

a plentiful amount of mortgage money available," he adds.

Officials of both the FHA and VA in Washington indicate they are not contemplating any cuts in the maximum permissive interest rates on mortgages backed by their agencies. The present FHA ceiling is 5½ percent, with another half-point added for insurance. The VA rate maximum is 4½ percent. Before the current upsurge in building and mortgage borrowing activity, there had been some talk of the advisability of the Government's trimming these fixed interest rates.

"Right now," says an FHA official, "our rate seems to be the rate which is meeting the mortgage market." And he adds: "Certain areas, in fact, need more mortgage money."

A measure of the investment appeal of fixed-interest mortgages is the amount of discount lenders may demand to buy such a lien. When a mortgage sells at 98, for example, the lender advances \$98 for each \$100 against the expectation of being repaid in full.

A Dallas VA official reports that GI mortgages priced at 91 and 92 points there in January through March, are now going to private lenders at 95 and 96 points. The FHA office in Jamaica, N. Y., serving New York City and suburban counties, reports that its Government-insured mortgages are now selling at par, up from 1- to 2-point discounts in effect last February.

CONVENTIONAL MORTGAGES

So-called conventional mortgages, which are not Government backed, currently pay interest yields ranging from about 5 percent to 6 percent, depending upon the section of the country. These rates generally are down about a percentage point from last January, largely as a result of the sharp influx of funds into the market at a time few mortgages were available for investment.

June applications for insurance on home loans, several FHA field offices said yesterday, ran well over those of the previous month. The San Francisco FHA office, for example, reported 5,626 applications against 4,094 in May and 1,447 in June 1957. At the agency's Chicago office, June applications totaled 1,267 for June against 933 in May. The Boston office added up 1,122 such requests last month against 1,044 the month earlier.

The Cleveland and New York FHA offices, however, showed slightly fewer mortgage insurance requests for June than the month before.

The Cleveland office of the Veterans' Administration, meantime, noted that its June loan requests "were 100 percent greater than in May and indications are July will be even bigger." VA officials in Philadelphia, Dallas, Los Angeles, and Chicago similarly told of substantial increases in June over May.

The VA in San Francisco, on the other hand, showed slight declines both in GI mortgage applications and in appraisal requests filed preliminary to loan applications.

Nationwide June activity figures are expected to be released by FHA and VA for their respective operations later this week. For May, FHA reported receiving applications for 90,000 housing units, topping the previous record of 89,764 reported for May 1950. Veterans' Administration national figures for May showed a rise of nearly 10,000 appraisal requests, and 8,705 home loan applications.

The stepped-up activity at Government home financing agencies is causing delays in processing the applications despite overtime operations and the use of so-called fee appraisers, outside experts who conduct inspections on a contract basis. This practice was recently authorized at the FHA though the VA has employed it for some time.

Comments an official in the Sacramento FHA office: "We're working out men Satur-

days plus 2 nights a week, but we'll be 6 weeks behind pretty soon unless this lets up."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 10, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 9 (legislative day of Monday, July 7), 1958:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

John A. McCone, of California, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 30, 1963.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Arthur S. Flemming, of Ohio, to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Gustav F. Doscher, Jr., of South Carolina, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 16, with headquarters at Charleston, S. C.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 9, 1958

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

I John 1: 5: God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all.

Eternal and ever-blessed God, may we now be drawn together in greater unity of spirit as we plan and labor for the welfare of our country and all mankind.

Strengthen and sustain us with Thy counsel and companionship and a vision of Thy divine purposes which can never be eclipsed by the forces of evil.

Grant that in the midst of worldwide conflict and confusion we may cleave with increasing tenacity of faith and courage to the abiding truth that nothing can ever impede the progress and triumph of the kingdom of righteousness.

Help us to strive more earnestly for the dawning of that blessed day when the spirit of man shall be lifted out of the darkness of hatred and selfishness into the glorious light of love and brotherhood.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 10347. An act to amend section 73 (q) of the Hawaiian Organic Act; to ap-

prove and ratify joint resolution 32, session laws of Hawaii, 1957, authorizing the issuance of \$14 million in aviation revenue bonds; to authorize certain land exchanges at Honolulu, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, for the development of the Honolulu airport complex; and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10504. An act to make the provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act applicable to certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 506 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities 13,000 additional copies of House Report No. 1360, current session, entitled "Annual Report for the Year 1957."

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

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Would the gentleman care to explain to the House in a few words what this is and what is the estimated cost?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. As I understand it, this is the annual report of the Committee on Un-American Activities. It is a sort of résumé of the things they did, the hearings they held, and the witnesses they interviewed during the year 1957. It is customary that this be printed as a House document, and it has been. This is a request for additional copies. The committee has letters from people who are asking that they be furnished with copies of this report.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It has been the custom down through the years to have this printed, and there have been a number of requests for copies of the report from year to year.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I believe that is correct. That is my understanding.

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

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Do the Members of the House generally share in the distribution of these extra copies, or do the copies go entirely to the committee?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Under the provisions of the resolution they go entirely to the committee. However, in the past House Members could get a reasonable number of copies from the committee. There is not a sufficient allotment to have any widespread distribution since they are asking for only 13,000 copies.

Mr. MARTIN. A Member can go to the committee, and they might be expected to be fair about the distribution.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is correct. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit while the House is in session during general debate for the remainder of the week.

Mr. MARTIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand both sides are agreeable to this and that they are probably going to conform their hearings to the actions of the House.

Mr. ALBERT. That is my understanding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 619) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of further conducting the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 107 of the 85th Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$25,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 5, strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$15,000."

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. May I say that this resolution was considered in the House Committee on Administration. It appears that the Committee on the Judiciary in order to complete its investigations needs a certain amount of money. The committee reduced the amount from \$25,000 to \$15,000. I think the resolution is all right. It was voted out unanimously by the House Committee on Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEE IN OFFICE OF DOORKEEPER

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 623) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective July 1, 1958, the basic compensation of the employee designated as "2 Female Attendant, Ladies' Retiring Room," on the June 1958 payroll of the office of the Doorkeeper, House of Representatives, shall be at the rate of \$1,800 per annum. The additional amount necessary to carry out this resolution shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to correct a false impression, as a result of yesterday's news accounts which missed the key points of the new defense education bill and the President's support of it.

To clarify this I will read a letter from the President written to my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT]:

JULY 7, 1958.

DEAR MR. WAINWRIGHT: It was a pleasure to meet with you and your associates and to receive later your letter concerning the action of the House Committee on Education and Labor on H. R. 13247.

I am pleased, of course, with your report that the committee has approved many provisions which generally follow the recommendations I made last January. I believe enactment of the emergency 4-year program, recommended by the administration, would have far-reaching benefits to education and to national security in the years ahead. There is a compelling national need for Federal action now to help meet emergency needs in American education.

This bill fulfills most of the objectives I outlined in my message to Congress last January. As I told you and your colleagues, I am in general sympathy with the provision for a loan fund which has been added. I do suggest, however, that the addition of this provision should lessen the need for scholarships. I hope, as the bill progresses, that adjustments will be made to reduce the number of scholarships. The committee bill, while adding the loan fund, also increases the scholarships from the 10,000 recommended by the administration to a figure somewhere between 18,000 and 23,000 a year. I also hope that the payment of scholarship stipends will not only be restricted to those students who show outstanding ability, but will also be paid only to the extent that such students need financial help in order to get a college education.

The passage of a sound educational bill is a top-priority objective for this session of Congress and I heartily support your efforts to achieve this objective. If the United

States is to maintain its position of leadership and if we are further to enhance the quality of our society, we must see to it that today's young people are prepared to contribute the maximum to our future progress and strength and that we achieve the highest possible excellence in our education.

With warm regards to you and your associates, I am,

Yours sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING HOUSE SESSION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

A LAST CHANCE FOR LEAD AND ZINC MINES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would provide for the stabilizing of production of copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluor-spar and tungsten from domestic mines.

This measure is a slightly modified version of the administration's stabilization program for these minerals frequently referred to as the Seaton plan. My bill is identical to S. 4036 as reported by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY on July 3 with committee amendments to the original S. 4036 as introduced on June 20. This Senate bill is explained in Senate Report No. 1799 as reported from the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Among other things, this bill would provide for the Government to pay domestic producers the difference between the market prices they receive and a set of fixed stabilization prices. For lead and zinc, as an example, the stabilization price for lead would be 15½ cents per pound, and the stabilization price for zinc would be 13½ cents per pound.

Bonuses also are provided for the first 500 tons of lead and zinc sold by a producer, which would be particularly helpful to the small and independent mines.

The program would be financed by giving the Secretary of the Interior authority to borrow up to \$350 million to implement the program.

The plight of the lead and zinc industry in Oklahoma, and particularly in the Congressional District which I represent, is desperate in the extreme. Lead and zinc miners, producers and smelters are suffering in extreme degree, and I have received literally hundreds of letters from my constituents urging immediate action to alleviate this situation.

This bill, on which early Senate action is expected, is, in my opinion, the last and sole hope in this session of the 85th

Congress for us to avoid outright disaster in the domestic lead and zinc industry. Therefore, I urge with all the strength at my command that this measure be adopted by the Congress at the very earliest possible time.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, Kansas has long needed a third Federal judge.

For years we struggled with one Federal judge; the work load continually increased; justice was too long delayed. Finally a second judge was provided. The late Honorable Arthur J. Mellor was appointed and served with distinction until his death, which again left Kansas but one Federal judge, the Honorable Delmas Hill.

With the appointment and confirmation last week of the Honorable Arthur J. Stanley, Jr., two judges will again preside in our courts. Even so, with the backlog of cases—with the constantly increasing caseload—these two, tireless workers though they may be, cannot possibly keep current and reduce the backlog in any appreciable degree.

This being true, Mr. Speaker, it was welcome news when it was learned that the Committee on the Judiciary has announced hearing on the omnibus judges' bill.

All necessary information to justify the third judge in Kansas has been furnished the committee.

It is yet possible for final passage of this important bill, and, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope there will be no further delay.

The following telegram from my own bar association is indicative of the feeling that exists throughout the State of Kansas.

The Wyandotte County Bar Association urges your support of the bill now coming before committee which would create a third Federal judgeship for Kansas. Litigation in the Federal court is increasing in Kansas. The caseload per judge is 50 percent greater than the national average. The docket is crowded. It is not in the interest of justice for two judges to be required to handle the Kansas docket. Kansas needs a third judge.

LEONARD O. THOMAS,
President, Wyandotte County Bar Association.

ADDITIONAL JUDGESHIPS IN TEXAS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to provide additional judgeships in Texas in the northern, western, and southern districts. There is an urgent need for these judgeships, and I understand an omnibus judgeship bill will be considered by the committee with hearings starting immediately.

It is my hope that the chairman and committee members will report out a bill for our immediate consideration, but should the omnibus bill continue to be shelved, because of alleged political implications or for other reasons, then the

bill I have introduced today can afford the relief so badly needed in Texas, if the committee will consider it.

Because of the backlog of cases and increased burdens on the judges and the hardship to litigants being substantially greater, these judgeships are needed and are long overdue. Take, for example, the case of the northern judicial district of Texas in which my Congressional District is located, a situation which was already bad and is now worse. Judge William H. Atwell, although retired, has been sitting and hearing cases until recently; but since he is in his 90th year he concluded that he should quit. That leaves two judges to handle the civil jury docket, the nonjury docket, the criminal docket, and the bankruptcy docket in Dallas, Fort Worth, Abilene, and San Angelo. This is an impossible task. The Texas Bar Association has unanimously passed a resolution July 5, 1958, and July 1957 asking the action of Congress, pointing out the need, and so informing the Representatives and Senators, urging their action and response. It seems to me that this resolution of the attorneys is worthy of immediate attention.

Therefore it is my urgent appeal to the committee chairman and my colleagues that these judgeships be considered so that this relief can be afforded as quickly as possible, if not through the omnibus bill, then through this bill which I have introduced providing the judgeships needed in Texas.

AUTHORIZING MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 617 and ask for its immediate consideration.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 121]

Adair	Everett	Magnuson
Anderson,	Evins	Mailliard
Mont.	Farbstein	Mason
Anfuso	Forrester	Morrow
Baring	Fountain	Miller, N. Y.
Bass, Tenn.	Gordon	Minshall
Baumhart	Granahan	Morris
Bolling	Grant	Morrison
Boyle	Green, Pa.	Moulder
Brownson	Gregory	Nix
Buckley	Griffiths	O'Brien, N. Y.
Burdick	Gwinn	Osmer
Carnahan	Halleck	Passman
Celler	Harvey	Patterson
Christopher	Healey	Philbin
Clark	Holt	Pilcher
Clevenger	James	Polk
Coffin	Jenkins	Powell
Collier	Jennings	Preston
Cramer	Jones, Mo.	Radwan
Curtis, Mo.	Kearney	Reece, Tenn.
Devereux	Kee	Reed
Dies	Kilburn	Robeson, Va.
Dollinger	Kilday	Rodino
Donohue	Kirwan	Sheehan
Dooley	Krueger	Shelley
Dorn, S. C.	Landrum	Shuford
Dowdy	Latham	Sieminski
Eberhart	Macdonald	Simpson, Ill.

Talle	Trimbie	Willis
Taylor	Tuck	Wilson, Ind.
Thompson, La.	Watts	Zelenko
Thompson, N. J.	Wharton	
Thornberry	Williams, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 325 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 7963) to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 617 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 13015, the military construction authorization bill. The resolution provides for an open rule and 2 hours of general debate.

The total amount authorized is \$1,762,904,000; \$732,071,000 is authorized for the Army; of this amount approximately 63 percent is for the guided-missile program—the surface-to-air missile program, including logistic support facilities, and research and development and training facilities. In addition, \$30,847,000 is authorized to defray deficiencies in authorizations previously granted because of the general rise in construction costs throughout the world.

The Navy is authorized \$319,048,000 for new public works and \$15,825,000 for deficiencies in authorizations. A major part of the funds are to be used to modernize the Navy's Shore Establishment and to replace obsolescent and deteriorated facilities.

The Air Force authorization is \$957,372,000 for construction of new facilities at 160 major installations, plus facilities

at sites for strategic defense and tactical missiles, off-base navigational aids, aircraft control and warning system sites. Also, \$4,372,000 is authorized for the Air Force Academy and \$13,411,000 for increased authorizations for prior years' projects for a total of \$975,155,000.

Fifty million dollars is authorized for the Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Department of Defense. The bill authorizes a total of 53,904 family housing units to be developed either under the Capehart and surplus commodity programs or military construction, plus another 9,374 units to be acquired under the Wherry housing program. The authorization for Reserve component facilities is \$30,958,000.

I urge the adoption of House Resolution 617 so the House may proceed to the consideration of H. R. 13015 for which ample time has been provided.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] and reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Did the Committee on Rules give any particular attention to section 110 of this bill, which provides for the moving of an ordnance depot from near Houston, Tex., to somewhere in Alabama at a cost to the taxpayers of more than \$44 million?

Mr. MADDEN. The committee did not give any special attention to that particular phase of it, but no doubt it will be brought out in debate on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Indiana explained so ably, House Resolution 617 makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 13015, the so-called military construction authorization bill, with 2 hours of general debate. It is an open rule which will permit amendments.

This legislation, and the report thereon, are quite voluminous and quite detailed. The bill, if my recollection serves me correctly, authorizes the expenditure of over \$1.7 billion for military construction of different types in different sections of the country for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and their military installations.

A great part of the funds involved in this legislation would be for the construction of new military housing. This is a measure I feel should be explained rather thoroughly, and I am sure it will be by the members of the Committee on Armed Services. It does involve, as I have said, the expenditure of a great deal of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF EMPLOYMENT OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL IN THE INTEREST OF NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. MADDEN (on behalf of Mr. COLLIER) from the Committee on Rules, re-

ported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 624, Rept. No. 2123), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, that upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that, the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1411) to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. MADDEN (on behalf of Mr. O'NEILL) from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 625, Rept. No. 2124), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13121) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking House minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PROMOTING BOATING SAFETY ON NAVIGABLE WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (H. Res. 626, Rept. No. 2125), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11078) to promote boating safety on the navigable waters of the United States, its Territories, and possessions; to provide coordination and cooperation with the States in the interest of uniformity of boating laws; and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and

controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AUTHORIZE CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13015), with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

This bill is known as the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1959.

The grand total of all authorities granted in the bill is \$1,762,904,000.

This total is made up of a number of elements, two of which are new in this year's bill. This grand total of \$1,762,904,000 is broken down into its six elements as follows:

Army, \$332,071,000.

Navy, \$319,048,000.

Air Force, \$957,372,000.

Department of Defense—for the Advanced Research Projects Agency, \$50 million.

Deficiency authorizations, \$64,455,000.

Construction for the Reserve components—armories and Reserve facilities, \$39,958,000.

Now, this construction bill, of course, is a reflection of the size of our Armed Forces. This year, it is based on 870,000 men in the Army, 864 ships in the Navy, and 105 wings in the Air Force authorized for June 30, 1959.

Each of the services has its physical plant requirement which, together with the men and the weapons, makes up the total of our defense. The physical plant is an absolutely essential part of the defense structure and it must be improved, added to, and kept modern all of the time.

Now, a bill of this kind has its origin in the requests made by the field establishments of the three services. It is then submitted through channels to the particular military department headquarters in Washington. That department reviews it and it is finally submitted to the Secretary of the military department for his approval. The program then goes to the Secretary of Defense, and specifically to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and

Installations, a position now very competently held by Mr. Floyd S. Bryant.

Mr. Bryant's job is to review and coordinate all of the military construction programs, making certain, for example, that facilities of one service that are not now being used to full capacity be used by another service. This office takes the overall view of the total construction program.

Following this process this year from a dollar standpoint, the picture is this: the field offices of the three departments made requests for construction totaling over two and a quarter billion dollars. Each of the three services cut this sum and the Secretary of Defense's office cut it further. So that we have before us a bill as I described it above.

This year the field requests of the three military departments totaled over two and a quarter billion dollars. The bill as submitted to the committee for the three military departments was \$1,634,000,000. The committee reduced this by over \$25 million, but in view of the fact that the committee inserted language authorizing the construction of armories in the amount of \$40 million, it makes the total of the bill approximately \$15 million more than asked for by the departments.

The two new elements injected into this bill, which I mentioned, are an authority in the amount of \$50 million for the Advanced Research Projects Agency and almost \$40 million for construction of armories and Reserve facilities for all of our Reserve components. Neither of these has appeared in a military construction bill before this year.

The bill represents some 2,800 individual items, not counting the Reserve construction or the Advanced Research Projects Agency. These line items are carried in what are called backup books and I have brought one of those books—only one of them—to the floor today in order that the House can have some idea of the amount of detailed study which goes into one of these bills. This particular book has 111 pages and is only 1 of 9 books.

Obviously, it would be impossible to go into any great detail with respect to a program of this size on the floor of the House. Indeed, it would take as long for me to explain it on the floor as it took the committee to study it during its hearings. I will, therefore, deal with some of the highlights of the program in order to make the general picture clear to the Members of the House.

For example, some \$545 million of construction in this bill is directly in support of our missile programs; about \$230 million is for expanded radar defense systems; \$208 million is for improving the capabilities of our Strategic Air Command; and \$178 million is for research and development, antimissile missiles, and facilities needed for outer space projects. Understand, none of this authority is for missiles themselves or for other equipment. It is all for construction.

These elements of the program alone make up 80 percent of the total construction for the three military departments.

Before looking at the highlights of the programs for the three military depart-

ments, let me point out one important matter which goes directly to the question of construction costs, and that is the fact that 94 percent of all of the construction contracts let by the military departments are on a bid basis. The competition is strong and the prospective contractors are using their sharpest pencils to get the work. To my mind, there is no greater assurance of getting a dollar's worth of construction for a dollar spent than this bid process.

ARMY

Let us look first at the Army program: Almost 40 percent of the Army program, or over \$137 million, is for construction of Nike, Hawk, and Missile Master facilities; 11 percent is for permanent barracks, messes, and administrative and supply buildings for almost 11,000 enlisted men; 9 percent, or \$31 million, is for classified facilities in overseas areas. All of the other percentages are relatively small and cover, for the most part, improvements and additions to existing installations.

NAVY

For the Navy, almost 20 percent is devoted to research, development, and test facilities, many of them classified items and some of them relating to Polaris facilities. Over 14 percent is for operational, communications, and depot facilities to support the needs of the expanding submarine and antisubmarine operations. Over 13 percent is for various training facilities. And I might say that training facilities in all of our military services are more important today than they have ever been before. Changing weapons systems and changing concepts of warfare make up-to-date training absolutely necessary at all times.

Almost 13 percent of the Navy program is for the housing of our enlisted personnel. Again, the other percentages are relatively small and represent for the most part the continued improvement of naval facilities.

AIR FORCE

The percentage distribution of the Air Force program is more widespread than the other services, although the amounts of money are substantial in each case. You will note that the Air Force program is more than both the Army and the Navy program together.

Almost 18 percent of the Air Force program is devoted to the dispersal of units of the Strategic Air Command; 17 percent is for the construction of facilities for ballistic missiles; 13 percent is devoted to construction in support of our aircraft, control, and warning stations in the United States, Alaska, and Canada. And over 12 percent relates to construction for the BOMARC missile at various locations within the United States.

The rest of the Air Force program is made up of troop housing for enlisted personnel, maintenance facilities, extension of the Distant Early Warning Line and numerous other additions and improvements to existing bases.

So those are the highlights of the construction programs of the three departments. I would now like to deal briefly with items which are always of interest

to the House and those are land acquisition, new bases in the program, and family housing for our military people.

LAND

I am happy to say that land acquisition in this program is the smallest in many years. The Army, for example, needs only about 4,000 acres; the Navy, a little over 1,000; and the Air Force, 2,000 acres. Of course, some additional relatively small parcels of land will be required from time to time for aircraft control and warning sites, strategic missiles, and other similar activities. These particular acquisitions cannot be anticipated with any great accuracy in advance but they should not add any great amount of land to the amounts which I have just referred to.

Speaking of land, we hear so often about the tremendous areas of land in the United States under the control of the military, and it is quite true that they do use and occupy vast areas in the United States. In my own opinion, the land used by the military is necessary for their proper functioning and is not excessive.

It is true that disposals of land can be made here and there and, indeed, are being made every day. Illustrative of this is the fact that between August of 1955 and April of 1958, a total of 469 installations, or portions of them, constituting over 1,800,000 acres were determined to be excess to the needs of the Department. Currently, an additional 4½ million acres of land are being studied within the Department with the idea that they, too, will be disposed of.

The military departments today occupy, in various fashions, about 27 million acres in the United States, of which only 7½ million acres have been removed from tax rolls. Their total land use is equivalent to only 1.4 percent of the total land area of the United States. And over half of the land under military control is from the public domain and has never been on the tax rolls. In any event, as indicated above, the additional acquisitions this year are extremely small and this is very gratifying.

While on the subject of land, I might point out that this year's bill, as submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, contained a provision which would repeal the law which would require the military departments to come into agreement with the Armed Services Committee on acquisitions or disposals involving more than \$25,000. The committee feels that this is a wise safeguard and struck from the bill the repealing language. So the committee will still have the opportunity to review these matters.

NEW BASES

Again, I am happy to inform you that there are no truly new bases in the program. There are, of course, some new radar stations and other minor facilities of this kind but there are no new bases of a substantial nature in the program.

FAMILY HOUSING

The family housing program is going very well both from the standpoint of constructing new family housing and the acquisition of Wherry housing proj-

ects. This bill contains a total of 53,904 units with 11,008 for the Army, 8,851 for the Navy, and 34,045 for the Air Force.

