as follows:

"Chief Joseph Dam, \$2,000,000;

"Albeni Falls Dam, \$1,200,000;

"McNary Lock and Dam, \$2,700,000;

"The Dalles Dam, \$8,179,000."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, the Pacific Northwest resource-development and flood-control program will suffer severely unless the Congress acts to provide sufficient funds for continuing orderly planning and construction of several important projects under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers.

I have been deeply disappointed by the drastic slashes made by the Appropriations Committee in funds for a number of the key projects in the Pacific Northwest. It will be noted that no planning or construction funds are provided for the important Eagle Gorge Dam and Reservoir, on the Green River, near Seattle, a stream that periodically floods, to cause tremendous damage and to threaten defense production and transportation in the area.

Another important project for which no funds are provided by the committee is the Ice Harbor Lock and Dam, on the Snake River, not far from the great Hanford Atomic Works. The power and the navigation aid which would be provided by the Ice Harbor Dam would be of tremendous value to this area.

Deep cuts were made by the committee in funds needed for the completion of projects which are now under way. I believe that most of us will agree that the sooner we can place new generators in production the sooner we can pay off, through earnings on the sale of power, the cost of installing those generators. The heavy cut in the appropriation for The Dalles Dam means that completion of this great project, on which more than \$24 million already has been spent, will be delayed another year, or quite likely 2 years. The longer we delay, the longer the Pacific Northwest will suffer from its great power shortage, and the longer will be the time before we can start returning to the Treasury the earnings from the sale of The Dalles power.

I feel that it is false economy to delay completion of this project. I feel it is also false economy to cut the amounts needed for construction of Albeni Falls Dam, Chief Joseph Dam, and McNary Lock and Dam.

The minimum that Congress should approve is the amount requested for these projects in the budget submitted by the White House. Personally, I feel that some of these budget items were unnecessarily low, but, in any event, they are the minimum needed to see that the generators start producing power for the energy-hungry Pacific Northwest.

My amendment would increase this construction item in the bill by \$14,079,000, which would raise to the level of the so-called Eisenhower budget amounts appropriated for continuing work on four Pacific Northwest multipurpose dams which are under construction.

The four dams under construction to which this \$14,079,000 would be allocated, under my amendment, are: Chief

Joseph Dam would be increased from \$23 million to \$25 million.

McNary lock and dam would be increased from \$25 million to \$27,700,000.

The Dalles Dam would be increased from \$29,250,000 to \$37,429,000.

Albeni Falls Dam in Idaho would be boosted from \$6 million to \$7,200,000.

The budget cuts made by the committee—and let me say that I share the committee's commendable desire to economize—would delay completion of these projects, to which we are irrevocably committed, and delay arrival of the day when the benefits and earnings of these dams will begin to be realized.

I urge approval of my amendment, which would restore the funds requested in the budget, and which are the smallest amounts that we economically should provide.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. I wonder if the gentleman thinks he might not unwittingly be doing the people in his area a disservice by asking for \$14 million additional at this time and whether he does not agree with me that the committee and the Congress over a period of time have been extremely generous to the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the gentleman that the Congress has been generous, and I think that its generosity will pay off. From an economic standpoint, I mean. I do not believe projects such as these are or should be settled on the basis of generosity or friendship. They must be economically sound, and I assure you that the public power program of the Pacific Northwest qualifies for that characterization.

I want to emphasize that these items that I would like to have restored to the bill were approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and I hope that this Committee of the Whole House will approve my amendment.

(Mr. METCALF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington because I am familiar with the power shortage in the Columbia Basin. The Columbia River which rises in Canada and flows through my own district in Montana is the last large untapped reservoir of power in the United States. It is important that this vast power potential be fully utilized in order for the entire Nation to have the benefit of the aluminum, the fertilizers, the minerals and the timber of the region. The tremendously important defense plants along the Columbia devour increased power faster than we are able to supply it. These big projects in the Northwest should not be slowed down, rather they should be accelerated in order to prepare to meet the power load that is increasing year by year.

When Bonneville Dam and Grand Coulee Dam were first started it was