Only 935 of this total will be built with appropriated funds. Most of the remaining houses will be constructed under the Capehart program. And overseas, 6,673 houses will be constructed under the surplus agriculture commodities program.

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

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that there are 95,000 housing units in this bill?

Mr. VINSON. There are 53,904 housing units; 11,008 for the Army, 8,851 for the Navy, and 34,045 for the Air Force. Except for 935 built under direct appropriation and 6,673 surplus commodity houses, these units are built under what is known as the Capehart Act.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have a breakdown of the housing units to be built outside of Continental United States?

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will examine the bill he will get that information. The bill requires line items for the housing. Indeed, I will state to the committee that the law requires that no houses may be built inside the country or overseas except by line item.

While on the subject of housing, I would like to point out that the bill this year contains a line item for every family housing unit which is going to be constructed. This is the result of last year's law which requires that no housing of any kind can be built or acquired after June 30, 1958, unless it has been supported by a specific line item in the military construction bill. So you can see where all of these houses are going to be built by a reference to H. R. 13015.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

I mentioned briefly the great number of individual items in this bill—2,800 of them. The bill you have before you is, of course, a clean bill which shows only a very small number of last-minute amendments, some of them merely corrective amendments.

The bill which the committee held its hearings on was amended by the committee in 115 instances. And these 115 amendments represent only those which could be seen on the face of the bill. At least this same number of additional amendments were made internally in the various sections of the bill but did not appear individually other than as a single change in a money figure. One of these amendments, I recall, involved 22 internal changes in a classified portion of the bill. This illustrates the precise and detailed consideration which the committee gives to a bill of this kind.

Many—indeed, most—of the changes which I have referred to were modifications of items submitted by the departments. In a few instances, the committee added items which, in their best judgment, should be in the program but were not included in it for various reasons with which the committee did not agree. I might say at this point that although the committee in great part is

offering to the House a program which represents the requests of the military departments, it still is highly aware and sensitive to the fact that in the last analysis, it is Congress who raises and supports our military force and writes into the law the items which it thinks the Congress should provide for our Armed Forces.

I would like to enumerate briefly the matters which the committee inserted in the program.

FORT HUACHUCA, ARIZ.

The first of these is the addition of the second increment of a technical building at Fort Huachuca, Ariz. I will not go into great detail about any of these items but this is, perhaps, a typical one. The first half of this building, which performs a highly classified function, is just being completed at this time. The Army had the second half of the building in its program last year and again this year, but each time, because of budgetary limitations, the second half of the building failed to survive the reviews of the various echelons within the Department and at the Bureau of the Budget. So the committee in its best judgment inserted this item and hopes that appropriations will be made in order that this important facility can be completed at the earliest possible date.

NAVAL SHIPYARD, CHARLESTON, S. C.

Another item added by the committee was authority to construct a drydock at a cost of \$10 million in Charleston, S. C. The Navy conceded that the existing drydocks at Charleston are not capable of accommodating the new ballistic missile submarines. And since this type of submarine will operate from this area, it is essential that all facilities necessary for its operation be provided in timely fashion.

Also, at Charleston, S. C., the committee inserted authority in the amount of \$10,300,000 for classified facilities directly related to the ballistic missile submarine. I cannot go into detail about these, suffice it to say that recent developments made this item particularly necessary at this time. The Navy was in full agreement with the committee's action, and I believe it can be safely said that there is little argument about the decision of the committee with respect to the addition of this construction.

NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION, KINGSVILLE, TEX.

At the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Tex., the committee added \$1,041,000 to construct two barracks for 504 enlisted men. The existing barracks were built at the beginning of World War II with a 5-year life. They have long outlived their usefulness and this is only a small step toward furnishing our enlisted people with reasonable and livable quarters.

NAVAL AIR STATION, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

For the Naval Air Station, San Diego, Calif., the committee inserted authority in the amount of \$7 million for the construction of a new marginal wharf and for dredging in that area. Today, the *Forrestal*-type carrier is assigned for

service in the Pacific, but the existing harbor entrance channel is too shallow to accommodate these carriers. Also, there is not in the San Diego area a wharf of sufficient size and equipment with adequate utilities to berth, refuel, and service this type of carrier. Activities in the San Diego area relating to this class of carrier are now both expensive and, on occasion, extremely dangerous.

NAVAL SHIPYARD, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

The subsidence of the Naval Shipyard at Long Beach, Calif., has a long history which I will not detail now. Suffice it to say that the shipyard at one point has sunk 17 feet. The apparent cause of this subsidence is the withdrawal of oil from the Wilmington oilfield. Over the years, the Navy has been granted authorities to build protective works to keep the ocean out of the shipyard. Action taken by this committee last year resulted in legislation being passed by the State of California to correct this subsidence. As an encouragement to this forward-looking program, the committee authorized \$6 million for protective works for what it hopes to be the last protective works for this shipyard in which we have an investment of \$65 million—and a replacement cost of \$140 million. Only \$500,000 of this \$6 million, however, can be used until the Secretary of the Navy in his judgment is satisfied that the State and local authorities and the oil companies have taken effective action to prevent further subsidence.

SCHOOL OF AVIATION MEDICINE, BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

A rather large authority added by the committee was one for the School of Aviation Medicine at Brooks Air Force Base, Tex. This school is probably the only school of its kind in the whole world. Unfortunately, it has had a rather unhappy history from a construction and facilities standpoint since its inception. While the operations carried on there—such as the recent simulated trip to the moon—are of great interest and of even greater importance to our country as we move forward into extremely high speeds within the atmosphere, and out into space, the construction items for a facility of this kind seem always to fall out of a program along the way and are replaced by items of, shall we say, a more immediately practical nature. Well, in my opinion, we need the runways and the barracks but we also need to keep our eye fixed far into the future. And there never has been a time in the history of the world when this has been more important. Some \$9 million has already been authorized for this school and it has been functioning under restricted conditions for many years. Always it seems that budget limitations or higher priorities have caused this school to suffer in the authorization bill. And for this reason, the committee decided this year to take the bull by the horns and insert this most important construction authority in the bill. We would not dare fall behind in this field and I fear that we may well fall behind unless we give our military people the research tools that are so necessary.

BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE, LA.

Another item for barracks was added at Barksdale Air Force Base, La. This is an important Strategic Air Command base and it, like the installation in Texas to which I referred briefly, has World War II barracks which simply are not fit for habitation. The \$925,000 added at this installation will be another small step in providing proper facilities for our enlisted airmen.

SECTION 110 (SAN JACINTO ORDNANCE DEPOT, TEX.)

The last item I would like to refer to is an authority granted by the committee which appears as section 110 in the Army title. Actually, this is more than an authority. This is a specific direction to the Army to move the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot from its present location on the Houston ship channel to an isolated area known as Point-Aux-Pins in Alabama.

The department took the position that the Point-Aux-Pins facility would only be built in the event of total mobilization. The great industrial centers of Houston, Tex., are very anxious that this hazardous depot at San Jacinto be removed from its area. There are some 40 million pounds of high explosives there.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The record of the hearings show there are 80,000 tons.

Mr. VINSON. Yes; 80,000 tons. I thank the gentleman. That is a large amount. That is 80,000 tons. That 80,000 tons keeps the people in that area a little bit disturbed when they hear a loud clap of thunder because they fear it might be the beginning of the rumble of the explosion of—how many tons did you say?

Mr. GROSS. Eighty thousand tons.

Mr. VINSON. Yes; 80,000 tons.

The Point-Aux-Pins facility was authorized in the amount of \$26 million some years ago. The depot has never been built since it represented only a mobilization requirement. Indeed, the land has never been acquired for the Point-Aux-Pins facility.

Now, the depot in Houston was built there a number of years ago and covers about 5,000 acres. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] appeared before the Armed Services Committee and contended in most forceful fashion that this depot should be moved on two bases: the first of these is that the facility constitutes a danger to the area surrounding it and second, it is now located on land so valuable for industrial development as to make it wholly unfair and improper to let it remain in its present location. The committee, after deliberation, inserted language in the bill which will require the movement of this depot, as I say, to a new location.

It is difficult to give exact figures of the cost involved since the Government will undoubtedly recover a large sum when it sells the property at the present location. Suffice it to say that from the standpoint of the bill, the committee increased the authorization for the Point-Aux-Pins facility from \$26 million to \$44

million, the \$44 million representing the cost of constructing the replacement facility.

Now, that is the construction bill for fiscal year 1959. I agree that I have dealt with only the highlights of the bill but I trust that I have given the Members of the House a picture sufficiently broad to warrant their support of this important legislation.

If we are to have a Defense Establishment, we must have facilities for that establishment. And that is all that this bill does. It provides the essential construction items needed to provide a base from which our forces can fight both here and overseas.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. How far is the city of Houston from this ordnance depot?

Mr. VINSON. About 15 miles.

Mr. GROSS. There seems to be quite a little variation according to the testimony brought out before your committee.

Mr. VINSON. There are a great number of buildings in that area, and there are numerous oil refineries and great chemical plants all down this channel.

Mr. GROSS. As a matter of fact, there is a chemical plant now; is there not?

Mr. VINSON. The committee has not been interested in anything but the ordnance depot itself. I did not think there was anything much there except ammunition.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services a question concerning the hazards relative to air traffic control.

I notice that in this bill you continue the expansion of the program for the construction of the Richard I. Bong Air Force Base in Wisconsin. Originally it was the Strategic Air Command base but now it has become a bomber base and it is located between two of the busiest airports in the world, Chicago Midway and Milwaukee, Wis. It is 45 miles from each of these 2 important civilian fields, and I call the gentleman's attention to the consideration the committee gave to the safety aspects of the location of this particular base.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I may say to our distinguished friend who made this inquiry that all of these locations were cleared with the CAA and with the Air Panel of the Defense Department.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. As the Chairman knows, I have introduced a bill requesting that the Port Chicago Naval Magazine in California be relocated in a safer area at Tubbs Island, Sonoma County, Calif. This bill was introduced at the request of the port supervisor of Contra Costa County, Calif., in which the Port Chicago Naval Magazine is located.

As the chairman knows, there has been a great deal of feeling in the Port Chicago area because of the great loss of life that occurred there in World War II and because of the tremendous increase in population and industry of the area. The people in that community are very anxious to have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. VINSON. I am sure the gentleman knows the attitude of the committee. The committee feels that this country is large enough to have these installations in areas where there is no danger from these high explosives. It is hazardous, as the gentleman mentioned, to have such installations in industrial areas. The gentleman will probably remember some 25 or 30 years ago when we established the first naval depot it was transferred from Kokomo, which had become a thickly populated area, to Hawthorne, Nev. The policy has been to put them in remote sections of the country.

Take the situation of this channel, this estuary at Houston. It is a hazard and a risk to an enormous amount of shipping that uses that waterway. Of course the people are disturbed. If we did not have remote areas where such installations could be placed, with safety to all concerned, it might be necessary to leave them in these congested areas. The sensible thing, however, is to put them out in another place that the Government found. That is the common sense thing to do. We should sell the present property and get as much for it as we possibly can, not give it away. In that connection I want to say I am proud of their record made in the sale of property by the General Services Administration and the amount of money we are receiving for it. I just today examined the figures. In a great many instances we receive 40 to 50 percent of the total amount invested by the Government when we sell this property.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Were there any mass meetings held in Houston, Tex., in opposition to the establishment of this ordnance plant?

Mr. VINSON. I do not know. That was not taken up by the Committee on the Armed Services.

Mr. GROSS. Back in 1942 was there any opposition to the establishment of this ordnance plant there?

Mr. VINSON. I would say no. They are like every community in the country, they wanted to get a military installation.

Mr. GROSS. They were tickled to death to get it?

Mr. VINSON. It is like a great many of these people who wanted air bases. They want them now. But when these jets come flying over them and disturb everybody they want to get rid of them. The only people that I know of that have not wanted to get rid of the base are the people near Grandview, Mo.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and that brings me to this question.

Mr. VINSON. Yes, I knew it would bring the gentleman to some question.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure there must be an appropriation in here for the Truman Airport.

Mr. VINSON. We have given it a new name.

Mr. GROSS. What is the new name?

Mr. VINSON. Let me see.

Mr. GROSS. That is very interesting.

Mr. VINSON. We took the name "Grandview" away from it and gave it the name of two outstanding officers from that community who were killed. It is now called Richards-Gebaur.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. May I invite the attention of the chairman of the committee and the membership of the House to the fact that I intend to offer an amendment to strike section 110 of the bill relating to San Jacinto and put back the permissive language which was the original position of our committee.

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

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

Mr. BALDWIN. On behalf of the citizens of Port Chicago, can we ask that the committee arrange for early hearings?

Mr. VINSON. An early hearing in January? I am hoping we will get through this session very soon and it will not be necessary to have many more meetings.

Mr. BALDWIN. You will have a hearing in January, then?

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mrs. HARDEN. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman if there is new construction contained in this bill?

Mr. VINSON. Of course all of it is new construction in one sense. There are no new bases in the broadest sense that we use the term "new bases." It may be necessary to buy some Nike sites and that type of installation. There will be a few.

Mrs. HARDEN. I am interested because in 1957 the Dana plant in my Congressional District was closed, and I was wondering if the distinguished chairman and his committee gave any consideration to using the facilities of that plant.

Mr. VINSON. That, I believe, is an industrial plant and would not be involved in this bill. I am sorry to say we did not go into that. I can assure you, however, that the Department does give close study to see if present facilities can be used and eliminate the need of establishing new ones. No doubt you have just read in the paper where the Committee on Armed Services is now making an investigation to see if Indian Head can be used to its full extent instead of going out and building a new

facility. Those matters are sometimes considered by us in the study of a bill of this kind.

Mrs. HARDEN. I hope the gentleman and his committee will give consideration to using the facilities of the Dana plant.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I should like to inquire about an item which appears on page 5 of the bill providing for the authorization of \$144,000 to acquire land in Baywood Park, Calif. I have considerable doubt in my mind whether it is necessary that this land be acquired. I am engaged in developing some additional facts at this time. I would like to have the assurance of the chairman if possibly I do develop other facts we can have another consideration?

Mr. VINSON. Yes. They are required, in addition to the authorization, to come before the Committee on Armed Services of the House and Senate for the acquisition of each tract of land in here, with a complete breakdown and detailed explanation. I will keep this matter open.

RESERVE COMPONENTS

Mr. Chairman, I have not dealt in any detail with title VI of this bill which involves about \$40 million of construction for the Reserve components. I am going to ask that this matter be covered by the true expert on this subject, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks]. He has been in this area of legislation for many years and I feel that his remarks on the subject will not only give a comprehensive picture of this portion of the bill but will have the added dignity of coming from a man who has had as his first interest in the Congress, the creation, maintenance, and advancement of the Reserve components of the United States.

I urge every Member of this House to support this bill. I can assure you that the bill you have before you today is a sound one and represents not only the best thinking of the military and civilian people within the Department of Defense, but also the considered judgment of the 37 members of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, just about all the facts and figures relating to this bill have been given by the chairman of the committee. And others that are speaking on this bill are directing their remarks to particular parts of the program which are of special interest to them.

I have had, as Members of the House know, a strong and abiding interest in our Army and ground forces, particularly in the foot soldier who, in the last analysis, does most of the drab, dangerous, and frequently terrific fighting.

By this I would not wish to indicate for a moment that I do not wholeheartedly support this whole bill. It is a well thought out one, and one which received the closest scrutiny by the committee during its deliberations.

As usual, of course, we had the fine leadership of our chairman, who, by his work over a long period of years, has earned and, as I have said in the past, richly deserves, the hearty commendation and respect of the membership on both sides of the aisle.

Indeed, I might say that this particular construction program finds much of its soundness in his able leadership and direction.

I would like to speak at this moment on the Army portion of the program, and I would like to conclude my remarks with a discussion of the several types of family housing which we are providing for all of our military personnel, since I believe that this constitutes one of the most important contributions which the Congress can make to the morale and well-being of our fighting forces.

The Army's construction authorization request for fiscal year 1959, as contained in title I of H. R. 13015, totals \$332,071,000. The title also authorizes family housing to be obtained through funds generated by the sale of surplus agricultural commodities and through the provisions of the Capehart Housing Act.

In view of the state of world affairs today and the responsibilities shouldered by the United States, this request is as modest as the mission of the Army will permit. Initiated within a fixed and rigid budget ceiling, reviewed exhaustively and painstakingly by the Department of Defense, by the Executive Office of the President and by the Congress, this request is the minimum that can logically be expected to provide construction support for the operational and mission type responsibilities of the Army and for the long-range requirements of that service.

The principal tasks of our Army today include but are not limited to: the overseas deployment of forces for the deterrence of aggression and prompt intervention in the event of limited or general war; the maintenance of a mobile combat-ready strategic force here at home for the rapid reinforcement of forward deployed forces; and the provision of forces as required for the defense of the United States against air attack.

Our overseas forces constitute our first line of defense and, in conjunction with the other services and with our allies, have the mission of deterring aggression. If aggression occurs, these forces must accomplish essential tasks to allow time for reinforcement. The Army has earmarked 12 percent of its total construction request to support this mission of deterrence.

The heart of our strategic force here at home is the Strategic Army Corps. This corps consists of 4 combat-ready divisions and supporting troops prepared to meet the initial requirements of limited war, or, in the event of general war, to provide immediate reinforcements for our forces now deployed overseas. The Army has included 1.1 percent of its present request to meet urgent requirements of this corps.

The third major mission of the Army is its contribution to the air defense of

the United States. The Army has earmarked 48.3 percent of the program to provide and construct sites for the tactical deployment of our surface-to-air missiles, to construct logistic support facilities for the tactical forces, and to insure adequate facilities for training the men who are to man the weapons.

In addition to the requirements of our deterrent forces in being, I would like to point out three other objectives of the Army's construction program that should be noted. These objectives are: first, the effort to support guided-missile research and development, testing and training; second, the continued program to provide proper facilities for the Army's aviation; and, third, the construction of permanent-type facilities in the United States and its possessions to provide essential, more efficient, and more effective facilities as obsolescence and high maintenance costs dictate the replacement of World War I and World War II temporary facilities or whenever additional construction is necessary to support new long-range missions or increased operational demands.

To support the Army's total guided-missile effort, including both surface-to-air and surface-to-surface, 63 percent of the program is devoted. Working within such an austere and rigid budgetary framework as was imposed this fiscal year, the Army has spent every dollar possible to insure that time, effort, and money will result in maximum returns. Husbanding the resources made available by the Congress and in spite of rigid fiscal restrictions and dishearteningly low priorities, the Army has achieved truly outstanding results for our national defense. It has launched the first United States satellite. It has recently recovered the nose cone of a Jupiter that was fired 1,500 miles through space—a remarkable feat that had not been accomplished heretofore. This feat has indicated to the world that we have the advanced propulsion, guidance, and materiel components for long-range missiles. This feat, I am sorry to say, has received all too little recognition even in our own press.

In the field of Army aviation, the sky cavalry of today, a vital arm in the modern Army designed to provide the ground forces with the organic aviation so necessary to accomplish its mission, the Army has earmarked 2.5 percent of its authorization request. This increment continues the program of making adequate aviation facilities available as soon as possible within present stringent budget limitations.

The long-range Army requires facilities that increase the efficiency of its operations and decrease the high maintenance costs of the inadequate temporary structures inherited from our past wars and emergencies. To replace old structures or make available new facilities, the Army embarked in fiscal year 1954 on an evaluation program of its overall physical plant. This program includes operational and training facilities, troop and family housing, maintenance, supply and community support facilities, and utilities. A time target goal of 20

years was established—the time within which new permanent structures should be phased in to replace present temporary structures, which would have far surpassed their normal life expectancy.

This permanent plant program has received the most careful planning. To insure that temporary facilities are used to their maximum economical and efficient life, careful analyses are made of available plant, the functions it must perform and the effects of this plant on operations, costs, and morale. To preclude any possibility of overbuilding in new permanent plant category, the Army plans and programs for this type of construction at a level safely below its long-range or current strength, whichever is smaller, and at only those posts which have been designated permanent and are, beyond any reasonable doubt, necessary to the accomplishment of the Army's long-range mission. However, as has been stated by the Honorable Dewey Short, Assistant Secretary of the Army, with 25 percent of the 20 years already passed, less than 18 percent of the total objective has been accomplished. Within military budget limitations, high priority mission and operational-type projects must and have taken precedence over the longer range objective of more efficient and adequate facilities and quarters for our troops. Since austerity is the keynote, the Army has been compelled in many cases to keep men living and working in facilities far below the standards acceptable in everyday life. Thirty and five-tenths percent of the present authorization request involves permanent-type structures.

As I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, I have had for a number of years a strong interest in the provision of family housing for our military people. It is my opinion that we should leave nothing undone to provide satisfactory housing for all our military families.

I have noted on occasion that some Members of the House—and I might say, quite understandably—do not have any precise picture of the manner in which or the extent to which we provide family housing for our military. Nor, in my opinion, is there a sufficient understanding of the magnitude of their requirements. With this in mind, I would like to direct the attention of the Members to pages 35 and 36 of the committee report. On those pages are set out the magnitude of the need for family housing, the number of existing units, and the deficit. What is not set out in the report are the details as to how this housing is provided.

In addition to the privately owned family units throughout the country and, indeed, throughout the world which are used by our military personnel, there are five different kinds of housing which are provided in various fashions which I will detail.

The first of these is the most readily understandable and that is the so-called appropriated fund housing. This housing is built after authorization by the Congress and the appropriation of funds. It is constructed under standard military construction procedures and the completed housing is operated as public

quarters, public quarters meaning nothing more or less than that the serviceman who occupies the housing surrenders his housing allowance.

Title VIII—Capehart housing: This housing is built following competitive bidding pursuant to authorization by a military construction authorization act and the builder is paid from a 100 percent mortgage loan insured by FHA and guaranteed by the military department. The completed housing is operated as public quarters and here also each military occupant forfeits his basic allowance for quarters. Pursuant to the guaranty, the military department pays off the mortgage loan and interest thereon by monthly payments over a 25-year period.

Wherry housing: This housing was built following competitive bidding in accordance with provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to August 11, 1955. In most cases the housing was built on Government-owned land by a private sponsor who contracted to operate the housing as private rental units under a leasehold from the military; the cost of construction was financed by an FHA-insured mortgage which could not exceed 90 percent of the estimated replacement cost.

When a Capehart project is built at or near a Wherry project, the military must acquire the Wherry housing; the military may acquire such housing even though no Capehart project is nearby. Such acquisitions are accomplished by negotiation or condemnation pursuant to statutory provisions; the military pays the sponsor for his equity, makes payments on the existing mortgage, and operates the housing as public quarters. Equity payments, amortization payments, and immediate repairs and improvements to acquired projects, are paid from the Wherry revolving fund; maintenance and operation costs are covered by separate appropriations.

Surplus commodity: Under this program, foreign currencies are generated through country-to-country agreements covering the sale of surplus agricultural commodities. A portion of the funds generated are set aside for the payment of construction costs of United States military family housing. In some cases, such as the United Kingdom and Japan, the local currency has been adequate to meet all costs. In others, however, such as Spain and Morocco, the local currency has been supplemented by appropriated dollars—up to a limit of 25 percent of the total cost—in order to obtain scarce items not available locally.

The occupants of this housing forfeit their quarters allowances which are used, first, to pay maintenance and operating costs, and, second, to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the foreign currencies used.

One important advantage of the surplus commodity program is that the quarters allowances are used to repay the Commodity Credit Corporation, so that there is no outflow of gold from the United States.

Rental guaranty program: The rental guaranty program provides housing in foreign countries, built with foreign capi-

tal and owned by foreign investors, without the requirement of any capital investment on the part of the United States.

Under this program some 4,800 units of housing were constructed in France during the period from 1953 to 1955 and additional projects have been constructed in Morocco and Spain. The selected builders are guaranteed a specified level of income for a certain period of years, usually 5 to 7 years, as an incentive to construct the required houses. Military families have first right of occupancy of these units at specified rentals and, if the guaranteed level of occupancy—95 percent is maintained, the United States incurs no cost other than the payment of quarters allowances to the individuals.

I would like to return to the Army again to speak briefly with respect to the family housing which is provided for them in the bill.

This bill authorizes the construction of 158 units of appropriated fund housing, 934 units of surplus-commodity-type housing in overseas temporary base rights areas, and 9,916 units of housing to be constructed in the United States and Hawaii under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act.

It should be noted that the appropriated fund housing is a reprogramming action using prior year's authorization and that no new dollar authorization is being requested. This, of course, is true of all appropriated fund housing in the bill. The housing in overseas temporary base rights areas will be built from local currencies arising from the sale of surplus commodities as I described.

The family housing to be authorized by this bill will still leave the Army with a program shortage of 31,000 units in the United States and possessions and a shortage of approximately 14,000 units overseas in temporary base right areas. Money invested in adequate housing will more than offset the substantial financial loss represented by the voluntary separation from service of highly trained personnel in whose training great amounts of money have been expended. The provision of adequate housing and the opportunity for normal family life is a basic factor in maintaining high morale and in the retention of skilled personnel in our services.

In summary, the construction authorization request for all three services in this bill is indeed austere. It has been limited primarily to essential mission and operational type facilities; it has been carefully and painstakingly assembled and will provide the American taxpayer with the results which he justifiably expects.

If each Member of the House had sat through the hearing day after day with me and the other members of the Armed Services Committee, he would give this bill the same kind of wholehearted support that I have indicated in my remarks. I can, therefore, in all sincerity ask that every Member of the House give his unqualified support to this important construction bill.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, the contents of this military public works bill have been very thoroughly discussed, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] will, I am sure, contribute substantially to the discussion. I shall not, therefore, attempt to add to the exposition that has been presented.

For the record, Mr. Chairman, I do want to take this opportunity to refer to one airbase for which this bill includes authorization, and give a brief description of the base, its history, and the outstanding training record that it has achieved through the years. I am referring to Laughlin Air Force Base, located at Del Rio, Tex.

This base occupies 4,192 acres of land in Val Verde County, Tex., approximately 7 miles east of the country seat at Del Rio, a community of 14,112 people, plus recent increases.

In 1942 construction began on the site of a ranch formerly owned by S. B. Harrison, of San Antonio, Tex. The installation was first occupied by military personnel in December 1942. The first base commander was Col. George Muncy. Construction continued after the base was occupied and by 1944 more than \$7 million had been expended on emergency war-base facilities.

The field was dedicated in March 1943, and named in honor of Lt. Jack Thomas Laughlin of Del Rio, Tex. Jack Thomas Laughlin was born in Del Rio, Tex., on September 17, 1914. He graduated from the University of Texas in 1938. Jack Laughlin entered into active service with the Air Corps in April 1941 and served admirably in the defense of our country until January 29, 1942. On that date he was killed in combat while flying a B-17 mission over Java. Lt. Jack Laughlin was the first World War II pilot casualty from Del Rio, Tex.

Throughout World War II, Laughlin Air Force Base, then known as Laughlin Army Air Field, was utilized as an advanced flying school for the training of B-26 pilots. The training program was instituted at Laughlin in February 1943, and during the period from February 1943 to October 1954, more than 2,200 B-26 pilots were trained there and dispatched to the war theaters.

After victory in 1945 and there being no longer a requirement for the installation, Laughlin Air Field was placed on inactive status and turned over to the Corps of Engineers. Later the land was leased for grazing.

With the Korean conflict, there was an immediate requirement to increase the pilot training program; so in May of 1952, the United States Air Force reopened the base as a single-engine aircraft training base. Under the 3645th combat crew training wing, whose mission was to conduct training in transition to jet aircraft and gunnery, the peak student load at reopened Laughlin came in May 1954 with 357 students.

Between fiscal years 1952 and 1956, approximately 10 million dollars was ex-

pended in construction of new facilities necessary to raise the base from World War II mobilization standards up to present Air Force standards necessary to accommodate modern weapons and equipment.

There are three usable runways at Laughlin Air Force Base: An asphaltic concrete primary-instrument runway, 9,500 feet long by 150 feet wide; a parallel runway of asphaltic concrete, 7,500 feet long by 150 feet wide; and an asphaltic concrete cross-wind runway, 6,500 feet long by 150 feet wide.

The majority of the structures existing on base are semi-permanent type buildings constructed primarily in support of the Air Training Mission. The total base inventory value as of June 30, 1957, was approximately 17 million dollars.

In April of 1957 Laughlin Air Force Base was transferred from the Air Training Command to the jurisdiction of the Strategic Air Command. The mission now operating from Laughlin is one which is vitally important to the overall operational concept of the Strategic Air Command.

The Air Force proposes to expend \$897,000 during fiscal year 1959 for construction of operational, aircraft maintenance, and community facilities. Continued investments in future years are planned by the Air Force for improvement and expansion of the facilities required to support the important strategic mission at this base.

The present base military population is approximately 2,800 men. Approximately 260 civilians are employed at various jobs on the base. This situation is expected to continue with the planned use of Laughlin Air Force Base, Tex.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for his liberality in yielding me so much time. I do not, however, plan to use all of that time, and I shall yield back that which I do not use.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to say this. I was present and in attendance at practically every meeting of the full committee when it considered this measure. It was exhaustively considered line by line, item by item. I think the committee knows fully what is in this measure. It is a tedious job to take up line by line, to investigate, and appraise, and reach a judgment upon items presented one after the other in rapid succession in a bill of this character.

I was also chairman of the subcommittee that handled the reserve portion of this bill; that is, title VI. In fact, the distinguished chairman of the full committee appointed Subcommittee No. 1, which is the Reserve Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services to handle title VI separately inasmuch as it deals with the Reserve program. Our subcommittee entered into a full study of each and every feature, including the line items, covering the Reserve program, all of which are under title VI of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first time this bill has had line items for the Reserve program. Heretofore we have brought in a separate bill with a lump sum authorization, but last year the full committee in its wisdom investigated this matter and instructed the Department in the future to bring in for the Reserve program a line-by-line type of bill. This is what has happened this year. So title VI was turned over to the subcommittee to work out.

The whole Reserve construction program as we know it today began in the year 1950. Up until that time the meager funds that were appropriated for Reserve construction were handled in a more or less haphazard manner. As a matter of fact, prior to the 1950 bill practically all of the money came from items tucked away in the general appropriations bill that had no authorization prior to the enactment of the bill.

In 1950 we set to work to set up a definite program of Reserve installation construction. Public Law 783 of the 81st Congress is the result of our work in this respect.

Under the bill before the committee now each of the services presents their line items and they are approved by the committee and by the Congress of the United States.

Under Public Law 783 we provided for a joint user, that is, for the use of the installations by all of the services that need the installations.

We also provided under the act of 1950 for contributions for Army National Guard construction. The Army National Guard armories are built by a contributory payment of the States of 25 percent and the remainder, 75 percent of the cost of construction, is contributed by the Federal Government. This rule does not apply to nonarmory construction, even with the National Guard. In the nonarmory type of construction the Government still pays the full 100 percent. That is especially true in reference to the Air National Guard.

We began in 1950 authorizing under this law and today we have authorized a total sum of \$580 million for Reserve construction throughout the United States. We have Army Reserve construction in every State in the United States and also in our possessions. To this date we have expended in this program the sum of \$554.4 million. The projects totaling \$480 million have actually been constructed or are definitely planned for construction. In other words, this is the amount presently on hand and available for use in 1959 and in fiscal year 1960.

There is a residue of \$74 million. This residue of \$74 million can be broken down as follows: The Army National Guard has a residue available of \$17.7 million on hand. The Army Reserve has \$30.8 million, the Navy and the Marine Corps Reserve have \$10.8 million. The Air Force Reserve has \$15.1 million. The Air National Guard has no funds carried over whatsoever.

Perhaps, you will be interested in a brief explanation of the Reserve components which require the continued authorization of additional Reserve facil-

ities. I am going to take them up briefly one by one.

For instance, we have the Navy surface program, which consists of 319 training centers and facilities. It also consists of 184 electronic facilities and stations.

A major effort is now underway to reorganize sizable segments of the Naval Reserve surface program to be cruise ready on short notice to man antisubmarine warfare ships for immediate augmentation of the fleet in the event of an emergency.

The Marine Corps Reserve program consists of 231 training centers belonging to the Marine Corps. One hundred and sixty-three of these are combined, however, with the Navy Reserve training centers under the joint user clause of the act of 1950. Although there are no additional centers now required, replacement, expansion, and modernization of some of the Marine Reserve centers will be needed in the future.

I want to take up at this point the Air Force Reserve and the Air Guard. Turn in to this phase of the Reserve program, we find that the Air Force and the Reserve and the Air National Guard has the established mobilization requirement of 38 combat wings. Twenty-four of these wings, Mr. Chairman, consist of 83 combat squadrons of the fighter and tactical reconnaissance type making up the tactical forces of the Air National Guard. There are 15 medium troop carrier wings and 45 tactical squadrons of the Air Force Reserve. In addition, there are 157 support type units of the Air Reserve and the Air National Guard which have been programed to meet specific mobilization requirements in the field of communications, weather, air resupply, air evacuation, terminal operations, air rescue and hospital type units.

The Air National Guard consists of 93 flying bases and 41 nonflying bases. Certain construction is necessary to complete some of the newer facilities to replace the World War II temporary construction to expand some of the facilities, especially the runways, the taxiways and some of the aprons in order to accommodate some of the aircraft of higher performance than those used in the past.

The Air Reserve program has 34 flying bases now in operation with a good percentage of the minimum operational facilities required having been provided. There are three additional bases which still need it, and these are now under construction and will be completed during the fiscal year 1959.

In the Army National Guard Armory program, 960 of the 2,089 armories constructed have been paid for by the several States. In other words, just a few less than a thousand armories have been paid for by the States themselves.

We have a total requirement which varies from 2,250 armories to 2,780. You ask, Why do you say the requirement varies from 2,250 to 2,780? I answer that in the program and changeover to the new type of concept of defense the Defense Department contends that we will need only 2,250 armories of this character, whereas the National Guard contends that we will need 2,780

armories. This matter, however, will be ironed out as we progress with the Reserve program and bring it down to a modernized condition. I can tell you that a total of 1,100 armories have been constructed, are under construction, or have been funded to date under this particular feature of the Reserve program.

Thus, the remaining requirement for National Guard armories ranges, as I said, from 234 armories to 764 armories, depending upon the modernized concept of the Reserve program as worked out by the Defense Department.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Is it my understanding that the armories which are provided for in this bill will be new ones in areas where now presently exist?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes. Of course, there will be some repairs, and there will be replacements in some instances; but, by and large, they will be in new locations, and the ones we provide for come from a list of priorities given us by the departments, that is, the Army, Navy, or Air Force, and the National Guard bureaus.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. In other words, the ones that were included in the gentleman's bill were the ones that were given a sufficiently high priority by the Reserves or by the committee.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The committee itself did not establish priorities. The priorities came from the Pentagon and from the Defense Department.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. In the Army Reserve program it is estimated that a total of 1,850 armories are needed, in addition to the program of the National Guard. Only 385 of these have been constructed or are under construction at this time. Thus there is a remaining requirement for the Army Reserves of 1,083 centers. This requirement also may be subject to revision or implementation.

Our Reserve program is proceeding quite well, and I can tell this group here today this, that the Navy Reserve program should be completed within the next 2 years. It has reached the point that we can see the end of the Reserve construction program for the Navy.

For the Air Force the Reserve program is something like 85 percent complete. Our big deficiency lies in the field of the Army, the Army National Guard program, and the Army Reserve program. There considerable new construction is required; and, as I just said, the Army Reserve requires 1,083 new centers to complete their program.

The Department's legislative proposal which came to our committee provided for roughly \$30,140,000 in new construction. We went over this proposal very carefully. We find that under the proposal the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps would receive an authorization of \$11,892,000 under the proposals from the Pentagon.

We find that the Air Reserve would receive \$6,272,000, and the Air National Guard would receive \$11,976,000.

The committee was considerably disturbed because the proposal that came from the Department contained no request or authorization for the Army or the Army National Guard, yet the need of the country and the reserve program more than any other need is for construction in the Army National Guard.

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

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. That is a point I would like to have cleared up. I have in my district an authorization for a National Guard armory and we are told that the funds have been used, that they are not on the priority list, or at least far enough on the priority list.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who I know is most sincere in his efforts in behalf of the defense program because I have worked with him for many years, it is not true that the funds have been consumed. Congress has appropriated money that has not been consumed by the Department or the Army National Guard. The gentleman referred to the Army National Guard. The Army National Guard has \$17.7 million funded and unobligated authorizations at the present time and the Army Reserve has \$30.8 million authorized and funded at this particular time. But that money has not been spent. Your committee has done its best to cause the proper orderly obligation of these funds toward the building of our program that we have sponsored in the past and adopted by the House.

Mr. FENTON. Do the various State authorities have any say at all in the selection of these priorities?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The priorities come from the States to the National Guard Bureau. The National Guard Bureau screens the priorities, then submits them to the Congress of the United States. In handling this we found that the funds are not finding their way down to the National Guard Bureau. The funds for the Army Reserve are not finding their way to the Army itself, therefore the Army and the National Guard Bureau have not been allowed to expend the funds which the Congress has provided in the past for this particular program. We think that money should have been spent.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I am sorry to interrupt, but this is of vital concern to me also. These funds which the gentleman referred to are earmarked for specific armories or are they earmarked for the over-all program?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. They are earmarked for the over-all program. The National Guard Reserve construction program received a lump sum. The Army Reserve program received a lump sum.

I want to go forward, and I think you will be interested in this. The several States now have appropriated through their State legislatures the sum of \$35 million. That money is now available

from the States for matching for the building of armories for this reserve program. But since the money appropriated by the Congress has not been released, the matching money from the States has not been consumed, which is something like \$35 million that is available for the program at this time.

I want to add this: After going into this matter carefully, your committee felt that we should add some money for the National Guard program; therefore, we added \$6 million for the Army National Guard program. We felt money should be added for the Army Reserve program, and we added \$5 million for the Army Reserve program. That \$11 million is added in title VI of the bill. To be sure that armories would be built under this additional amount, we sent down to the Department and asked them to send up a priority list covering the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve program. That list came up and it was adopted by your subcommittee in a part of the committee report and in a part of the bill just as it was sent to us. There has not been a change. The priorities were sent by the Department itself. So that your bill comes to you with title VI, showing a total of \$39,958,000 as the total amount authorized in title VI, which is the Reserve program.

In conclusion I want to say this: The Reserve program has been moving forward satisfactorily. In spite of the fact that funds have been held back from time to time, the program has been developed in an orderly manner and it has been very successful. In certain instances your armories are used every night in the week and sometimes in the afternoon. The program generally is reaching a point where we can see that we are over the hill and that we are coming to the end of the Navy and the Marine program. We are over the hill in regard to the Air Force Reserve program. We still have to do considerably more work on the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard program. We are giving our thought and our mind and our activity in this direction with the hope that within the next few years we can come to you and tell you that we have a completed Reserve construction program.

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

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. I would like to compliment the committee on this arduous work and careful study of this particular problem. I have just one question I would like to ask. I am referring specifically to page 29 of the committee report which refers to the purchase and disposition of real estate. I would like to ask this committee whether or not the committee has given any consideration to certain policies that should be used by the armed services, particularly the Air Force, in the purchase of land. I illustrate what I am trying to say. We find so many times that people who have land adjoining a military installation are forced to settle by condemnation rather than by negotiation, and as a result it has been a loss to the people in that particular area.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to thank the gentleman very much for asking that particular question, and I want to say this, that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services set up a special subcommittee to check into the matter of the use of land by the military and especially the use of the power of eminent domain, which I think in many instances has been abused by the armed services. The subcommittee has held hearings. We have heard witnesses from the Justice Department making certain suggestions, and we have also heard witnesses from other departments, and we are working on the program that the gentleman has in mind looking toward the point where more definite rules for the acquisition of land by the military will be set up. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I think it is of very great importance, because we must have excellent public relations between the public, the people in the adjoining area, and the military, and I sometimes feel that the arbitrary attitude taken by the military, particularly in some instances, has created ill will toward the military installations in that area. I think that this is unfortunate. Secondly, it has been a great loss to the people in the area. I refer specifically to one instance in which I have been in contact with the Air Force real estate division for quite some time. They are trying to force a farmer to take much less for his land than the current value of the land in the surrounding area. I still think it is very unjust, and I hope the matter can be corrected.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman has some excellent ideas there. I want to say this, too, in addition to what I said about hearings of our subcommittee on that particular matter, that I think there really has been abuse, and the Congress can do a great deal to assist in this sort of program. But, in addition to this, the Committee on Public Works has a bill pending before it which it is considering at this time.

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

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 13015, comes before the House, as is already abundantly clear, after long, exhaustive, and thorough hearings. The bill is highly technical, and it would seem to me that it is not a bill that can be amended or greatly changed on the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has, I think, one inherent handicap, and that is that it has little glamor and almost no drama connected with it. At first blush, one cannot become highly excited about an automotive repair shop or the installation of a new heating plant in the administrative building at a distant Army post.

Much of the legislation which comes before this House has a strong, intimate and personal impact on individual Members of the House and on their constituencies. People — individuals — are

immediately and importantly affected by much of it.

Because this bill does lack color, it does not arouse strong partisan feelings on any overall basis. And, because of this, stimulating and thought-provoking debate is somewhat of a rarity during its consideration.

I think this is wrong. No bill that comes on the floor of this House is, to my mind, more important than the construction bill for the military departments.

As our distinguished chairman has mentioned, there are three essential elements to defense: the men who are ready to fight; the equipment with which they would fight; and the bases which give them the foothold for the battle. If we eliminate any one of these elements, we have nothing. The man is the brain, the weapon is the instrument, and the base is the ground on which he stands.

This bill is the ground on which he stands.

Chairman VINSON has given in most admirable and comprehensive fashion all of the statistics of the bill—its size, its composition, and the highlights of the program both generally and with respect to the individual service. It was presented so clearly and so concisely that I shall not attempt to repeat what you already know.

I would rather speak briefly on some general matters relating to the bill.

For example, I was most impressed by the great wealth of information which was already in the minds of the committee members at the time we started hearings on the bill and before any consideration of the detailed items that comprise it.

This is understandable since, while there have been some new installations established within the last few years, the great bulk of our base structure for the military departments is made up of installations which have been in existence since the beginning of World War II—and in many instances installations which go back many, many years before that.

Many of the members of the Armed Services Committee and, of course, particularly the chairman and those members seated close to him on both sides, have been dealing with legislation of this kind over a great many years, and, therefore, can draw upon an abundance of knowledge not only of the general defense picture but also in truly remarkable detail with respect to specific installations.

An example of this—and, indeed, it is an example of a number of elements to which I wish to refer—is the naval shipyard at Long Beach, Calif. The authority granted for this shipyard in the bill this year is actually not new at all. This shipyard has been under study for a number of years in view of the fact that it has been subsidizing each year over quite a period of time.

Last year because of the concern which the committee felt with respect to this subsidization a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee visited the shipyard, made a detailed inspection, and made a report to the full com-

mittee. A development with respect to this particular item is the fact that the State of California passed very recently legislation which will insure the repressurization of the area in which the shipyard is in order to prevent further subsidization.

Perhaps one should not give full credit to the Armed Services Committee for the passage of this legislation by the State of California, but very great credit is due the committee because of its insistence that aggressive and effective action be taken by the State. Therefore, it is more than merely coincidental that the State passed this legislation.

So, it is clear from an example of this kind that not a great deal of wholly new material is presented to the committee each year but, rather, a series of steps in a continuous process of protecting, improving, and making more efficient our base structure.

With the new weapons and the new supporting facilities for them which, of course, in this time of rapid change are constantly coming into the program, the committee draws upon its great background of information to survey these items, too, with a critical eye.

I would like to cite an example of this. In the program this year there are several sites for the Bomarc missile. The cost set out for the supporting facilities were in the order of \$13½ million per site. After a close examination of these several sites by the committee, it was revealed that very recent contract experience indicated that the cost of one of these sites could be cut by as much as three to three and one-half million dollars. I would not wish to create the impression that the costs furnished by the Department were deliberately high in the first instance. It was, rather, that since the facilities were of a new type, the design and plans could not be as particularized as one might wish. They did not constitute, in other words, as is true of many construction items in the program, repetitive structures with common design and common plans and specifications.

However, again the committee drawing on its experience was able to make a rather substantial cut in this particular part of the program without in any way affecting the defense aspect of the Bomarc missile facilities.

Another area in which it is gratifying that the committee did not make a cut was that portion of the bill which deals with the new Advanced Research Projects Agency. The authority granted by title IV of the bill for this organization is the first of its kind in a military construction program.

Without intending to be facetious, the letters "ARPA," which is the short name for this Agency, could well be thought of as "always remember projects ahead." Here we have an organization whose charter, so to speak, is to deal in fields where there may be little, if any, practical application in the immediate future. It is, however, from research of this kind that come our truly great advances in scientific fields.

Practicality is a virtue. An unreasonable practicality which could be called also shortsightedness is the opposite. We

cannot think of today and the immediate tomorrow only. We must project ourselves—as other parts of the world are doing, notably the U. S. S. R.—to make sure that we have the basic knowledge that will permit far-reaching extensions of our weapon systems as time goes on. We cannot afford to be narrow. We cannot afford to be unimaginative. Indeed, we must be far seeing and bold in our perspective of the future.

Mr. Roy W. Johnson, the Director of ARPA, when he appeared before the committee, stated that his agency was organized "to provide for the Department of Defense forward-looking research programs which in the past have been retarded by the necessity for a formal military requirement." He went on to say that the organization of the agency "is in recognition of the importance of pushing advanced research which may have military application even before we know whether the results will be fruitful and how any results achieved may be used."

This position is, of course, wholly consistent with the ideas which I have tried to express, and indicate a refreshing and encouraging kind of imaginative outlook.

The agency will do little construction as such, but plans to use existing facilities of the military departments and organizations such as the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the National Academy of Sciences, the National Scientific Foundation, and our great universities throughout the country. This, to my mind, is a true step forward and I know every Member of this House would join with me in providing every encouragement for this program.

One concluding word concerning the bill. I would like to draw the attention of all Members of the House to the report on this bill. It is a long one—81 pages—but is broken down in such fashion as to make it relatively simple to study any particular parts of the program which are of special interest to the individual.

Each of the military programs is broken down not only by types of facilities but by commands and by other functional divisions. The general provisions are explained in what is a completely clear fashion and at the very end of the report is the State breakdown listing by geographical area within and without the United States all of the installations which appear in the program, with the exception, of course, of certain classified facilities.

May I urge, then, on all of the Members of the House a study of this report and the favorable vote on the bill which I believe is clearly warranted.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield? Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my distinguished colleague and fellow member of the committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. I wish to congratulate you for the very splendid remarks you have just made and to say that these remarks are in keeping with the fine work you have been doing as a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank my colleague.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from New York for the very fine work she has done with reference to the reserve program. The consideration she has given to the work on the subcommittee has been refreshing to all the members of the committee.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank my chairman of the subcommittee. May I say it has been an inspiration and a pleasure to work with him.

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

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my colleague from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I would like to state to the House that the total devotion which the gentleman from New York has shown in the preparation of this bill and her constant attention at the hearings indicates her knowledge of the subject and her firm desire to be a good member of a good committee and to render a great service to the Nation, which is all reflected in the very fine statement that she has just made.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski].

Mr. O'Konski. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I rise with a great deal of reluctance because it is not easy to oppose or question a project that is reported to the House by such an illustrious committee as the Committee on Armed Services. I am further reluctant to say anything because one would sometimes look at the mentality of a Member of Congress who got up and questioned the advisability of spending several million dollars for a project within his home State. Further to add to my reluctance is the fact that this project is named after a personal friend of mine, a Maj. Richard Bong, a young farm boy who left the farm and in 2 years learned to fly a plane and shot down 40 Japanese aircraft. But, authorities in Wisconsin who are interested in air safety seriously question the advisability of building an air base for the Defense Command and the Strategic Air Command at Kansasville, Wis. It has been stated that the Civil Aeronautics Authority, after investigating, finally gave clearance to the project. But, I think that is only part of the story. It should be brought out that the CAA authorities gave clearance to the project only after the Air Force agreed that that base after it was established and built and used, that the air defense planes and the strategic air defense planes would fly only in certain directions.

I wonder about the advisability of spending \$100 million even for an air base for the Air Defense Command, the Strategic Air Command which by civil protection is going to be used by planes that are going to be able to take off and come back only in certain directions.

I am not going to ask this committee or the Congress to do anything about the authorization for further money for this airport, but I am going to ask the Committee on Appropriations to take a further look at it to see if this project actually ought to be built.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, war is a terrible thing. War is the most expensive pastime we have ever had in the world. You pay for wars indefinitely. I recall when I first came to this noble body the debt limit was under \$40 billion; the debt was under \$40 billion. Today it is approximately \$280 billion. Why? Because of war.

We have had 3 terrible wars, 4 in my lifetime, even including the Spanish-American War; and none of them are completely paid for and probably will not be in a century or two. Regardless of whether we should have had those wars or not, we had them; it is water over the dam.

Now we are faced with another situation: Whether we will have another war we do not know; we hope and pray we will not, but we must not take any chances with the security of our country.

Your Committee on the Armed Services in the hearings on the authorization bill now before you took all of these matters into consideration, went over this bill line by line and item by item, and I approved most of it. Maybe I did not agree with all parts of it, but the overall is very good, very conservative, very sound, and very reasonable when you realize that we are dealing with the security of our country. If we should have another of those terrible wars, regardless of the expense involved and the cost in human life, we must not be reasonably unprepared. On the contrary, we must be reasonably prepared.

In my opinion, this bill is a minimum in preparedness and authorizations for preparedness that we may dare risk today if we are interested in our country.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon mention was made of what I call the Truman Airport at Grandview, Mo. I understood the Chairman to say that it now is known as the Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base.

On page 35 there is an appropriation for the Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base at Kansas City, Mo.

On page 76 it is the Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base at Belton, Mo.

On page 58 there is an appropriation for the Grandview Air Force Base, at Kansas City, Mo.

I am puzzled by all this; is this the Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, the Truman Airport, or the Grandview Air Force Base?

Mr. VINSON. I would say to the gentleman that it is all the same base.

Mr. GROSS. All the same?

Mr. VINSON. All the same.

Mr. GROSS. With some \$3 million total appropriated for that installation?

Mr. VINSON. That is correct. It is written out in the bill here.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask a question that I have asked every year, and that is whether the Continental Air Command has been moved down there, as I was assured it would be when the authorization first went through several years ago?

Mr. VINSON. It has not been moved from Mitchel Airfield, N. Y.

Mr. GROSS. It is still there?

Mr. VINSON. It is still there.

Mr. GROSS. So it never became the headquarters of the Continental Air Command?

Mr. VINSON. No. I understand the reason the gentleman is making the inquiry, but that did not take place.

Mr. GROSS. I did not think it would be moved from New York.

Mr. VINSON. The Mitchel Airbase is still there.

Mr. GROSS. And members of the Truman family have sold the last 220 acres of land they owned around the Grand View Airbase?

Mr. VINSON. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. GROSS. Well, if memory serves me correctly, the family had some 600 acres there, but, I understand, a few weeks ago they sold the last 220 acres. I imagine at a pretty good price after the airbase was put in there.

Mr. Chairman, if my figures are correct, there are around 5,000 housing units in this bill to be constructed overseas; is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. That is probably correct. There are 6,673 houses that will be built overseas under what is known as the surplus agricultural commodity program.

Mr. GROSS. Those will be built out of counterpart funds; is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. Oh, no. They are built out of what is known as the surplus agricultural commodity program. That is a program that has been worked up by the Agricultural Commodities Commission.

Mr. GROSS. What kind of currency do they use? What funds are used?

Mr. VINSON. They use local funds.

Mr. GROSS. Local currency?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Are they not counterpart funds?

Mr. VINSON. No, it is not counterpart funds. It has no relation to counterpart funds. This money is derived out of the surplus agricultural commodity program. That is, when we ship commodities abroad for this purpose, cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco—whatever it is—it is sold entirely by the surplus agricultural program.

Mr. GROSS. No dollars go into this at all; no dollars except as the surplus agricultural commodities are purchased in this country? No dollars go into this construction overseas, is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. May I say to the gentleman, where equipment or material cannot be locally purchased, they may have in those instances to spend dollars to bring them into the country; but, generally speaking, the agricultural commodities are sold over

in those countries, then the money that is raised by the sale of those commodities is placed in the building of the housing in question for our troops.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: What happens if these housing facilities are abandoned or are found to be unnecessary, whatever word you want to use? What happens to them?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is a matter subject to negotiation. We anticipate using them for some time.

Mr. GROSS. Are they sold to the local governments? What is done with them?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. They are placed for future disposition.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. What is the source of counterpart funds if it is not from the sale of surplus products?

Mr. GROSS. That is one of the sources.

Mr. MASON. It is the main source.

Mr. VINSON. Counterpart money comes out of the mutual security program and has no relation to this phase at all.

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

Mr. GAVIN. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

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

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

Mr. GAVIN. I also made inquiry relative to this program of surplus commodities. Under this program, foreign currencies are generated through country-to-country agreements covering the sale of surplus agricultural commodities. A portion of the funds generated are set aside for the payment of construction costs of United States military family housing. In some cases, such as the United Kingdom and Japan, the local currency has been adequate to meet all costs. In others, however, such as Spain and Morocco, the local currency has been supplemented by appropriated dollars—up to a limit of 25 percent of the total cost—in order to obtain scarce items not available locally.

The occupants of this housing forfeit their quarters allowances which are used, first, to pay maintenance and operating costs and, second, to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the foreign currencies used.

One important advantage of the surplus commodity program is that the quarters allowances are used to repay the Commodity Credit Corporation, so that there is no outflow of gold from the United States.

I trust that explains the matter the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, but what I would like to know is, when is this sort of program ever going to end? Is it going on indefinitely and forever? Are we going to continue each year the building of thousands of housing units overseas?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I hope the time will come soon when all of our houses in Europe and every place else will be vacant.

Mr. GROSS. I hope so, too, but every year you come in with a bill for more thousands. Now, I would like to ask one other question. This bill provides for the leasing of housing overseas. Under what conditions is this to be undertaken?

Mr. VINSON. I will say it does not apply to the leasing of any housing overseas. In response to the question, "When will there cease to be any further building?" it is hoped that the program will be completed next year or probably the following year. Within 2 years, at least, there should be no more programs of this kind. We hope within the next year it may end.

Mr. GROSS. On page 8 of the bill, section 104 (a), it reads:

In accordance with the provisions of section 407—

And so on and so forth—

as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations—

Then those are all foreign locations.

Mr. VINSON. Notwithstanding that language, my statement is correct. That is nothing but standard language which appears in the bill in dealing with this broad subject. But there are no plans to lease any quarters.

Mr. GROSS. But you do provide a clear provision for leasing housing facilities overseas.

Mr. VINSON. I understand that. It is just one of those things that happens to be written in like other language that is written, but that is all.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, there is nothing to prevent them from leasing housing overseas if they want to do it under the terms of this bill?

Mr. VINSON. Suppose we do lease them. What will be wrong with that? There is no plan to lease them, so far as the information before the committee was concerned, but there is nothing wrong with leasing them if it is necessary to house American dependents on foreign shores.

Mr. GROSS. Had you said the military is leasing housing overseas, my next question would have been under what terms and conditions, because I am informed that some agencies of Government are paying fabulous prices for leased property.

Mr. VINSON. Well, there is a standard as to how much a man can get for rental allowance, and a lease is always based on the rental allowance.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been thoroughly debated and I think fully explained. It was my privilege to work along with my colleagues and our distinguished chairman in its preparation. Like the gentleman from Iowa

[Mr. CUNNINGHAM] said, we must survive. There is no cut rate way to survive or furnish armaments to survive in this nuclear, in this space, in this missile age. This is the best we can give you from the best we have. We urge you to accept our recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said, I have participated in the thorough examination which the House Armed Services Committee has made covering this bill and I wish to assure the Congress that it was most thoroughly reviewed. Certain projects which we considered to be merely desirable, but not essential, were eliminated by our committee and the remaining work which this bill authorizes is strictly limited to projects for which a compelling military necessity exists.

Throughout our study of this bill our committee kept firmly in mind the fact that heavy expenditures for new modern types of weapons will create tremendous financial burdens for the next several years. For this reason each project in this bill was carefully scrutinized and I feel that the work covered by this bill is the minimum amount needed to satisfactorily support the missions which are assigned to our military forces.

To illustrate the importance of the work which is to be authorized by this bill, I would like to point out that 32 percent of the projects which it authorizes are directly in support of our missile programs and their associated nuclear capability. Approximately 14 percent is required for radar defense systems. Approximately 12 percent is for improving the capability of the Strategic Air Command. Substantial amounts are also provided for research and development, submarine and antisubmarine activities, fighter aircraft programs, combat training, and other essential activities of the three military departments. I wish I could state publicly what I know about the mission of MATS. This is impossible for security reasons. I would, however, like to speak on this subject to the extent that I can.

Mr. Chairman, I think it timely and important that I make a few remarks on the Military Air Transport Service.

It is true that the bill does not contain any large authorizations for this great organization but it has been the subject of scrutiny—and I might say, attack—during this Congress and I feel that the other side of the coin could well be studied by the Members of this House.

One of the defense functions receiving extended consideration by the House Armed Services Committee during the 1958 review of the military forces was that of military air transportation activities. This was deemed advisable in light of the interest of other committees, extending over several years, in the size, structure, and operations of MATS. Their findings and recommendations, following hearings on MATS, raised the question in the minds of the Armed Services Committee members as to whether they had entirely fulfilled the responsibilities of the committee. As a result a thorough searching inquiry was made into the premises. Questions were so framed by the members of the Armed Services Committee as to disclose all

matters pertinent to MATS as a military force and its relationship to the armed services. Due to the disparaging, even though dispassionate views on MATS which exist, I feel that a more extensive discussion of the subject is required.

During the course of the hearings, testimony was given in opposition to MATS on the premise that it competes with civil air carriers. It has been further stated that this competition retards development of air transportation, and in several cases has been the cause for carriers going out of business. This complaint has been injected into Congressional hearings for a number of years, and made the subject of public addresses, news items, magazine articles, and releases by business associations.

The gravity of these charges and the extent to which they have been exploited places an obligation upon the Armed Services Committee to inform the Congress and the general public in this matter.

The military threat which imperils free nations throughout the world is a direct threat to the peace and security of our own freedom. This has necessitated a broad peacetime military program to assure our defense against military aggression. Activation of this program in establishing, maintaining, and supporting essential preparedness forces for defense has generated military air traffic which is not too dissimilar to wartime requirements.

Utilization of the airlift capability and the maintenance and support man-hours, made available by the essential peacetime operations of MATS, to airlift the military traffic is commendable. It shows a sense of responsible management with deep concern for the taxpayer and far-reaching consideration of the national budget.

In reviewing the testimony adduced at the hearing, the committee finds that the military services have made significant contribution to the development of the civil air transportation industry. Millions of dollars annually have been paid to civil carriers for airlifting military traffic which exceeds the capability generated by MATS. However, it appears that continuous efforts are made by the civil carriers to obtain more military business by reducing the beneficial payload carried by MATS. The DOD would be amiss in wasting public moneys to procure such airlift merely to provide business to commercial operators. This would constitute a subsidy with funds appropriated for military defense purposes, which never has been intended by Congress. This view is strongly supported by the important fact that Congress specifically provided, in the Civil Aeronautics Act, the means by which the Government should insure the economic development of civil air transportation system required by the public convenience and necessity.

In summary, the Committee on Armed Services does not concur with the views expressing competition by MATS. Instead the committee supports the policy and practice of the military in obtaining the most beneficial use of the airlift generated by MATS' peace time opera-

tions and meeting essential requirements. The procurement of civil airlift to meet requirements which exceed MATS' capability should be continued; however, this supplemental lift should not constitute the mainstay of any civil carrier, nor should the revenues therefrom represent more than an element of byproduct income for such carriers.

The military has no authority, nor can it be expected to subsidize any carrier or class of carriers by the procurement of airlift or other services merely to keep an air carrier solvent. This is the duty and responsibility assigned by Congress to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The distinction between MATS and an airline is evident. An airline operates its services between communities on a schedule designed to afford the best frequencies of travel as dictated by the trade and commerce needs of the points serviced. MATS operates its transports to provide airlift as levied on it by the JCS and the several military services, in moving military traffic. The fact that some of these requirements can be airlifted more economically by operating military flights with limited regularity does not change the character of MATS from a military logistic operation to an airline operation.

Taking all of the foregoing into account, the Committee on Armed Services cannot agree with the common parlance which characterizes MATS as an airline. Conversely, it is the strongly held view of the Armed Services Committee that MATS is a carefully integrated part of the overall military force; further the committee is fully convinced that MATS is designed, both as to size, composition, and character, to fulfill critical emergency military requirements which, by their nature, timing and need for security, can be met by no other means.

The security of the United States from enemy aggression can only be assured by a combat readiness to fend off all would-be assailants. The character of the potential enemy, the modern weapons for making warfare, and the geographical locations of friendly nations compel the maintenance of a unified defense, alert and ready. For the United States this has mandated a broad program worldwide, and necessitates a continued deployment of military personnel, armaments, and support to almost every corner of the earth not controlled by the U. S. S. R. The MATS' transport mission is essential to the success of the initial actions. The emergency transport mission to be successful will commence before or concurrently with strategic deployments if such become necessary. While attrition is to be expected in any case, the losses could be significantly more extensive if MATS' mission failed. For this reason the MATS' transport fleet is operated to provide the continuous exercise of its facilities and to produce manpower training and operational readiness under military command and control. The importance of MATS' strategic-transport operations requires the same kinds of training and readiness as are required of all military components which will be engaged in combat duty.

In conclusion—and regardless of the fact that I have said or intimated this fact throughout my remarks—I want to say again that the Military Air Transport Service is not an airline. It is an essential, integral part of our fighting forces.

I urge the complete support of every Member of this House for the military construction bill this year.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am certainly not rising in a spirit of criticism of a great committee, but I am seeking a little information. I have a special interest in the Fifth Army not only because the Fifth Army services 13 of the Middle Western States, almost twice as many States as are served by any of our other armies, but also because of a personal interest, because my Chicago Congressional offices are with the Fifth Army Headquarters.

I note in the report that the First Army, which covers 8 Eastern States, gets 1.2 percent of the program; the Second Army, which serves 7 States, including Pennsylvania and Ohio, gets 1 percent; that the Third Army, which services 7 Southern States, including the great State of Georgia and the great State of South Carolina and other great States in that region, gets 3.3 percent; the Fourth Army, which serves 5 States, including the great State of Texas, gets 6.4 percent; the Fifth Army, servicing 13 States, 13 big States in the Middle West and West, gets 0.9 percent—less than 1 percent. The Sixth Army, serving 8 Western States, gets 2.7 percent. At the bottom of the list is the Fifth Army, servicing 13 great Middle Western States, including Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota. I wonder why it is that the Fifth Army always comes out at the bottom of the list.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. VINSON. I think that is a very high compliment to the Fifth Army area. It shows that in this great section of the Republic, in the States of Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Wyoming, that climatic and other conditions are such and the management by the commanding officers is of such a high efficiency that there is no need for as much repair of installations, and there is no military necessity for building any new installations. This bill is not written on geographical considerations. It is written on military needs and requirements. So I say it is a compliment to that great section that it is not calling upon the Treasury of the United States for money to maintain its magnificent installations, because they do not need to be cared for by direct appropriation this year.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. From the bottom of my heart I thank the distinguished chairman. He replied exactly as

I thought he would and has made it possible for me, when I return to the headquarters of the Fifth Army, to tell them that I am bringing from the great chairman of this great committee the word that the Fifth Army is tops.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly, it is tops.

SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, in St. Clair County, Ill., some 34 years ago, one of the major installations of today's Air Force, Scott Air Force Base, had its beginning as an integral part of the Army's first air arm. Records indicate that the site for a mammoth aviation school was chosen by Congress on June 14, 1917, and construction began several weeks later.

Following the usual procedure of naming aviation fields in honor of American flyers who had distinguished themselves, the new school was named for Corp. Frank S. Scott. Scott had lost his life several years earlier on an experimental flight at College Park, Md. He is believed to have been the first enlisted man to die as the result of an air accident.

Although Scott Field, as it was originally called, was a vital factor in the winning of World War I, it was not until June 25, 1919, that the Government actually purchased the property at a cost of \$119,285. It occupies 2,761 acres of land in St. Clair County.

During the twenties and early thirties, Scott became the Army's center of lighter-than-air flying. In 1921 construction began on an airship hangar which was to be the second largest structure of its kind in the world. For 18 years it was a middle-western landmark, the symbol of a great base, guided for many years by Col. John A. Paegelow, one of the world's authorities on lighter-than-air craft.

The year 1939 spelled the end of the lighter-than-air era. The dirigible hangar was razed and replaced by a more modern airplane hangar. The acreage was increased considerably when two new areas housing the parent radio school of the Air Corps were incorporated. During the period 1939 to 1947 this base expanded its technical training facilities and functions, for the primary purpose of furnishing skilled operating personnel for military service, and played an important part in the successful conclusion of World War II.

In 1947 the Technical Division of the Air Training Command moved its headquarters to Scott Air Force Base from St. Louis and in 1949 the Air Training Command, consolidating its divisions, established new headquarters here. In 1951 the command again decentralized its activities into air forces, one specializing in technical and the other in flying training. In early 1952 a crew-training air force was organized.

In order to consolidate flying training and technical training activities into a single-unit organization, resulting from

development of more complex aircraft, the headquarters of Air Training Command in the fall of 1957 moved to Randolph Air Force Base, Tex. Concurrently, the headquarters of Military Air Transport Service Headquarters was transferred to Scott Air Force Base from Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Prince Georges County, Md.

This move was made in order to effectuate a more efficient and centralized location for the worldwide operations of the Military Air Transport Service. The release of facilities at Andrews Air Force Base permitted the transfer of headquarters Air Research and Development Command, formerly located in scattered and rented buildings in the city of Baltimore, Md., to establish their consolidated headquarters in permanent buildings at this location at minimum cost and disruption of activities. This location is also advantageous to the Government in that it permits constant liaison to be maintained with all branches of the military services in the Washington area.

The joint users of Scott Air Force Base include Air Defense Command, Air Training Command, Continental Air Command, and the headquarters of Military Air Transport Service.

The transfer and establishment of the organizational functions of MATS headquarters at this location was quickly and economically effected with minimum disruption to operational command activities.

Existing facilities to accommodate this movement were found to be satisfactory and minimum expenditures of funds in future years are anticipated. Approximately 3,000 military personnel are permanently assigned here with 2,500 additional civilians employed for a total strength of 5,500 persons.

The mission of the Military Air Transport Service is to provide, first, airlift required in support of approved joint war plans; second, scheduled airlift for the Department of Defense within the continental United States between the continental United States and overseas areas, and between and within overseas areas as directed by higher authority; third, worldwide air transport, air weather, airways and air communications, and air rescue service systems; fourth, flight service within the zone of interior; fifth, organization and training of air resupply and communications services; sixth, supervision and control and maintenance of primary facilities for performing its assigned mission; and seventh, theater jurisdiction in overseas areas where MATS units are stationed but which are outside the jurisdiction of any theater commander.

Belleville, Ill., 6 miles west of Scott Air Force Base, is the seat of government of St. Clair County. It was settled in 1806, established in 1814, and incorporated in 1819.

The center of a vast farming area, it is also the stove manufacturing capital of the United States. In addition, there are unlimited supplies of bituminous coal and high-grade limestone.

The population of Belleville is estimated around 40,000, occupying an area

of 6.5 square miles. The mean annual temperature is 56.3 with an average annual rainfall of 37.2 inches. The humidity maintains an annual average of 0.70 and the prevailing winds are south. The city is 420 to 630 feet above sea level.

The city has a first-class hotel, numerous tourist homes, and tourist courts. It has a modern hospital, two homes for aged, a good nursing home, and an orphanage maintained by the Catholic diocese of Belleville.

There are four large theaters and one drive-in, a 26-acre municipal park, and three golf courses.

Churches of every major faith welcome Scott personnel and many maintain service centers.

There are two daily newspapers and one radio station.

East St. Louis which joins Belleville on the west, has an estimated population of nearly 100,000. It boasts several good motels and a modern hotel, parks, and golf courses. It is one of the largest livestock centers in the world.

There are two major hospitals in East St. Louis, with a tuberculosis sanitarium close by. It is the home of Parks College of St. Louis University, one of the few institutions in the United States offering a college degree in various phases of aeronautics.

St. Louis, Mo., hub of most of the activities of this area, is a center of a population of close to 2 million. The second largest railroad center in the United States, it is also served by all major airlines.

It is the shoe and beer manufacturing center of the United States and the home of the famous Washington University Medical Center and St. Louis University Medical School. It is the world's largest raw fur market, the center of a large chemical industry, and along with its sister city, the center of a meatpacking industry rivaled only by Chicago.

Back in Illinois, several small communities lie within a 10-mile radius of Scott Air Force Base. Many officers, airmen, and civilian personnel of Scott reside in Lebanon, O'Fallon, and Mascoutah, as well as in other outlying communities. Lebanon is the home of McKendree College, over 100 years old, and boasts a country club with swimming pool and golf course. Many Scott personnel are active members of this club.

The Air Force has invested \$58 million in this installation to date, with an additional expenditure of \$693,000 planned for construction under authorization being provided by this fiscal year 1959 construction authorization bill.

Additional investments in future years are planned by the Air Force to expand and improve the facilities at this important Air Force Base.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, this bill now before the House which would authorize 1959 fiscal year military and naval construction contains two items which I have been supporting for some time. The first is an authorization for the construction of 310 Capehart housing units at Westover Air Force Base,

Chicopee Falls, Mass., at a cost of \$1,345,000 and the second authorizes the construction of a National Guard Armory at Agawam, Mass., at a cost of \$170,000.

Mr. Chairman, Westover Air Force Base is the headquarters of the Strategic Air Command's Eighth Air Force. Since the Atlantic Division of the Military Air Transport Service vacated Westover Field in 1955 and the Strategic Air Command took over command of the facility, there has been a tremendous increase in the number of military personnel assigned to the base. Naturally, military families have found difficulty in obtaining housing in off-base communities close enough so that there would be no great travel time lag in the event of an emergency. The military commanders at the base were concerned over key personnel such as pilots and engineers living at great distances from their aircraft. As we all know, the Strategic Air Command is still our first line of defense and SAC planes and crews are on a 24-hour a day alert. The late Brig. Gen. Donald W. Saunders, who commanded the 57th Air Division at Westover until he was killed in the tragic take-off crash of a jet tanker on June 27, had expressed his concern to me about the need of more on-base housing for his military personnel. I am quite pleased to know that this legislation contains an authorization item for 310 housing units at Westover. Construction of these units will start in the fall. The Strategic Air Command has already asked for 370 additional Capehart units for Westover, and this request has been approved by Air Force Headquarters. It is my understanding that the Defense Department has deferred action on the 370 additional units until such time as construction is well underway on the 310 units contained in this bill. Authorization for the 370 additional units will have to come through in subsequent authorization legislation.

Because of General Saunders' keen interest in these 310 housing units for his officers and men at Westover, I think it was most fitting and proper that Westover Air Force Base officials have decided to name the new housing project Saunders Knoll out of respect for the memory of the late General Saunders.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following news story from the Springfield Daily News on July 3, announcing the naming of the housing project as Saunders Knoll:

SAUNDERS KNOLL TO BE NAME OF NEW HOUSING ON BASE—FIRST SECTION OF PROJECT TO BE MEMORIAL TO COMMANDER OF 57TH AIR DIVISION KILLED IN CRASH

WESTOVER AIR FORCE BASE, July 3.—Brig. Gen. Donald W. Saunders, commander of the 57th Air Division, who was killed last Friday in the crash of the KC-135 Stratotanker here, will be memorialized when the first portion of the new Capehart housing project is constructed on this Strategic Air Command base.

Base officials today announced that the initial part of the 310-unit housing project will be named Saunders Knoll in honor of the 57th Air Division commander.

One of the other portions of the huge housing project will be named in honor of

one of the two sergeants who were killed aboard the same plane.

General Saunders was the aircraft commander of the number three craft "Cocoa" in the ill-fated flight. All 15 occupants of the plane, including the crew of seven, six newsmen and two aeronautical officials lost their lives when the plane failed to gain altitude and hit high tension lines and then crashed into a cornfield nearly a mile from the end of the Westover runway.

General Saunders, 45, had been commander of the 57th Air Division at Westover since September 24, 1955.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House authorizes an expenditure of \$135,000 for an Army National Guard Armory in Caldwell, Ohio. Caldwell is the county seat of Noble County in the 15th district of Ohio, which I have the honor to represent.

I should like to call the importance of this measure to the attention of the Members of the House for indeed it is an important item.

For many years Caldwell had no National Guard unit. From time to time interest was displayed only to subside because of the seeming impossibility of obtaining training facilities. Recently local interest has been increasing and a National Guard unit was formed which has trained and performed admirably. Its presence has been a source of pride to the community and is providing our State and our Nation with an important arm of defense. We will make no mistake in providing this authorization. We would make grave errors if we should fail to authorize it. The Adjutant General of Ohio has approved this installation, and the matching funds are available. The National Guard Bureau has also approved the facility and requested it be given priority.

The National Guard program will be further strengthened by this installation in Caldwell, Ohio. I urge its approval.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I have not asked for any time and I desire no time.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Technical Services Facilities

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,697,000.

Detroit Arsenal, Mich.: Administrative facilities, \$5,666,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Ala.: Administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$8,529,000.

Rock Island Arsenal, Ill.: Operational and training facilities, \$570,000.

White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, research, development and test facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$7,931,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Fort Lee, Va.: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$4,630,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Army Chemical Center, Md.: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,051,000.

Fort Detrick, Md.: Troop housing, \$1,795,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Ariz.: Maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$9,098,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Army May Service, Md.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,913,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Va.: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,634,000.

(Medical Corps)

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colo.: Troop housing, \$862,000.

Field Forces Facilities

(First Army area)

Fort Devens, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, \$171,000.

Fort Dix, N. J.: Troop housing and utilities, \$3,749,000.

(Second Army area)

Carlisle Barracks, Pa.: Hospital facilities, family housing, and real estate, \$2,274,000.

Fort Knox, Ky.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$516,000.

Fort Meade, Md.: Operational and training facilities, \$498,000.

Fort Ritchie, Md.: Supply facilities, \$43,000.

(Third Army area)

Fort Benning, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and family housing, \$3,454,000.

Fort Bragg, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$762,000.

Fort Campbell, Ky.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and administrative facilities, \$847,000.

Fort McClellan, Ala.: Operational and training.

Fort Rucker, Ala.: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,406,000.

(Fourth Army area)

Fort Bliss, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$13,734,000.

Fort Hood, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,258,000.

Fort Sill, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$3,227,000.

(Fifth Army area)

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.: Troop housing, and family housing, \$783,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,076,000.

Fort Riley, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$1,084,000.

(Sixth Army area)

Baywood Park, Calif.: Real estate, \$144,000.
Camp Desert Rock, Nev.: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,892,000.

Fort Lewis, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,085,000.

Fort Ord, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,733,000.

Yuma Test Station, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, \$173,000.

(Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.: Troop housing, medical facilities, and community facilities, \$5,844,000.

(Armed Forces special weapons)

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$273,000.

(Tactical installations support facilities)

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, \$6,311,000.

Outside continental United States

(Alaskan area)

Fairbanks Permafrost Research area: Real estate, \$7,000.

(Pacific Command area)

Kawaihae Harbor, T. H.: Operational and training facilities, \$240,000.

Schofield Barracks, T. H.: Troop housing, \$593,000.

Fort Shafter, T. H.: Supply facilities, maintenance facilities, family housing, and community facilities, \$2,925,000.

Korea: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$904,000.

(United States Army, Europe)

France: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,063,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$201,121,000.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons development, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$10 million: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services, of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat.

454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 298 units.
Vicenza, Italy, 371 units.

Army Security Agency, location 13, 91 units.

Gateway Communications Station, 174 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Inside the United States

Redstone Arsenal, Ala., 316 units.
Seneca Ordnance Depot, N. Y., 120 units.

White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex., 200 units.

Fort Monmouth, N. J., 130 units.
Fort Lee, Va., 435 units.

Natick R&E, Mass., 35 units.
Fort Belvoir, Va., 618 units.

Two Rock Ranch Station, Calif., 25 units.
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 50 units.

Beaumont Army Hospital, Tex., 125 units.
Fort Totten, N. Y., 130 units.

Fort Campbell, Ky., 837 units.
Granite City Engineer Depot, Ill., 65 units.

Fort Rucker, Ala., 400 units.
Fort Stewart, Ga., 73 units.

Fort Bliss, Tex., 410 units.
Fort Hood, Tex., 500 units.

Fort Sill, Okla., 349 units.
Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., 700 units.

Fort Leavenworth, Kans., 200 units.
Fort Sheridan, Ill., 50 units.

Fort Baker and Barry, Calif., 98 units.
Oakland Army Terminal, Calif., 88 units.

Fort Lewis, Wash., 856 units.
Branch United States Disciplinary Bar-

acks, Calif., 160 units.
United States Military Academy, N. Y.,

156 units.
Bossier Base, La., 200 units.

Fort Eustis, Va., 223 units.
Medina Base, Tex., 125 units.

Sandia Base, N. Mex., 213 units.
Army Air Defense command stations, 466

units.

Outside the United States

Canal Zone, 330 units.
Schofield Barracks, T. H., 385 units.

Fort Shafter, T. H., 481 units: *Provided, however*, That no family housing units shall be constructed on Fort DeRussy.

(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to acquire family housing at the following location:

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Aberdeen, Md., 796 units.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 209, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "Technical Service Facilities (Ordnance Corps)," with respect to Pueblo Ordnance Depot, Colo., strike out "\$563,000" and insert in place thereof "\$600,000".

(b) Public Law 209, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$44,407,000" and "\$134,075,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$44,444,000" and "\$134,112,000", respectively.

SEC. 106 (a) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Huachuca, Ariz., strike out "\$6,856,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,576,000".

(2) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Chemical Corps)," with respect to Camp Detrick, Md., strike out "\$913,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,074,000"; and with respect to Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, strike out "\$867,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,044,000".

(3) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Huachuca, Ariz., strike out "\$6,856,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,576,000".

(4) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Belvoir, Va., strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place thereof "\$940,000".

(5) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Belvoir, Va., strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place thereof "\$940,000".

(6) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Belvoir, Va., strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place thereof "\$940,000".

(7) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Belvoir, Va., strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place thereof "\$940,000".

(8) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Belvoir, Va., strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place thereof "\$940,000".

(9) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Belvoir, Va., strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place thereof "\$940,000".

(10) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Belvoir, Va., strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place thereof "\$940,000".

(11) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Belvoir, Va., strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place thereof "\$940,000".

(12) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Belvoir, Va., strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place thereof "\$940,000".

Aux-Pins Area Ammunition Storage Depot and Terminal, Alabama-Mississippi: Ammunition storage depot and ammunition loading terminal, including acquisition of land, \$44,168,000.

(b) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$131,906,000" and "\$238,870,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$149,123,000" and "\$256,087,000", respectively.

SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Ordnance Corps)," with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Ala., strike out "\$2,865,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,180,000".

(2) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Monmouth, N. J., strike out "\$615,000" and insert in place thereof "\$731,000"; and with respect to Vint Hill Farms Station, Va., strike out "\$695,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,022,000".

(3) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Corps of Engineers)," with respect to Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois, strike out "\$1,822,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,815,000".

(4) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Medical Corps)," with respect to Walter Reed Army Medical Center, D. C., strike out "\$4,472,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,714,000".

(5) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Second Army Area)," with respect to Fort George G. Meade, Md., strike out "\$923,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,264,000".

(6) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Fourth Army Area)," with respect to Fort Bliss, Tex., strike out "\$4,645,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,965,000"; and with respect to Fort Sill, Okla., strike out "\$3,053,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,454,000".

(7) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Sixth Army Area)," with respect to Fort Ord, Calif., strike out "\$1,407,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,742,000".

(8) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Military Academy)," with respect to the United States Military Academy, New York, strike out "\$756,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,171,000".

(b) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$237,320,000" and "\$546,387,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$244,125,000" and "\$553,192,000", respectively.

SEC. 108. (a) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Ordnance Corps)," with respect to White Sands Proving Ground, N. Mex., strike out "\$693,000" and insert in place thereof "\$735,000".

(2) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Chemical Corps)," with respect to Camp Detrick, Md., strike out "\$913,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,074,000"; and with respect to Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, strike out "\$867,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,044,000".

(3) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Huachuca, Ariz., strike out "\$6,856,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,576,000".

(4) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Belvoir, Va., strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place thereof "\$940,000".

(5) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Belvoir, Va., strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place thereof "\$940,000".

(6) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Belvoir, Va., strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place thereof "\$940,000".

(7) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Belvoir, Va., strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place thereof "\$940,000".

(8) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Belvoir, Va., strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place thereof "\$940,000".

(9) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Belvoir, Va., strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place thereof "\$940,000".

(5) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Transportation Corps)," with respect to Fort Eustis, Va., strike out "\$1,231,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,436,000."

(6) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (First Army Area)," with respect to Fort Dix, N. J., strike out "\$54,000" and insert in place thereof "\$68,000."

(7) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Second Army Area)," with respect to Fort George G. Meade, Md., strike out "\$5,885,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,695,000."

(8) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Third Army Area)," with respect to Fort Benning, Ga., strike out "\$422,000" and insert in place thereof "\$616,000"; and with respect to Fort McClellan, Ala., strike out "\$397,000" and insert in place thereof "\$527,000."

(9) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Fourth Army Area)," with respect to Fort Hood, Tex., strike out "\$2,457,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,846,000."

(10) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Fifth Army Area)," with respect to Fort Riley, Kans., strike out "\$1,519,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,892,000."

(11) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Sixth Army Area)," with respect to Fort Lewis, Wash., strike out "\$3,022,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,596,000"; and with respect to Fort Ord, Calif., strike out "\$223,000" and insert in place thereof "\$319,000."

(b) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Outside the United States" in section 101, as follows:

Under the subheading "(Alaskan Area)," with respect to Wildwood Station (Kenai), strike out "\$352,000" and insert in place thereof "\$516,000."

(c) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 402 the amounts "\$95,010,000", "\$35,763,000", and "\$334,104,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$100,343,000", "\$35,927,000", and "\$339,601,000", respectively.

Sec. 109. (a) Public Law 85-241, 85th Congress, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Corps of Engineers)," with respect to Cold Regions Laboratory, Hanover, N. H., strike out "\$2,496,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,787,000."

(b) Public Law 85-241, 85th Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$115,624,000" and "\$293,103,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$116,915,000" and "\$294,394,000."

Sec. 110. The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to enter into a contract or contracts for the sale of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Texas, and convey a clear title by quitclaim deed all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to said depot, to any legal person or group, except Government agencies or departments, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be in the public interest. The Secretary of the Army is directed to act as follows:

(1) The depot shall be moved to, and integrated with, the ammunition outloading terminal previously authorized for construction at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala., and, notwithstanding any other provisions of this or any other act, the authority contained in the act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 536), for the acquisition of land and initiation of construction for the Point-Aux-Pins facility shall continue in effect until specifically superseded, modified, or repealed.

(2) The sale of the San Jacinto Depot property shall be offered by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on behalf of

and under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army within 18 months from the date of this act. No part of the land herein shall be sold, transferred, or occupied, by virtue of this transaction, by any Government agency or department.

(3) A contract or contracts for the sale of the San Jacinto Depot shall be consummated as expeditiously as possible thereafter and on such terms as are determined by the Secretary of the Army to be in the best interest of the United States: *Provided*, That if the property is to be conveyed under any terms by which the purchase price is not paid in full simultaneously with the signing of the contract, title shall remain in the United States until full payment is made but there shall be no penalty or charges made for deferred payments.

(4) All proceeds from the sale shall be available to administer the provisions of this section and to pay any and all expenses, including land acquisition, in connection with the relocation, exchange, or sale of the San Jacinto Depot or the establishment of a fully integrated depot at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala., or all proceeds deposited into the Treasury of the United States for obligation by the Army.

(5) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, and the monetary limitation imposed by section 502 hereof shall not be inclusive of any funds required for or in connection with the San Jacinto Depot relocation.

Notwithstanding any provision of this section to the contrary the United States may retain possession of the San Jacinto depot or any part thereof until such time as facilities are substantially completed and available for use at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala.

TITLE II

Sec. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Shipyard Facilities

Naval Facility, Cape May, N. J.: Operational and training facilities, \$141,000.

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, S. C.: Drydock, \$10 million.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$6 million: *Provided, however*, That no more than \$500,000 of this sum shall be utilized for protective works until the Secretary of the Navy determines in his judgment that sufficient action has been taken or arrangements made to arrest further subsidence of the shipyard.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn.: Operational and training facilities, \$2,247,000.

Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$766,000.

Fleet Base Facilities

Naval Station, Newport, R. I.: Troop housing and community facilities, \$1,709,000.

Naval Base, Norfolk, Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$2,546,000.

Aviation Facilities

(Naval air training stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Tex.: Troop housing, \$1,041,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Miss.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$14,940,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$4,679,000.

(Fleet support air stations)

Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$114,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Fla.: Maintenance facilities, \$1,252,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$47,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nev.: Operational and training facilities, \$80,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Fentress, Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, administrative facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$11,215,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, \$74,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, community facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements \$15,823,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$9,892,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, Calif.: Operational facilities and real estate, \$7 million.

Naval Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

(Marine Corps air stations)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, S. C.: Operational and training facilities and real estate, \$4,352,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,067,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,003,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$2,158,000.

(Special purpose air stations)

Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Md.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, utilities, and operational and training facilities at the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Md., \$17,666,000.

Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing (including operational and training facilities and troop housing on San Nicolas Island; and maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements at Camp Cooke), \$13,841,000.

Supply Facilities

Naval Supply Depot, Newport, R. I.: Utilities, \$2,210,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Va.: Administrative facilities, \$128,000.

Naval Supply Center, Oakland, Calif.: Administrative facilities, \$146,000.

Marine Corps Facilities

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$280,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S. C.: Utilities, \$462,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,138,000.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$168,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, Calif.: Utilities, \$206,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, \$241,000.

Ordnance Facilities

Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Wash.: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, Calif.: Supply facilities, \$129,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Concord, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, \$2,517,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, Calif.: Research, development, and test facilities, \$510,000.

Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Va.: Research, development, and test facilities, \$44,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Hingham, Mass.: Maintenance facilities, \$694,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Md.: Research, development, and test facilities, \$601,000.

Service School Facilities

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.: Troop housing, \$14,200,000.

Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,184,000.

Naval Receiving Station, District of Columbia: Operational facilities, \$650,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,368,000.

Naval War College, Newport, R. I.: Operational and training facilities, \$273,000.

Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$4,643,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$4,199,000.

Medical Facilities

National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md.: Hospital and medical facilities, \$8,503,000.

Communication Facilities

Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational and training facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$38,654,000.

Office of Naval Research Facilities

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development, and test facilities, \$192,000.

Outside the United States

Shipyards Facilities

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, T. H.: Operational and training facilities, \$159,000.

Aviation Facilities

Naval Air Station, Agana, Mariana Islands: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, \$4,414,000.

Naval Station, Bermuda, British West Indies: Operational and training facilities, \$683,000.

Naval Air Station, Ford Island, T. H.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,271,000.

Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Supply facilities, \$165,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, P. R.: Operational and training facilities, \$3,824,000.

Supply Facilities

Naval Supply Depot, Guam, Mariana Islands: Supply facilities, \$3,060,000.

Communication Facilities

Naval Communication Unit No. 3, Asmara, Eritrea: Operational and training facilities, \$1,180,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Operational and training facilities, \$219,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Port Lyautey, Morocco: Operational and training facilities, \$519,000.

Yards and Docks Facilities

Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$890,000.

Sec. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installa-

tions and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$75,301,000.

Sec. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop naval installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real-estate actions pertaining thereto.

Sec. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Naval Magazine, Cartagena, Spain, 46 units, and community facilities.

Naval Magazine, El Ferrol, Spain, 45 units, and community facilities.

Naval Air Station, Port Lyautey, Morocco, 330 units.

Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Italy, 122 units, and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Inside the United States

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, 277 units.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, N. C., 800 units.

Naval Facility, Cape Hatteras, N. C., 27 units.

Naval Facility, Centerville, Calif., 24 units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C., 849 units.

Naval Facility, Coos Head, Oreg., 24 units.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill., 425 units.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif., 800 units.

Naval Facility, Nantucket, Mass., 19 units.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn., 500 units.

Naval Facility, Pacific Beach, Wash., 30 units.

Naval Facility, Point Sur, Calif., 24 units.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Wash., 550 units.

Naval Ordnance Missile Test Facility, White Sands Proving Grounds, N. Mex., 51 units.

Outside of the United States

Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, T. H., 1,140 units.

Fleet Marine Force, Pacific, Headquarters, Camp H. M. Smith, Oahu, T. H., 168 units.

Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands, 220 units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, T. H., 650 units.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, T. H., 80 units.

Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, T. H., 650 units.

(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to acquire family housing at the following locations:

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Fla., 96 units.

Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Md., 385 units.

Naval Station, Green Cove Springs, Fla., 392 units.

Sec. 205. (a) Public Law 534, 82d Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "medical facilities," with respect to the Naval Hospital, Norfolk, Va., area, strike out "\$12,815,000" and insert in place thereof "\$13,979,000."

(b) Public Law 534, 82d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$139,143,000" and "\$266,927,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$140,307,000", and "\$268,091,000."

Sec. 206. (a) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "\$70,656,000", and inserting in place thereof "\$72,785,000."

(b) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "\$70,656,000", and "\$210,704,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$72,785,000", and "\$212,833,000."

Sec. 207. (a) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 201 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Marine Corps Facilities," with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif., strike out "\$648,000" and insert in place thereof "\$778,000."

(2) Under the subheading "Ordnance Facilities," with respect to the Naval Underwater Ordnance Station, Newport, R. I., strike out "\$370,000" and insert in place thereof "\$411,000."

(b) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Outside Continental United States" in section 201, as follows:

Under subheading "Aviation Facilities," with respect to the Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands, by striking out "\$6,525,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$9,063,000" and with respect to the Naval Station, Argentia, Newfoundland, by striking out "\$8,589,800" and inserting in place thereof "\$9,089,800."

(c) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "\$308,463,600", "\$108,365,300" and "\$575,592,300" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$308,634,600", "\$111,403,300", and "\$578,801,300."

Sec. 208. (a) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Fleet Base Facilities," with respect to the Naval Station, Newport, R. I., strike out "\$11,672,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,601,000."

(2) Under the subheading "Aviation Facilities (Naval Air Training Stations)," with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Tex., strike out "\$2,247,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,569,000"; and with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station,

Meridian, Miss., strike out "\$8,231,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,141,000."

(3) Under the subheading "Aviation Facilities (Marine Corps Air Stations)," with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C., strike out "\$170,000" and insert in place thereof "\$273,000."

(4) Under the subheading "Service School Facilities," with respect to the Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Va., strike out "\$237,000" and insert in place thereof "\$300,000," and with respect to the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill., strike out "\$8,413,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,613,000."

(5) Under the subheading "Medical Facilities," with respect to the Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Ill., strike out "\$12,730,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,754,000."

(b) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 203 "\$85,939,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$86,711,000."

(c) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$303,453,000," "\$85,939,000," and "\$451,393,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$312,004,000," "\$86,711,000," and "\$460,716,000."

SEC. 209. Public Law 85-241, 85th Congress, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "Aviation Facilities (Special Purpose Air Stations)," with respect to the Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, Calif., insert before "\$7,669,000" the words "and land acquisition."

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Air Defense Command

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minn.: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$2,649,000.

Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vt.: Troop housing, \$990,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Mont.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$10,659,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, N. Dak.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,176,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$10,673,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oreg.: Community facilities, and utilities, \$229,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, and utilities, \$9,948,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$935,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, N. Dak.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,721,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Palmouth, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,689,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, Calif.: Medical facilities, \$122,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Mo.: Operational and training facilities,

maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and real estate, \$2,799,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,579,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, N. Y.: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wis.: Troop housing, and ground improvements, \$795,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$3,992,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$8,696,000.

Air Materiel Command

Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Ala.: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$975,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$1,177,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,746,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Utilities, \$157,000.

Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pa.: Supply facilities, \$94,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing, \$1,560,000.

Memphis General Depot, Memphis, Tenn.: Administrative facilities, \$1,464,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, Calif.: Supply facilities, \$658,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pa.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$6,169,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,362,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$5,196,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, \$11,037,000.

Air Research and Development Command

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, Calif.: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, \$981,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$10,109,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, N. Mex.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$1,650,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$481,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass.: Maintenance facilities, \$165,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$2,884,000.

School of Aviation Medicine

School of Aviation Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities,

utilities, and ground improvements, \$12 million.

Air Training Command

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$979,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$1,534,000.

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Ill.: Troop housing, \$640,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Ala.: Troop housing, \$400,000.

Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Miss.: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, \$298,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Tex.: Troop housing, \$750,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colo., or alternate location: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$5 million.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Ariz.: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$441,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,213,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, \$2,119,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nev.: Maintenance facilities, \$358,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Tex.: Maintenance facilities, \$319,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$245,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,051,000.

Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nev.: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$571,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,770,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$3,081,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,361,000.

Continental Air Command

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Troop housing, \$1,805,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$11,589,000.

Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Ga.: Utilities, \$172,000.

Headquarters Command

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Md.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$18,937,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, S. C.: Maintenance facilities, \$78,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$2,874,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, N. J.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,901,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Ill.: Troop housing, \$423,000.

Strategic Air Command

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,051,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, La.: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,280,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$7,868,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,080,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Ark.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$1,654,000.

Brunswick Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$11,417,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Ind.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and utilities, \$7,996,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$2,257,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,578,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,734,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Miss.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,939,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,174,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,404,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,346,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$3,241,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$4,094,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,703,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,489,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,493,000.

Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, La.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$3,401,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,795,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$897,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebr.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,250,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Ark.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,463,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$11,716,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$3,774,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,577,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,832,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$3,344,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,137,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$1,039,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$3,265,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, N. H.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$940,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, N. Y.: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$208,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wis.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$15,552,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,352,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,997,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$3,431,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Mass.: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,345,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,185,000.

Tactical Air Command

George Air Force Base, Victorville, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, \$536,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Va.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,371,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, S. C.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,650,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tenn.: Troop housing, \$591,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,858,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, S. C.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,339,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,474,000.

Special Facilities

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$563,000.

Aircraft Control and Warning System

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$163,066,000.

Outside the United States

Air Materiel Command

Various locations: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$696,000.

Alaskan Air Command

Elson Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, \$380,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, \$710,000.

King Salmon Airport: Operational and training facilities, \$340,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$24,986,000.

Caribbean Air Command

Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational and training facilities, \$1,540,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$5,347,000.

Pacific Air Forces

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$144,000.

Midway Island: Supply facilities, \$839,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$15,688,000.

Strategic Air Command

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,508,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$643,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$21,431,000.

United States Air Forces in Europe

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$19,952,000.

Aircraft Control and Warning System

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$29,135,000.

Special Facilities

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$315,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$287,500,000.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$10 million: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the

Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Lajes Field, Azores, 306 units.
 Kindley Air Force Base, Bermuda, 300 units.
 Laon, France, 102 units.
 Keflavik Airport, Iceland, 300 units.
 Benguerir Airport, Morocco, 248 units.
 Sidi Slimane Air Base, Morocco, 295 units.
 Clark Air Force Base, Philippines, 900 units.
 Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, 200 units.
 Madrid-Torrejon area, Spain, 460 units.
 Moron-San Pablo area, Spain, 40 units.
 Various locations, Spain, 120 units, and community facilities.
 Zaragoza Air Base, Spain, 176 units.
 Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 50 units.
 Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 190 units.
 Bruntingthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 93 units.
 Brize Norton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 215 units.
 Chelveston RAF Station, United Kingdom, 79 units.
 Chicksands Priory RAF Station, United Kingdom, 83 units.
 Fairford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 177 units.
 High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 110 units.
 Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 55 units, and community facilities.
 Stansted-Mountfitchet RAF Station, United Kingdom, 22 units.
 Upper Heyford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 259 units.
 Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, 416 units.
 (b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Inside the United States

Camp Adair Air Force Station, Oreg., 150 units.
 Amarillo Air Force Base, Tex., 500 units.
 Beale Air Force Base, Calif., 970 units.
 Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Ind., 250 units.
 Chanute Air Force Base, Ill., 450 units.
 Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 536 units.
 Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Okla., 50 units.
 Custer Air Force Station, Mich., 169 units.
 Donaldson Air Force Base, S. C., 275 units.
 Cooke Air Force Base, Calif., 525 units.
 Dover Air Force Base, Del., 500 units.
 Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 530 units.
 Duluth Municipal Airport, Minn., 365 units.
 Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., 778 units.
 Ellsworth Air Force Base, S. Dak., 220 units.
 Forbes Air Force Base, Kans., 414 units.
 Custer Air Force Station, Mich., 169 units.
 Fort Lee Air Force Station, Va., 154 units.
 Geiger Field, Wash., 168 units.
 Glasgow Air Force Base, Mont., 460 units.
 Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak., 744 units.
 Griffiss Air Force Base, N. Y., 270 units.

Hamilton Air Force Base, Calif., 550 units.
 Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex., 400 units.
 James Connally Air Force Base, Tex., 366 units.
 Keesler Air Force Base, Miss., 290 units.
 Kinross Air Force Base, Mich., 475 units.
 K. I. Sawyer Airport, Mich., 595 units.
 Kirtland Air Force Base, N. Mex., 490 units.
 Lake Charles Air Force Base, La., 300 units.
 Langley Air Force Base, Va., 500 units.
 Larson Air Force Base, Wash., 200 units.
 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio, 400 units.
 Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont., 150 units.
 Mather Air Force Base, Calif., 220 units.
 McChord Air Force Base, Wash., 1,000 units.
 McClellan Air Force Base, Calif., 540 units.
 McCoy Air Force Base, Fla., 688 units.
 McGuire Air Force Base, N. J., 1,450 units.
 Minot Air Force Base, N. Dak., 932 units.
 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 270 units.
 Nellis Air Force Base, Nev., 200 units.
 Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, N. Y., 290 units.
 Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr., 616 units.
 Oxnard Air Force Base, Calif., 315 units.
 Pease Air Force Base, N. H., 483 units.
 Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.
 Richard Bong Air Force Base, Wis., 900 units.
 Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Mo., 610 units.
 Robins Air Force Base, Ga., 150 units.
 Selfridge Air Force Base, Mich., 580 units.
 Sheppard Air Force Base, Tex., 500 units.
 Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa, 235 units.
 Stewart Air Force Base, N. Y., 300 units.
 Suffolk County Air Force Base, N. Y., 220 units.
 Syracuse Air Force Station, N. Y., 216 units.
 Topsham Air Force Station, Maine, 177 units.
 Truax Field, Wis., 280 units.
 Turner Air Force Base, Ga., 200 units.
 United States Air Force Academy, Colorado, 300 units.
 Vance Air Force Base, Okla., 230 units.
 Westover Air Force Base, Mass., 310 units.
 Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo., 154 units.
 Williams Air Force Base, Ariz., 150 units.
 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich., 618 units.

Outside the United States

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, 1,050 units.
 Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, 600 units.
 (c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to acquire family housing at the following locations:
 Brookley Air Force Base, Ala., 175 units.
 Carswell Air Force Base, Tex., 600 units.
 Craig Air Force Base, Ala., 225 units.
 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Ariz., 550 units.
 Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyo., 500 units.
 Hunter Air Force Base, Ga., 500 units.
 Kelly Air Force Base, Tex., 592 units.
 Lowry Air Force Base, Colo., 480 units.
 March Air Force Base, Calif., 644 units.
 Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., 250 units.
 Mitchell Air Force Base, N. Y., 628 units.
 Randolph Air Force Base, Tex., 612 units.
 Reese Air Force Base, Tex., 418 units.
 Shaw Air Force Base, S. C., 400 units.
 Walker Air Force Base, N. Mex., 800 units.
 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, 2,000 units.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "Continental United States" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "Air Defense Command," with respect to Otis Air Force Base,

Falmouth, Mass., strike out "\$6,076,000," and insert in place thereof "\$6,522,000."

Under the subheading "Air Materiel Command," with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, strike out "\$14,508,000" and insert in place thereof "\$15,800,000."

(b) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "\$824,300,000" and "\$1,363,189,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$826,038,000" and "\$1,364,927,000," respectively.

SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "Air Defense Command"—

(1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minn., strike out "\$1,469,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,636,000."

(2) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass., strike out "\$11,577,000" and insert in place thereof "\$13,341,000."

Under the subheading "Air Materiel Command," with respect to Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, strike out "\$1,339,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,661,000."

Under the subheading "Air Training Command," with respect to James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Tex., strike out "\$4,687,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,301,000."

Under the subheading "Strategic Air Command," with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont., strike out "\$1,586,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,726,000."

(b) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the amounts "\$11,342,000" and "\$1,447,950,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$814,349,000" and "\$1,450,957,000," respectively.

SEC. 307. (a) Public Law 85-241, 85th Congress, is amended, under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "Air Defense Command"—

(1) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Mont., strike out "\$2,048,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,390,000."

(2) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Mo., strike out "\$1,100,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,348,000."

(3) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, N. Dak., strike out "\$6,804,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,507,000."

(4) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass., strike out "\$559,000" and insert in place thereof "\$615,000."

Under the subheading "Air Materiel Command," with respect to Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex., strike out "\$899,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,128,000."

Under the subheading "Air Training Command," with respect to Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Tex., strike out "\$460,000" and insert in place thereof "\$637,000."

Under the subheading "Strategic Air Command"—

(1) with respect to Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, La., strike out "\$3,344,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,633,000."

(2) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, Calif., strike out "\$7,458,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,087,000."

(3) with respect to MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Fla., strike out "\$936,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,268,000."

(4) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, N. H., strike out "\$2,344,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,947,000."

(5) with respect to Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Mo., strike out "\$235,000" and insert in place thereof "\$306,000."

(b) Public Law 85-241, 85th Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "\$394,076,000" and "\$601,781,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$399,755,000" and "\$607,460,000," respectively.

Sec. 308. (a) Public Law 85-325, 85th Congress, is amended, under the heading "Alert and Dispersal of Strategic Air Command Forces" in section 1, as follows:

(1) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, N. Dak., strike out "\$895,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,892,000."

(2) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, N. Dak., strike out "\$867,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,479,000."

(3) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out "\$438,000" and insert in place thereof "\$547,900."

(4) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr., strike out "\$690,000" and insert in place thereof "\$969,000."

(b) Public Law 85-325, 85th Congress is amended by striking out in section 3 the amount "\$549,670,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$552,657,000."

Sec. 309. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out in the first sentence the figure "\$135,425,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure "\$139,797,000."

Sec. 310. The last paragraph under the heading "Research and Development Command" in title III of Public Law 161, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 342), is amended to read as follows:

"Various locations: Research, development, and operational facilities (including not more than \$257,000 for an off-base roadway approximately 10 miles in length in the vicinity of the north boundary of Cape Canaveral—an auxiliary to Patrick Air Force Base) \$20,000,000."

The amendment made by this section is effective from March 1, 1956.

TITLE IV

Sec. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities required for advanced research projects and in connection therewith may acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the total amount of \$50 million.

The Secretary of Defense shall report in detail semiannually to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to the exercise of the authority granted by this title.

TITLE V

General provisions

Sec. 501. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 529, 40 U. S. C. 259, 267), and sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U. S. C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Sec. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this act, but appropri-

tions, for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$112,218,000; outside the United States, \$8,732,000; section 102, \$201,121,000; section 103, \$10,000,000; or a total of \$332,071,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$217,363,000; outside the United States, \$16,384,000; section 202, \$75,301,000; section 203, \$10,000,000; or a total of \$319,048,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$536,218,000; outside the United States, \$123,654,000; section 302, \$287,500,000; section 303, \$10,000,000; or a total of \$957,372,000.

(4) for title IV: \$50,000,000.

Sec. 503. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 percent for projects inside the United States and by 10 percent for projects outside the United States. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

Sec. 504. Any outstanding authority heretofore provided by the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), the act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991), for the provision of family housing shall be available for the construction of family housing at any installations for which appropriated fund family housing is authorized to be constructed under titles I and III of this act.

Sec. 505. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts; the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

Sec. 506. Contracts made by the United States under this act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and section 15 of the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547, 551). The Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

Sec. 507. As of July 1, 1959, all authorization for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in acts approved before August 4, 1956, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public-works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisition in whole or in part before July 1, 1959, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for family housing in the amount of \$100 million that is contained in section 302 of the act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) the authorizations for public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained

in sections 2231-2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886);

(5) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$30 million that is contained in title I, section 102, of the act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

(6) the authorization for development of classified facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343);

(7) the authorization for public works and for the appropriation of funds that are contained in the act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended; and

(8) notwithstanding the provision of section 506 of the act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 558), the authorization for:

(a) jet engine test cells in the amount of \$1,850,000 at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., that is contained in title II, section 201 under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Aviation Facilities" of the act of August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 440, 442), as amended;

(b) ammunition storage facilities in the amount of \$225,000 at the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, Calif.; navigational aids in the amount of \$590,000 at the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, Calif.; research and development facilities in the amount of \$1,804,000 at the Naval Air Turbine Test Station, Trenton, N. J.; and navigational aids in the amount of \$400,000 at the Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Wash.: that are contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Aviation Facilities" of the act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 540), as amended;

(c) the development of aviation ordnance facilities in the amount of \$2,638,000 that is contained in title II, section 202, of the act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 543), as amended;

(d) the development of ammunition storage depot and ammunition loading terminal facilities, Point-Aux-Pins Area, Ala.-Miss., in the amount of \$44,168,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 536), as amended.

Sec. 508. Section 408 (b) of the act of June 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 236, 245), is hereby repealed.

Sec. 509. Section 515 of the act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 515. During fiscal years 1958 through and including 1961, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than 5,000 of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit."

Sec. 510. Section 406 of the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1015), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 406. (a) The Secretary of a military department may acquire any interest in land that—

"(1) he or his designee determines is needed in the interest of national defense; and

"(2) does not cost more than \$25,000 (exclusive of administrative costs and the amounts of any deficiency judgments).

This section does not authorize the acquisition, as part of the same project, of two or more contiguous parcels of land that together cost more than \$25,000."

SEC. 511. Section 408 (a) of the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(5) No determination that a project is urgently required shall be necessary for projects, the cost of which is not in excess of \$5,000."

SEC. 512. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization act except (1) housing units required to be acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) housing units leased, utilizing available operation and maintenance appropriations, for terms of 1 year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than 5 years pursuant to the provisions of section 417 of the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1018); and (3) rental guaranty family housing authorized under section 302 of the act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622); and (4) to the extent that any of the authorization of subsection 104 (b), 204 (b), and 304 (b) of this act to construct housing at locations specified therein are not utilized, such authorization may be exercised to construct housing at other locations: *Provided*, That the total number of housing units to be constructed under the authority of this subsection may not exceed for any service 10 percent of the total number of units authorized in its subsection: *Provided, further*, That the Secretaries of the three military departments, or the designee of each, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to utilize the authority granted by this section.

TITLE VI

Reserve forces facilities

SEC. 601. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) That part of section 2233 (a) that precedes clause (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2233. Acquisition

"(a) Subject to sections 2233a, 2234, 2235, 2236, and 2238 of this title and subsection (c) of this section, the Secretary of Defense may—

(2) Section 2233 is amended by adding the following new subsections at the end thereof:

"(e) The Secretary of Defense may procure advance planning, construction design, and architectural services in connection with facilities to be established or developed under this chapter which are not otherwise authorized by law."

"(f) Facilities authorized by subsection (a) shall not be considered 'military public works' under the provisions of the military construction authorization acts that repeal prior authorizations for military public works."

(3) The following new section is inserted after section 2233:

"§ 2233a. Limitation

"No expenditure or contribution that is more than \$50,000 may be made under section 2233 of this title for any facility that has not been authorized by a law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces. This requirement does not apply to the following:

"(a) Facilities acquired by lease.

"(b) Facilities acquired, constructed, expanded, rehabilitated, converted, or equipped to restore or replace facilities damaged or destroyed, where the Senate and the House of Representatives have been notified of that action."

(4) The analysis of chapter 133 is amended by inserting the following new item:

"2233a. Limitation."

SEC. 602. (a) Section 3 of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended by paragraph (a) of the act of August 9, 1955, chapter 662 (69 Stat. 593), and by section 2 of the act of August 29, 1957, Public Law 85-215 (71 Stat. 489), is amended by striking out the words "in an amount not to exceed \$580 million over a period of the next 8 fiscal years commencing with fiscal year 1951."

(b) Section 3 (a) of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended by section 414 of the act of August 3, 1956, chapter 939 (70 Stat. 1018), is amended by striking out the words "and without regard to the monetary limitation otherwise imposed by this section."

SEC. 603. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for reserve forces:

(1) For Department of the Navy:

Naval Reserve (aviation)

Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta, Ga.: Training facilities, \$480,000.

Naval Air Station, Dallas, Tex.: Supply facilities and utilities, \$259,000.

Naval Air Station, Denver, Colo.: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, \$352,000.

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Ill.: Navigational aids and utilities, \$179,000.

Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Mich.: Airfield lighting, \$147,000.

Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, liquid fueling and dispensing facilities, airfield lighting, and land acquisition, \$1,992,000.

Naval Air Station, New Orleans (Alvin Callender Field), La.: Administrative facilities, community facilities, navigational aids, operational facilities, supply facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,447,000.

Naval Air Station, New York, N. Y.: Airfield lighting, \$130,000.

Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$652,000.

Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, \$570,000.

Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Mass.: Utilities, \$407,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pa.: Utilities, \$39,000.

Naval Reserve (surface)

Alameda, Calif.: Waterfront operational facilities, \$128,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Bloomington, Ind.: Training facilities, \$95,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Boston, Mass.: Training facilities, \$108,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Centralia, Wash.: Training facilities, \$81,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Chillicothe, Ohio: Training facilities, \$100,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Danville, Ky.: Training facilities, \$84,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Dunkirk, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$79,000.

Fort Schuyler, N. Y.: Waterfront operational facilities, \$120,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Hayward, Calif.: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$99,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Honolulu, Hawaii: Training facilities, \$515,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Iowa City, Iowa: Training facilities, \$97,000.

Master Control Radio Station, New Orleans, La.: Communications, \$210,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Olympia (Tumwater), Wash.: Training facilities, \$47,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Pasadena, Calif.: Training facilities, \$132,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Port Chicago, Calif.: Training facilities, \$94,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Jose, Calif.: Land acquisition, \$78,000.

St. Petersburg, Fla.: Waterfront operational facilities, \$26,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Steubenville, Ohio: Land acquisition, \$18,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, White Oak (Lewiston), Md.: Training facilities, \$557,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Yakima, Wash.: Training facilities, \$48,000.

Marine Corps Reserve (ground)

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Lynchburg, Va.: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$388,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Memphis, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$453,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Moline, Ill.: Training facilities, \$152,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Pasadena, Calif.: Training facilities, \$163,000.

(2) For Department of the Air Force:

Air Force Reserve

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Md.: Operational and training facilities, \$129,000.

Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Ind.: Operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$3,174,000.

Bates Field, Mobile, Ala.: Maintenance facility, \$97,000.

Bradley Field, Windsor Locks, Conn.: Maintenance facility and utilities and ground improvements, \$160,000.

Davis Field, Muskogee, Okla.: Maintenance facility, and supply facility, \$325,000.

General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wis.: Maintenance facility, and operational and training facilities, \$173,000.

Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, N. H.: Operational and training facilities, \$180,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Belton, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, \$101,000.

Naval Air Station (Alvin Callender Field), Orleans Parish, La.: Operational and training facilities, \$622,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pa.: Maintenance facility, \$93,000.

Air National Guard of the United States

Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, and hospital and medical facilities, \$171,000.

Barnes Field, Westfield, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, \$740,000.

Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel, Minn.: Site improvements, \$500,000.

Birmingham Municipal Airport, Birmingham, Ala.: Operational and training facilities, \$150,000.

Byrd Field, Richmond, Va.: Supply facilities, \$50,000.

Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wis.: Operational and training facilities, \$579,000.

Capital Airport, Springfield, Ill.: Supply facilities, \$78,000.

Des Moines Municipal Airport, Des Moines, Iowa: Operational and training facilities, \$53,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,308,000.

Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, N. H.: Operational and training facilities, \$170,000.

Gulfport Municipal Airport, Gulfport, Miss.: Supply facilities, \$362,000.
Hayward Municipal Airport, Hayward, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$113,000.

Hensley Field, Grand Prairie, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,862,000.

Hubbard Field, Reno, Nev.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$159,000.

Kellogg Field, Battle Creek, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,136,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$570,000.

Martinsburg Municipal Airport, Martinsburg, W. Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$123,000.

O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Ill.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,099,000.

Ontario International Airport, Ontario, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$127,000.

Portland Municipal Airport, Portland, Oreg.: Supply facilities and maintenance facilities, \$233,000.

Rosecrans Field, St. Joseph, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$123,000.

San Juan International Airport, San Juan, P. R.: Supply facilities, \$70,000.

Sky Harbor Airport, Phoenix, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, \$655,000.

Standiford Field, Louisville, Ky.: Operational and training facilities, and administrative facilities, \$715,000.

Theodore F. Green Airport, Providence, R. I.: Operational and training facilities, \$213,000.

Travis Field, Savannah, Ga.: Housing, supply facilities and utilities, \$317,000.

Various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, \$300,000.

(3) For Department of the Army:

Army Reserve

Batavia, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$171,000.

Beckley, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$289,000.

Beloit, Wis.: Training facilities, \$157,000.

Canandaigua, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$171,000.

Canton, Ohio: Training facilities, \$40,000.

Cheyenne, Wyo.: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Durant, Okla.: Training facilities, \$141,000.

Fargo, N. Dak.: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Fremont, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Galesburg, Ill.: Training facilities, \$157,000.

Greenwood, S. C.: Training facilities, \$35,000.

Hempstead, N. Y. (Nr2): Training facilities, \$536,000.

Johnstown, Pa.: Training facilities, \$99,000.

Kewaunee, Wis.: Training facilities, \$157,000.

Madison, Wis. (Nr2): Training facilities, \$490,000.

Oklahoma City, Okla. (Nr2): Training facilities, \$443,000.

St. Mary's, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.

St. Mary's, Pa.: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Salinas, Calif.: Training facilities, \$164,000.

Sinton, Tex.: Training facilities, \$134,000.

Stockton, Calif.: Training facilities, \$164,000.

Warren, Ohio: Training facilities, \$289,000.

Wilton, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Land acquisition: Training facilities, \$419,000.

Army National Guard of the United States (armory)

Ackerman, Miss.: Training facilities, \$54,000.

Agawam, Mass.: Training facilities, \$170,000.

Ashford, Ala.: Training facilities, \$70,000.

Beckley, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$200,000.

Belton, S. C.: Training facilities, \$122,000.

Berryville, Ark.: Training facilities, \$45,000.

Berryville, Va.: Training facilities, \$135,000.

Bethel, Alaska: Training facilities, \$480,000.

Caldwell, Ohio: Training facilities, \$135,000.

Calhoun, Ga.: Training facilities, \$110,000.

Chester, Pa.: Training facilities, \$206,000.

Espanola, N. Mex.: Training facilities, \$57,000.

Fairbanks, Alaska: Training facilities, \$277,000.

Gainesville, Tex.: Training facilities, \$111,000.

Hollister, Calif.: Training facilities, \$105,000.

Honey Grove, Tex.: Training facilities, \$90,000.

Juncos, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, \$38,000.

Livingston, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.

Lovell, Wyo.: Training facilities, \$142,000.

Mayaguez, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, \$160,000.

Middleboro, Ky.: Training facilities, \$130,000.

Northwest St. Paul, Minn.: Training facilities, \$130,000.

Pitman, N. J.: Training facilities, \$175,000.

Rigby, Idaho: Training facilities, \$57,000.

Salem, S. Dak.: Training facilities, \$150,000.

Saranac Lake, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$300,000.

Shallotte, N. C.: Training facilities, \$95,000.

Smithfield, N. C.: Training facilities, \$98,000.

South Portland, Maine: Training facilities, \$150,000.

Sturgis, Mich.: Training facilities, \$220,000.

Swanton, Vt.: Training facilities, \$137,000.

Walparaiso, Ind.: Training facilities, \$188,000.

Whitman, Mass.: Training facilities, \$170,000.

Whitmire, S. C.: Training facilities, \$99,000.

Winnemucca, Nev.: Training facilities, \$110,000.

Army National Guard of the United States (nonarmory)

Augusta, Maine: Administrative facilities, \$90,000.

Burlington, Vt.: Supply facilities, \$208,000.

Camp Beauregard, La.: Supply facilities, \$325,000.

Camp Dodge, Iowa: Supply facilities, \$120,000.

Concord, N. H.: Supply facilities, \$145,000.

Kalispell, Mont.: Maintenance facilities, \$67,000.

Trenton, N. J.: Maintenance facilities, \$80,000.

(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility to be undertaken under this subsection.

SEC. 604. The first sentence of section 2233a of title 10, United States Code, does not apply to—

(a) facilities that—

(1) have been the subject of consultation with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives before July 1, 1958;

(2) are under contract before July 1, 1960; and

(3) are funded from appropriations made before the date of enactment of this act; or

(b) facilities that are authorized by section 603 (4) of this act; or

(c) The following facilities for the Air National Guard of the United States.

(1) Milford Point, Conn.: Operational and training facilities, \$337,000.

(2) Wellesley, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, \$319,000.

(3) Westchester County Airport, White Plains, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, \$105,000.

SEC. 605. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this Title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and section 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 606. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 603 for the respective reserve components of the Armed Forces may not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$11,886,000.

(2) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air Force Reserve, \$5,054,000;

(b) Air National Guard of the United States, \$11,976,000.

(3) for Department of the Army: Army Reserve and Army National Guard of the United States, \$11,042,000.

SEC. 607. Any of the amounts named in section 603 of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses 1, 2 (a), 2 (b), and 3 of section 606 respectively.

SEC. 608. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1958."

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the Record at this point in its entirety, and that it be open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against paragraph 4 of section 110 which appears on page 18 of the bill. This paragraph is on appropriation in a bill from a committee not having jurisdiction to report appro-

priations, and is in violation of rule 21, paragraph 4.

Specifically, this provides that funds from the sale of the San Jacinto Ammunition Depot shall be available to the Secretary of the Army to pay any and all expenses, including land acquisition, in connection with the relocation, change, or sale of the San Jacinto Depot or for the establishment of a fully integrated depot at a specified location in Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. VINSON. I do not desire to be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman. I concede the point of order. Therefore, paragraph 4, if the Chair sustains the point of order, will be eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia concedes the point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. How much of this language in section 110 is now stricken?

The CHAIRMAN. Paragraph 4, starting in line 10 and ending in line 17 on page 18.

Mr. GROSS. Only paragraph 4?

The CHAIRMAN. That is all.

The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendments as follows:

On page 2, line 22, strike "\$1,795,000" and insert "\$795,000."

On page 4, following line 11, add the following: "facilities, and hospital facilities, \$3,505,000."

On page 9, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following: "Fort Bragg, N. C., 367 units."

On page 18, line 8, place a period after the word "made" and strike the remainder of that line and all of line 9.

On page 18, line 25, strike the word "to."

On page 19, following line 3, insert "Title II."

On page 29, following line 14, insert the following:

"Naval Base, San Diego, Calif., 1,000 units."

On page 53, strike all of line 14.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ARENDS: Page 16, line 24, strike out all of section 110, and insert:

"Sec. 110. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to sell the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Tex., at not less than fair market value as determined by the Secretary of the Army and to convey by quitclaim deed all right, title and interest, of the United States in and to said depot, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be in the public interest: *Provided*, That if such authority is exercised by the Sec-

retary of the Army, it shall be subject to the following:

"A. The United States may retain possession of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot or any part thereof until such time as substitute facilities are substantially completed and available for use at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala.

"B. The San Jacinto Ordnance Depot property shall be advertised for sale by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on behalf of and under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army.

"C. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Army such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, including land acquisition, the sale and relocation of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, and the establishment of a fully integrated depot at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala. The monetary limitation imposed by section 502 hereof shall not be inclusive of any funds required for or in connection with the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot relocation."

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, first let me say I am pleased that the gentleman who represents the Houston, Tex., area in such an able manner is present on the floor of the House. He knows my intent. He knows my high regard for him. He knows, of course, there is nothing personal involved in my approach to this San Jacinto Depot matter before us. I am offering this amendment, to make it permissive rather than mandatory, as presently set forth in this bill, for the movement of the depot. I think this merits the close attention of the House. It is one of great importance.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished committee chairman [Mr. VINSON] has fully outlined what is embodied in this bill. I am in favor of the bill, except for one section, and it is solely to this that I should like to direct your attention.

What is proposed in this section is unprecedented, and I firmly believe that it would be a grave error to allow this section to remain in the bill as now written.

I call your attention to section 110, beginning at the bottom of page 16. This section relates to the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot in Houston, Tex.

Section 110 would require the Army to move its depot and outloading facility from Houston, Tex., to an area known as Point-Aux-Pins in Alabama. The language permits of no exercise of discretion on the part of the Army. The language does not say that this movement would be made if the defense of the country would be better served thereby. It just flatly tells the Army to move the depot regardless of any other considerations, whether of a defense nature or of a fiscal nature.

This matter has been before the Armed Services Committee for several years. And I might say that I never actually believed that language would ever be inserted in the bill requiring the Army to move the San Jacinto Depot.

But it is in the bill today. I would like to relate very briefly the history of this depot and its proposed movement.

In 1956, upon representations that the depot should be moved, the committee and the Congress authorized a study to be made for the purpose of determining where the depot should go. In effect, the study indicated that should it ever be moved, Point-Aux-Pins, Ala., was the proper place for it to be moved to. The study did not indicate any reasons why the movement should be made, however.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] appeared before the committee and detailed the reasons why he thought the movement should be made. I subsequently restudied his testimony and I believe I am correct in saying that his argument is based on two factors. The first of these is that the depot constitutes a hazard to the life and health of the people in that area. And the second, is that the land has become so valuable that it is wasteful to have it used as an ammunition depot and outloading facility.

I would like to deal with each of these arguments separately. With respect to the question of danger, I can only say that the experts within the Department of the Army state that this depot not only is safe—and they give details as to why it is safe—but that it is the safest facility of its kind in the whole United States.

I hasten to say that in saying that it is the safest facility of its kind, the Army is not intimating that it is only relatively safe. The Army means simply that it does not constitute any danger under its present operation to the people in the area.

The depot is located on the Houston ship channel. The outloading facilities are, of course, on the water's edge. And in time of war or national emergency when the outloading facilities would be used, they would constitute a danger in exactly the same fashion and to the same extent that any such facility would. But I want to make it entirely clear that these outloading facilities are not used and will not be used except under war or emergency conditions. And if we are under conditions of this kind, not only will the people in the city of Houston be in danger but also every individual in the United States regardless of where he is located.

The depot in the performance of its storage activities is harmless. And that is the only function it performs today.

Attempts have been made to draw an analogy between this and the Texas City disaster and the disaster at the naval magazine, Port Chicago, Calif. The analogy, I can assure you, is a remote one. In the first place, the Texas City disaster did not involve, primarily, shipments of ammunition at all. Nor did it involve ships of the Army or the Navy. Also, all of the other circumstances attendant upon this unfortunate happening bears little or no resemblance to the situation at Houston.

With respect to the Port Chicago explosion, it is pointed out that ships were being loaded during the war and this is always a ticklish and dangerous operation. It would be a dangerous operation

at Houston, too. But this activity would be carried on at Houston only if we were in an emergency situation where all of us must, in one way or another, participate in the common danger.

Also, at Port Chicago, the only persons killed or injured were those actually engaged in the loading activity. Not one single person in the town of Port Chicago was even injured. It was only those who were on the docks at the time who were affected.

So, I hope I have made clear that these other disasters are not in any way similar to the situation that exists at San Jacinto today. It is a perfectly safe depot operation with, the experts tell me, no danger whatsoever to the surrounding area.

The second principal argument made by the gentleman from Texas—and I might say that I regret that I must take the position that I do as strongly as I do—the gentleman's second argument is that the property has now become too valuable to use as an ordnance depot.

Now, this is a consideration. I could see an argument of this kind generating a good bit of sympathy. I can visualize a situation where property was developed as a tank farm or an automotive parking area 10 years ago on land that has now become very valuable because of the growing community in that particular area. In a case such as this, I would say—in complete agreement with the gentleman—that the tank farm should be moved and the property put to more productive use—or, as the property appraisers call it, its highest and best use.

But here we have an installation specifically and deliberately located on a channel giving it access to the gulf and to the ocean. This site was not selected in any haphazard fashion. It was selected after a study of the requirements for a depot and outloading facility. Such an activity, of necessity, must be in a place very similar to where the San Jacinto Depot is now. It cannot be just anywhere at all.

After the Army selected this site, it spent many millions of dollars in improving it. It has 5,000 acres, 281 permanent buildings, 18 miles of railroad, 415,000 square feet of igloo or magazine storage and all of the other many facilities that such an installation has to have.

Today there is stored at San Jacinto 80,000 short tons of ammunition valued at \$120 million.

I would raise this question: Is the Federal Government to be penalized for its foresight in selecting properties of this kind? Can we extend this concept to the place where every time the United States purchased property and developed it and it later on became very valuable that it should be abandoned and turned over to private interests? The answer to this is very obvious. The answer is "No."

So I trust I have made it clear that, first, the depot is a safe one, and second, that the argument that the property is too valuable simply will not stand up.

And speaking of costs, the Army estimates that it will cost a minimum of \$44 million to construct the new facility at Point-Aux-Pins. I might mention that not even the land has been acquired at

Point-Aux-Pins since the Army never intended to build this Point-Aux-Pins facility until there was a mobilization requirement for it under emergency or war conditions. So, added to the other reasons why this depot should not be moved is the taxpayers of the United States who, I feel, find it a little bit difficult to understand why we abandon one facility—a perfectly good one—and build another. I can hear my own constituency telling me that they, in the past, have wondered why the military services continued to build additional facilities when there were so many installations being closed. This is a question I would rather not be called upon to answer with respect to this case.

Now, let us suppose that the House disagrees with me, and the language remains in the bill in its present mandatory form. What does this mean for the future? It means that we will have established a precedent that will come back to haunt the Congress as long as there are military construction bills—or as long as we have a Military Establishment. San Jacinto is not alone. San Jacinto is one of a great many facilities throughout the country which is constructed on property which subsequently became very valuable. Some of these other facilities have their own elements of disturbance to the local populace. B-52's make a lot of noise. Are we going to move our B-52 bases to isolated areas and abandon the investment we now have in the existing fields? Pretty soon we are going to have facilities on our east and west coasts for loading the Polaris missile into submarines. I have no detailed information with respect to any dangers which may be involved in this operation but I suppose that there are some.

No, we cannot accept arguments of this kind if for no other reason than that we would be embarking on a program to relocate hundreds of millions—perhaps billions—worth of installations.

Now, I am not unsympathetic with the position of the gentleman from Texas. I do not for a minute doubt the sincerity of his belief that this is a dangerous facility nor do I doubt his belief that the property is not being put to its highest and best use. Simply stated, I do not agree with the gentleman's conclusions. I have taken the same set of facts and presumably have received the same information and advice as the gentleman from Texas, but my conclusion is that we should not force the Army to move the San Jacinto Depot.

Since no one of us is perfect, and since there is, of course, the possibility—although I consider it a remote one—that this facility should be moved from its present location, I would suggest that as an alternative to the mandatory language which the gentleman desires, there be inserted in the bill permissive language. This, I think would place the responsibility in the proper place—with the Army. I do not wish to take it upon myself to tell the Army that it should or should not have a certain number of ammunition depots and outloading facilities at particular locations. I am not qualified to make judgments of that kind. And I don't think

many Members of this House are qualified to make these judgments. Let us provide permissive authority which would allow the Army to move the depot if in their best judgment it should be moved, but let us not force it on them.

I have in my hand a letter addressed to the Honorable CARL E. VINSON, chairman, Committee on Armed Services, signed by Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, dated June 20, 1958, reading as follows:

JUNE 20, 1958.

HON. CARL E. VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have before me the draft of H. R. 13015 wherein section 110 thereof requires the mandatory removal of the Army facilities from the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Tex.

Assistant Secretary Higgins whom you so kindly permitted to state the Army position before your committee presented the Army views in detail. I do not wish to belabor you with repetitious detail; the principle involved, to me, is of much greater import. Secretary Higgins' presentation included some draft legislation for a more deliberate approach which I only agreed to with considerable reluctance.

I believe that I would be remiss in my duties as Secretary of the Army if I did not make known to you my objection to such proposed legislation. While I am cognizant of the authority of Congress in such matters, I am nevertheless deeply concerned with the implications of the proposed legislation with respect to the basic responsibility of the Department of the Army for determining those facilities and installations required to fulfill its missions.

I bespeak your good offices to do everything in your power to prevent this mandate upon the Army from being enacted.

Sincerely,

WILBER M. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army.

In conclusion, I should like to point out one thing more. As you read the mandatory language in the bill, you quickly note that this land will not be disposed of in the usual manner, where it is turned over to the General Services Administration, but rather it will be put up for public sale on the courthouse steps or some place else, and then it will go to the highest bidder who has the money to buy 5,000 acres of valuable land. That is not following normal procedure. Who gets it is beside the point, but why this special method. It seems to me that making this language permissive is the desirable procedure, and I hope you will vote in the best interests of the public and the taxpayers. There is a fundamental principle involved.

MR. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MR. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I am a little bit embarrassed because I am talking for my own District. Well, we will do the best we can. And, my friend from Illinois is my friend and I am his. We have been friends and we will continue to be for a long time, because he is going to stay here and I hope I am, too. And, he was very frank with you

and I am going to be frank, too, and I am going to talk in my own way and I am going to try to talk a little horse-sense to you.

The Army does not want to get out and they are not going to get out. They have so stated. The language in the committee bill makes it mandatory they must leave in 18 months. Of course, the amendment by my lovable and able friend makes it permissive, and if you adopt his language, they will frankly tell you "We will never get out, because your language does not make us get out."

Now, there is nothing wrong with the language. The committee clerks helped prepare it. And the sale is under the control of the able and distinguished Secretary of the Army, and I think he has got sense enough to sell it right, and if he listens to me—and I hope he reads this language—he will cut it up into small tracts, and then business people can come and buy it and it will bring a whole lot more money that way. And, Mr. Secretary, I hope you will read those words and I know you will do the right thing and cut it up in small tracts.

Now, why get rid of this thing? It is a health hazard; it is an economic burden on the community. And I plead guilty; I helped put it down there during the war. In 1941 our ordnance people said, "We have to have it." And I said, "Come on down in my section. You are already within 3 miles of there with 2 other propositions, a tank plant, a gun-barrel plant. Come on. We are patriotic. We will go with you and we will help you get the land." What did my folks do? My chamber of commerce went out and scoured that country to cooperate and came up with what? Five thousand acres of that land. It is shaped like a pencil. Five miles of waterfront, the most valuable land in the country. They paid \$450 an acre for it. It is worth \$3,000, \$4,000, and \$5,000 an acre now. I have been on the phone the last 2 or 3 days and my people say that is a conservative figure.

Now, let us see what happened here. About a year ago, or 2 years ago, there was a meeting in Secretary Bob Anderson's office. There were 6 or 7 mayors of towns close to the depot, the president of the chamber of commerce, and the county judge, and the president of the port commission—I do not know whether Senator LYNDON JOHNSON was there or whether his assistant was there—and Senator PRICE DANIEL was and myself. We met in Secretary Anderson's office. He was then Under Secretary of the Armed Services. He called in Mr. Higgins, the gentleman who was in the War Department and who was quoted in the letter. He said, "Mr. Higgins, I am familiar with this project down there. It is a health hazard, it is an economic hazard, it is a burden to the community down there. Get rid of it." And 12 or 15 or 20 people heard him.

That was Secretary Anderson, now Secretary of the Treasury. At that time he was Under Secretary of the Armed Services. Shortly thereafter he resigned from Government service. And, lo and behold, my able and likable friend, Mr.

Higgins, did not wait hardly long enough for Mr. Anderson to get out of town, before he came over to my office and said, "I have to have some legislative authority to move that depot."

Now when Mr. Anderson says, "Go on and move it," he does not need any authority. He already has it. You know it and I know it, and every time we try to give him some authority he says, "I do not want it now."

Mr. Chairman, we are not asking anything but what is right and just and honorable. My people pay taxes, just as yours do, and by no stretch of the imagination will it cost the taxpayers in excess of \$2.5 million to move that depot, over what the land and equipment will sell for. Otherwise, they would have to air condition every igloo that they put up, and they would have to have a dancehall in practically all the buildings.

Do you know what this thing cost, land and everything, down there? It cost only \$16,350,000—less than \$16.5 million. Now Mr. Higgins says in a letter—and I have it right here—written by my able friend, Mr. Higgins, in December 1957, that it cost \$30 million to replace the depot. Six or eight months later he said it cost \$33 million. And, lo and behold, he went to the committee the other day and said that it cost \$44 million. I guess he is going to air condition every igloo and put a dance hall in every one of those buildings. He is puffing his cost figures.

Mr. Chairman, it could not possibly cost more than \$20 million or \$25 million at most, and that land down there will just about bring us out. Here is the able gentleman from Alabama Mr. BOYKIN and he says, "I want to put it on deep water, 20,000 or 25,000 acres, and if it goes up it is not going to hurt anybody, and I will buy the land at \$50 an acre."

How unreasonable can anyone be, to put an ammunition depot in the heart of a great industrial area on land that is worth from \$3,000 to \$5,000 an acre, when it ought to be out in the hinterland so, if it goes up, nobody is going to get hurt. Nobody thought Texas City would go up, either. I am not an explosives expert, but all I know is that 600 people are still dead and hundreds of them are mangled. And if this ammunition depot goes up, with a dozen refineries and chemical plants around there, it will make the Texas City disaster look like a firecracker. I hope it never goes up, but who can guarantee that it will not?

Mr. Chairman, I am not asking anything unreasonable. I think Secretary Bob Anderson had a good knowledge of the situation. He said it was a health hazard, an economic hazard. And I make you one proposition and I think it is a sound one. The taxpayers of this country have had a tremendous burden on their shoulders since 1939 to support the armed services. They represent 65 percent or 75 percent of our total national expenditures, and, as far as we know, we are going to have to bear that burden, 5, 10, 15, 20 years longer—who knows? We are going to have to do it.

If the Army is in a community and the Army is an economic burden to that community and a health hazard to it, why should not the Army get out? Who supports the Army? Is it the country? Or does the Army support the country. I never heard of the Army supporting the country. It is the country that supports the Army, is it not?

This country is large enough and great enough, there is room enough here for all of us. Put these installations where they are not going to hurt, because these communities that are suffering have to pay taxes to support themselves and also to support the Army.

I do hope you will vote down the amendment offered by my able friend. He is not being personal, I know that. I admire him and I respect him. We usually think alike. But this ammunition dump ought to be moved. We can get large tracts of cheap land at \$50 an acre on water where it is not going to hurt anybody if it should go up. Sell this land. Let the Army sell it. Under this language in the bill now the Army has direct control. It is their job to dispose of it. I repeat, let them cut it up in small tracts, and they will get a tremendous amount of money. Under no circumstance can I imagine that it would cost in excess of what that land will bring, more than \$2.5 million to replace it.

I humbly apologize to all of you for talking so long, but my people want you to help them get rid of this hazard.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas who just addressed the House talks in terms of constructing another ordnance depot in 18 months, and under the terms of this bill, if he is correct, the Army would have to abandon the ordnance depot in San Jacinto in 18 months. I wonder if another ordnance depot could be constructed on the salt flats or swamplands of Alabama in 18 months. I find nothing in the hearings to indicate how long it would take to construct such a depot.

Mr. VINSON. While I do not recall any particular testimony as to the length of time, the type of installation that would be required to remove the ammunition can all be constructed within 18 months. I took the responsibility of fixing 18 months because that is generally what is required in other installations of this character.

Mr. GROSS. I found nothing in the hearings to indicate that.

Mr. Chairman, I can understand, I think, why Secretary Anderson would like to move this depot, because, as I understand it, he is also a Texan. I can understand, too, the reason why Texas might want another 5,000 acres at this time. Statehood for Alaska has just gone through, and Alaska will be a larger State than Texas.

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

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

Mr. MORANO. Perhaps the Secretary of the Treasury did come from Texas, but I want the gentleman to know that the distinguished Secretary lives in my own home town of Greenwich, Conn., now.

Mr. GROSS. That is fine. I am glad he has 2 or 3 homes.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I think it should be made clear that this installation is 15 miles from the border of the city of Houston.

Mr. GROSS. From reading the hearings I do not know whether it is 25 or 15 miles.

Mr. ARENDS. It is 15 miles, and there is barren land between the city boundary and this installation.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to read from the hearings the testimony of Secretary Higgins of the Defense Department. Addressing the gentleman from Georgia, the distinguished Chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, he said:

San Jacinto is one of the safest ammunition depots in the country. * * *

The Army has continued to advise the Congress that we wish to retain San Jacinto in its present location. * * *

San Jacinto is a permanent installation in excellent repair, and strategically well located to perform its mission.

Then, he goes on to say:

This facility performed admirably during World War II, and was of major importance during the Korean war.

Three hundred thousand tons of ammunition, he said, were outloaded from this facility during the Korean fighting. Talk about hazards, there was no trouble in handling 300,000 tons in 6 months during the Korean war out of this particular facility. When the gentleman from Texas mentioned Texas City a while ago, he was not talking in terms of ammunition. The Texas City explosion occurred because apparently they were handling broken bags of nitrate along with loose sulfur. They were not handling ammunition at Texas City, and the two situations cannot possibly be compared. The Army did outload 300,000 tons of ammunition in a 6 month's period out of this San Jacinto Ordnance Depot and it was accomplished without the least trouble.

As the gentleman from Illinois stated a while ago, and I would like to reread this portion of Secretary Higgins' testimony before the committee. He said:

The installation consists of 281 buildings which, with minor exceptions, are of permanent construction. It is surrounded by 61,000 feet of chain-link fence. There are 18 miles of railroad trackage; 202 igloos and 7 magazines; 7 warehouses; 150 open-storage sites with earth barricades; 270,000 square feet of open, improved storage area; administrative support facilities; a slip 4,357 feet long by 250 feet wide and 36 feet deep; a pier for 2 vessels, 1,500 feet long, and a tugboat dock, 120 feet long. In addition,

there are 43 miles of roads, plus walks, bridges, trestles, platforms, parking areas, and operational buildings.

I imagine most of these roads are paved; certainly they are all-weather roads.

No wonder they want these 5,000 acres with 43 miles of paved roads, miles of trackage and so forth.

Then Secretary Higgins goes on to say:

Mr. Chairman, it must be realized that, in the event the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot were to be relocated, a precedent would be established which could well result in the relocation of other similarly situated Army installations.

Of course, that is exactly what will happen if this bill is passed without the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. We will be establishing a precedent and there will be all kinds of bills here seeking relief in similar situations and calling for the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Without being facetious at all, I think we must admit that there is absolutely no danger from this facility except in case of war, and let me say to our good colleagues of the House that if the time comes when war comes to America, we will not be worrying about explosives on the ground, but we will be worrying about explosives coming from the air above.

Mr. GROSS. As Secretary Higgins said and I quote his exact words from the hearings:

I wish to point out again, as I have previously, that the depot's storage facilities do not constitute a health or safety hazard.

Those are his precise and exact words from the hearings.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill is passed without the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois, it will constitute what I will have to call the Texas land grab of 1958.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. ARENDS) there were—ayes 57, noes 65.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. ARENDS and Mr. Brooks of Louisiana.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 82, noes 84.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to ask a question of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. On page 39, line 11, appear the words "Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colo., or alternate location" and the sum of \$5 million.

Could the chairman inform me what the object and purpose of that authorized action?

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman from Colorado that the intent of that section, which reads "Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colo., or alternate location: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$5 million," is to bring about the removal of the North American Defense Headquarters from Colorado Springs and concentrate it all at Lowry Air Force Base. That is what that language is intended to do.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILSON of California: On page 29, following line 13, change the period to a comma and add the following language: "to be constructed on land, including the following tracts which are hereby authorized and directed to be transferred to the Department of the Navy by the Administrator of General Services without reimbursement: GSA H-Cal 446D; GSA H-Cal 546-B; and GSA H-Cal 587."

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical amendment, and I will explain it briefly. It allows the Navy to have transferred to it some 407 acres of land which is now under the control of the General Services Administration for use of the 1,000 Capehart units that have been approved in this bill. All this does is to expedite transfer without reimbursement by the Navy.

The 1,000 units of Capehart housing can be developed on 3 pieces of property comprising 407 acres of land located within the city limits of San Diego some 5 miles north of the downtown area. These three properties were developed during the war period with defense housing. The housing has now been removed and the sites are available. Utilities and services, including some streets, are already in place. The 407 acres of land contain approximately 288 acres of land usable for housing. The transfer of this land from the Public Housing Authority to the Navy without reimbursement is desirable and necessary. It will provide land without the necessity of buying private property and removing it from the tax rolls. If the transfer were not made without reimbursement, it would be necessary for the Navy to procure additional funds to provide for reimbursement. The 1959 budget has already been presented to the Congress and if the transfer is not made without reimbursement it might delay the construction of these urgently required Capehart housing units until next year when funds could be requested. These sites provide the best and most convenient locations for housing of this type without the necessity for purchasing extremely valuable property. No formal appraisal has been made for the value of these lands but it is estimated they are worth between \$500,000 and \$1 million.

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

Mr. WILSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman has presented his amendment to me, and personally I have no objection to accepting the amendment.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to the amendment on this side.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUBSER: On page 80, following line 9, add a new item as follows:

"San Jose, Calif., road improvements, \$32,000."

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

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman has submitted his amendment to us. We are thoroughly conversant with it. We know what it is. There is no objection to accepting the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we will be glad to accept it on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services a question relative to the outside of the United States family housing units on page 29 and the top of page 30. It is my understanding that the housing units that are listed on page 29 have already been contracted for and that this is merely a reauthorization.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentlemen from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Those listed on page 29 have not been contracted for, otherwise they would not be in the bill. The reason they are in the bill is that the law requires a line item for all those that have not been contracted for prior to June 30, just last month. And, these have not been contracted for.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Well, may I then go on to the item at the top of page 30, for which a letter of acceptability was issued on April 29, 1958? It is my understanding that that letter has since been revoked. However, the original letter of acceptability provides the bidder a 30-day period in which to appeal, and I simply want to make clear for the Record, Mr. Chairman, that this new authorization is merely for the purpose of making sure that the housing is built and will not in any way take away the rights of the bidder under the original letter of acceptability.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman has stated it absolutely correctly.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the chairman.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: On page 61, after line 10, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 311. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized and directed to enter into a contract or contracts for the sale of the Air Force installations at Wold-Chamberlain Field, Minneapolis, Minn., within 18 months from the date of this act."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, there are two Air Force installations and a naval air installation on Wold-Chamberlain Field, which is the commercial airfield for the Twin Cities, located on the edge, in fact, partly within my Congressional District. These installations are not just health hazards as the gentleman from Texas has described the ammunition dump 15 miles from Houston; they are a death dealer. We have had military jetplanes crash repeatedly, 5 or 6 times in 2 years, into my District. One of them killed 6 children playing in the street, and the parents of 3 of them, who were in one of the four houses destroyed. My folks have properly been pressing me to get those military air operations out of Wold-Chamberlain Field. Now that we have voted to remove a possible hazard from Houston, I think, without question, we should vote to remove a proved hazard from Minneapolis. I hope the gentleman from Georgia will accept by amendment. I should really introduce a similar amendment to title II, directing the naval air forces to get out within 18 months also, because the Navy has a large air installation there too. I hope we can direct the Air Force and the Navy to get those jetplanes out of Wold-Chamberlain Field within 18 months. Will the gentleman accept my amendment?

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

Mr. JUDD. Certainly.

Mr. VINSON. You ask by your amendment to sell and dispose of an active military installation that is being used today, and nothing being constructed to take its place anywhere else. Now, I do not think this committee or the House would be justified to sell what is known as Wold-Chamberlain Airfield that has military planes and installations on it today, this afternoon.

Mr. JUDD. What I asked was not that we sell Wold-Chamberlain Airfield, but that we sell or dispose of the military installations on it, and get those jet planes out of there so my people will be safe and able to relax in quiet and security. I cannot see any reason why we should take a potential hazard away from the vicinity of Houston, where they have never had any difficulty, and do nothing about an actually proved safety hazard, a death dealer in my Congressional District.

Mr. VINSON. Does the gentleman think he is in the same position as Houston? There we have an alternate base to which to go. In the gentleman's case we have no place where we can take this installation. The gentleman is proposing just to close it up immediately. We cannot do business that way. Let the

gentleman offer his proposal, give us an opportunity to study it, and, if the facts warrant it, I have no hesitancy in saying that the Congress will do the same in his case as they have done with Houston.

Mr. JUDD. We have been trying for years to get the military flying removed.

Mr. VINSON. This is the first time this matter has been brought to the attention of the committee.

Mr. JUDD. I just want to give the House a sample of the demands you are going to get from all over the United States if the action stands that you have just taken with respect to Houston.

Mr. VINSON. I do think Congress is composed of sensible men and that they will not do these things.

Mr. JUDD. At Bethel, Minn., just north of Minneapolis, some 20 miles away, in the district of my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER], the Air Force has approved a new air base for these military planes. They have been fiddling around with it for a long time. This bill keeps it alive, no more, with a \$500,000 authorization. Why not give them \$44 million as in Alabama, and direct them to get on their horse, or their plane, if you will, and finish that base at Bethel, so that in the next 18 months, they can remove those military planes from Wold-Chamberlain that are killing people in my district?

Mr. VINSON. The project down in Texas has been pending before the Committee on Armed Services for 3 years.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman is able to get action when he wants it. The Texas job is to be completed in 18 months.

Mr. VINSON. But in Texas we have some place to go.

Mr. JUDD. Have you actually bought the land in Alabama to which to move? The gentleman from Texas said first that he thought you could get it for \$50 an acre and then he said something about getting it for \$25 an acre. Which is it? We have land to which to move in Minnesota too.

Mr. VINSON. The matter was approved by the Committee on Armed Services, and it is pending now in the other body. But the gentleman's proposition is not an analogous proposition because he is proposing to close up today.

Mr. JUDD. No, no; in 18 months. This would give them 18 months to move elsewhere. That is what my amendment says.

Mr. VINSON. Very well, but the gentleman is proposing to close up right now, remove the base, without any provision made to accommodate that activity. Congress would not be acting wisely to do that. No doubt the base should be closed and others should be closed and located in other isolated places. But I trust the Committee will not vote for an amendment like that.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. May I say to my beloved chairman that he knows, as I do, that we have set a precedent here today.

The bill originally had permissive language, but let us be honest about it, this is a precedent. And we are going to be sorry about it one of these days. Let me say that this was the first indication I had of it. I have heard repeatedly from various people to get these things out of here. But today we have set a precedent. As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] says, these people are being killed.

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

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

The Houston proposition is not analogous to this at all. For 3 long years the San Jacinto matter was pending before the Committee on Armed Services. It was studied by the Department. Complete hearings were had. That was the justification for it. Here an amendment is offered to close up a going air base—just close it up. If Congress wants to do it, it has the authority to do it. It is up to the membership; they must make up their mind. If that is the type of legislative approach they want to give it, then they may go ahead and do it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this is largely a question of air traffic in that area. If they are going to put another jet base somewhere in the United States, I will be candid with my friend from Minnesota and say that we would be glad to invite them to come down to Louisiana. We would be glad to have them.

But it seems to me his problem is that of air control. The Committee on Interstate Commerce is now holding hearings on the question of sharing the air control between the military and the civilian. He can get the relief he wishes for his people and save the lives of both military and civilian personnel by cooperating with that committee and working out suitable rules for handling mutual traffic between military and civil aviation.

Mr. JUDD. The problem is not air control. It is due to trouble with the planes or the pilots in taking off or landing. In the worst case some kind of engine failure occurred and the pilot trying to land could not make the runway and landed in the midst of a heavily populated area, not 15 miles away as in San Jacinto, but just across the street from the airport.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Perhaps it is a matter of air traffic. It is a pattern for use by that local base there. Perhaps the pattern they use in the takeoff and for coming in can be corrected and you can eliminate a great deal of the trouble you are suffering from now.

Mr. JUDD. This is a case where the Air Force and Naval Air themselves would like to move away. They do not like it. But this bill contains only \$500,000 for the new base they need at Bethel; not \$44 million as is authorized for a new ammunition dump at Point-Aux-Pins which the Army does not need and does not want.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize this is not the way to consider legislation as the gentleman from Georgia has said I do not intend to press for a vote on my amendment. I offered it to underline the folly of the vote just taken on the San Jacinto project, and to give warning of what we are in for if we allow the vote to stand. I hope the vote will be reversed in the motion to recommend.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask several questions of the committee concerning line 5 of page 55 which refers specifically to housing installations at Truax Field in Madison.

There have been complaints that the activities of the Air Force in the acquisition of properties have been quite dictatorial. They have insisted, for instance, on appropriating 130 acres of excellent farmland when the owners have no desire to sell, and have rejected adjoining areas actually offered to them. This, I assure the committee, is the kind of activity which the taxpayer and citizen falls to understand.

Further, protests have been made to me that the housing is not even necessary.

I should like to have the chairman detail for the House the processes employed by the committee to determine the necessity for this housing.

Mr. VINSON. I will try to give the gentleman the information he desires concerning the requirements of housing in connection with the military installations.

First, the Department makes a most careful, detailed study. Then it must bring out plans for a Capehart house and must go to the FHA and have them approved. Then it comes back to the Department, and the Department comes to the committee. Then the committee has a subcommittee that sits down and hears witnesses, local witnesses from the community or witnesses from the services or from any other place that is necessary. After we get all this information, finding out how many personnel there are in the installation eligible for quarters, the decision is reached as to whether or not we will build Capehart housing.

Mr. TEWES. Is it the position of the committee that the subcommittee has determined first of all the housing is necessary in the light of the housing which is presently available?

Mr. VINSON. We not only do that. I am glad the gentleman called attention to that. A complete survey is made of what the local community has contributed in the way of rental houses that are available for the Army personnel. Sometimes we find that a local community has adequate accommodations. Therefore, we disapprove of the Government going in and building any houses there. But, if the community does not

have the facilities and if the Army, Navy, and the Air Force does not have the facilities, then we say under the law certain types of individuals in the service who are given quarters allowance will have the quarters allowance taken away from them and we will give them a house in which to live.

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

Mr. TEWES. I yield.

Mr. BEAMER. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin raised a point that I attempted to raise with the gentleman from Louisiana only recently pertaining to a similar subject, the acquisition of real estate. I would like to reemphasize with all the emphasis that could be put upon it that the Committee on Armed Services should give considerable study and make it very emphatically known to the Armed Services and to the Department of Defense when they are dealing with the people who own the land that they wish to acquire for military installations, it should be taken by negotiation as much as possible and avoid the very expensive condemnation proceedings. I think that is vital. I hope the chairman will give consideration to that suggestion.

Mr. VINSON. I will state to the gentleman that that is the purpose of the committee, and it is the purpose of the three military departments to always try to negotiate for the sale of property, and only as a last resort to have condemnation proceedings.

Mr. BEAMER. If the gentleman would yield, I would like to state and tell the chairman that that has happened not once but many times. They have been purchasing land from farmers and they insist upon a set price and they will not budge one bit. As a result, farmers are losing from two to three hundred dollars per acre. These are absolutely cases that have happened in my district, and I think the gentleman from Wisconsin should be complimented for bringing it to the attention of the House.

Mr. VINSON. May I suggest to the gentleman that, perhaps, the cases to which the gentleman is referring are matters for which the local appraisers should be criticized?

Mr. BEAMER. Let me make a statement with reference to that. The appraisers were not local appraisers, but they were sent up from Chicago by the Navy or Air Force Department and local people did not even have a chance to say what the farmers' land was worth. I can give you several instances of such cases and I think it is very vital.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 11, strike out all of line 10 through line 22.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike out the provision for \$44,168,000 to build an ordnance depot at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala. Mr. Chairman, San Jacinto is a perfectly good ordnance depot which the Secretary of Defense has stated is not a health or

safety hazard. Mr. Chairman, the Treasury of the United States is not a bottomless pit.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman that the theory and the reason why the \$44,168,000 was put in the bill was because it was estimated by Mr. Higgins that that would be the total cost of building an ammunition depot at Point-Aux-Pins. We had previously authorized \$26,951,000 for the construction of it. I am perfectly willing to see this figure stricken out and let it stand at \$26,951,000 because if you sell the 5,000 acres at Houston, Tex., they will then have sufficient money and probably within the \$26 million limit to build it, and there will be surplus money going to the Treasury of the United States from the sale at Houston.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that the gentleman is accepting my amendment?

Mr. VINSON. I am accepting the gentleman's amendment. It strikes out the \$44,168,000. The balance of the section remains except the figure \$44,168,000; is that correct?

Mr. GROSS. My amendment strikes lines 10 through 22.

Mr. VINSON. That is perfectly all right also.

Mr. GROSS. That is fine.

Mr. VINSON. Because we have authorized \$26 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 67, strike out all of lines 9 through 18.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would, I hope, further nail down this proposition. This would again strike out reference to the appropriation of \$44,168,000.

Mr. VINSON. I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment because this still preserves the \$26 million originally appropriated.

Mr. GROSS. I am not so sure that it does. I hope that it strikes out every dime for this relocation and saves the taxpayers millions of dollars.

Mr. VINSON. If it does not it will be corrected at the proper place.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to determine the status of the proposed early warning and radar station at Sundance, Wyo.

This was first proposed by the Air Force in 1955. Since that time there has been substantial interest in that area with regard to it. The committee report on this bill does not specifically mention this new facility to be located in the State of Wyoming.

I have been in constant contact and have had voluminous correspondence

with the Department of the Air Force concerning this ever since 1955. On July 3, 1958, I was advised in a letter from the Secretary of the Air Force as follows:

The facilities for the establishment of the Sundance site are presently included in the Air Force fiscal year 1959 military construction program, which is currently before the Congress.

I quote from Secretary Bryant's statement before the committee appearing at page 7057 of the committee hearings:

The utilization of new weapons and the assignment of new missions require that certain new bases be provided. A list of the new bases which are in this bill at unclassified locations is shown below.

And the first one he lists is the Sundance Air Force base at Sundance, Wyo., aircraft control and warning radar station.

In the committee report on page 79 there is further listed at various locations in the Zone of the Interior: "Air Force, \$163,629,000."

I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee if the Air Force base at Sundance has been included in this bill and funds provided for this base.

Mr. VINSON. I will state that the bill does include the Sundance Air Force Base. It is taken care of in the item of \$163 million. It is in there.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 617, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves to recommit the bill H. R. 13015, to the House Committee on Armed Services, with instruction to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On page 16, insert section 110 as follows:

"Sec. 110. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to sell the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Tex., at not less than fair market

value as determined by the Secretary of the Army and to convey by quitclaim deed all right, title, and interest, of the United States in and to said depot, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be in the public interest. Provided: That if such authority is exercised by the Secretary of the Army, it shall be subject to the following:

"A. The United States may retain possession of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot or any part thereof until such time as substitute facilities are substantially completed and available for use at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala.

"B. The San Jacinto Ordnance Depot property shall be advertised for sale by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on behalf of and under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army.

"C. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Army such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, including land acquisition, the sale relocation of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, and the establishment of a fully integrated depot at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala. The monetary limitation imposed by section 502 hereof shall not be inclusive of any funds required for or in connection with the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot relocation."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on the motion to recommit, with instructions, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings on this matter be put over until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority whip if he will kindly inform the Members of the House as to what will be taken up tomorrow and in what order.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the first order of business will be the vote on the motion to recommit H. R. 13015, the military-construction bill.

Next will be the vote on the passage under suspension of the rules of S. 495, followed by a vote on adoption of the rule to consider S. 1832, providing for an additional Assistant Secretary of State. If the rule is adopted, S. 1832 will then be considered in the Committee of the Whole.

The next order of business will be consideration of House Joint Resolution 424, crimes and offenses, sentencing procedure, and, if time permits after the

consideration of that bill, it is planned to call up the bill, S. 1411, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, dealing with the suspension of employment of civilian personnel.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 111 on Friday, June 27, on the passage of the bill H. R. 12832, the Transportation Act of 1958, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present and voting I would have voted "yea."

ATOMIC REACTOR ELECTRIC POWER COST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 25 minutes:

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore Sun on Monday put into correct focus the facts about the \$386 million atomic authorization bill reported July 1 by the Joint Atomic Energy Committee.

Mr. Rodney Crowther, the Sun reporter, told how the new authorization bill could socialize the atom as a source of energy.

I call special attention to the concluding paragraphs of Mr. Crowther's story:

What worries some of the critics from private industry is twofold: First, that the reactor program will run into multiple billions; and second, that the Government will insist on developing a socialized power industry no matter how much it costs.

AEC officials have told some of these critics that they are seeing gremlins where none are; and Members of Congress declare that it is a race against the Communist world and that the money must be spent, no matter how much it comes to.

If it were only a one-shot business and the first reactors built would produce electric power at competitive prices, the private industries, it has been said, would jump at that chance to get into the business.

But, they appear troubled by reports from Congressional sources that the Federal program will involve second and third generation large-scale reactors costing billions of dollars before anything approaching a competitive situation will occur.

Some of the critics point to the Shippingport reactor, built at a cost of around \$120 million and recently put into service.

COSTS COMPARED

The coal people charge, for example, that Shippingport "has been erected right on top of coal beds" where conventional methods can produce power for 5 mills per kilowatt-hour. But the Shippingport reactor power, they insist, will cost between 75 and 100 mills per kilowatt-hour.

The Shippingport power is being sold to the Duquesne Power & Light Co., they assert, for about 8 mills per kilowatt-hour and the Government absorbing the loss—estimated at \$25 million a year.

Perhaps the most disturbing facts reported by Mr. Crowther appear at the end of his story:

Some of the views of the private industry critics are due to be aired when the authorization bill comes before the Senate and House, but there is little likelihood that they will have any deterrent effect upon Members of Congress.

Their view is that for the long-range future their reactor program is a necessity and for the national security the weapon-material program must be pushed relentlessly.

Gentlemen, this is an objective report about a controversial activity. The Baltimore Sun recognizes that the climate today is unfavorable to private enterprise in the public utility business. While the astute Sun did not say so, apparently its reporter recognized that there has been a revolution in the minds of the members of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. Therefore, the Sun has concluded that Congress will not reject a bill unanimously reported by the members of that committee, and that it will without much inquiry put the stamp of its approval on what is obviously the biggest grab for economic as well as electric power in the history of our country.

I also wish to call particular attention to the second and third paragraphs of the Baltimore Sun article which read:

In boosting the bill well above what the administration recommended and outlining a long-range program for future development, the committee caused some eyebrows to rise in some segments of the private utility industry.

It also caused some apprehensions among producers of conventional fuels, such as coal, oil and gas, who see in the committee's announced proposals—and some unannounced ones which are scheduled to be reported to this session later—a plan to spend several billion dollars, or more, to launch the United States Government in the business of producing electric energy from atomic reactors.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the Sun atomic story be placed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The article referred to is as follows:

BILL GIVES UNITED STATES ATOM-AGE PUSH—JOINT COMMITTEE RAISES AMOUNT REQUESTED

(By Rodney Crowther)

WASHINGTON, July 6.—The Joint Atomic Energy Committee last Tuesday unanimously reported to the House and Senate a \$386,679,000 authorization bill designed to push the United States energetically into the age of atomic-produced power.

In boosting the bill well above what the administration recommended and outlining a long-range program for future development, the committee caused some eyebrows to rise in some segments of the private utility industry.

OTHERS WORRIED

It also caused some apprehensions among producers of conventional fuels such as coal, oil and gas, who see in the committee's announced proposals—and some unannounced ones which are scheduled to be reported to this session later—a plan to spend several billion dollars, or more, to launch the United States Government in the business of producing electric energy from atomic reactors.

The bill as reported by the joint committee and made public by its chairman, Representative DURHAM (Democrat, of North Carolina), represents an increase of \$193,300,000 over the amount approved by the Budget Bureau, but \$76,100,000 less than the Atomic Energy Commission originally requested.

BUREAU DENOUNCED

In overriding the Budget Bureau and approving a long list of projects that Bureau had rejected, the joint committee denounced the Bureau for presuming to decide on its own what projects the AEC should be allowed to proceed with and which it should defer or drop.

"The joint committee is seriously concerned," it said in its report to Congress, "over the dominant role assumed by the Bureau of the Budget in the atomic-energy construction program."

"Again and again the committee was advised that the Bureau had disapproved a project or has withheld funds on a project recommended by the Commission and approved by the Congress. This, the committee does not approve."

One of the major increases the committee insisted on was \$145 million for the construction of a convertible type plutonium reactor. The AEC has asked for \$120 million and the Budget Bureau said "No."

The committee said it was "greatly concerned over the production of reactor products to meet necessary military needs." It said it had been hearing for 3 years from weapon development scientists, and other military experts as to the need for plutonium. Accordingly, it approved \$145 million for this purpose.

Also included in the increased authorization was \$39,050,000 for the construction of additional research facilities for the AEC physical research program.

FOR BASIC RESEARCH

The committee said it was convinced after extensive hearings that this sum was needed "to meet national requirements in the field of basic research."

Some of the new projects in the authorization bill, which are designed to advance this country in atomic research, production of nuclear materials, and a long-range civilian atomic power program are:

1. For design and engineering studies of a heavy-water reactor suitable for use for natural and slightly enriched uranium and for several other power reactor types, \$9,250,000.

2. For construction of a power component reactor experiment to assist in the development of the heavy-water cooled and moderated reactor concept, \$8 million.

FOR POWER REACTOR

3. For construction of a gas-cooled graphite-moderated power reactor to be constructed either by the government under contract with industry or alternatively by means of a cooperative arrangement between the AEC and public, private, or cooperative groups, \$51 million.

4. For an extension of the power reactor demonstration program, \$20 million.

5. For continuing research on the fast breeder concept, \$1,250,000.

6. For a cyclotron at the University of California, \$5 million.

The plutonium plant, to be built at Hanford, Wash., would be designed so as to be convertible for power production later on, in event of an international agreement on disarmament.

PLANS DISTURBING

In general, it's the long-range atomic power program which critics of the committee's decisions and the AEC's own program find disturbing. A statement on a long-range program is now being prepared by the AEC and the Joint Committee.

There are, for example, 6 reactor proposals in the bill—2 for immediate construction and 4 for design studies. There are half a dozen reactors under construction and as many more proposed.

But the committee has expressed in its report on the bill concern over the fact that only one wholly private reactor project has been announced. The Joint Congressional Committee is disturbed about the possible loss of United States leadership in technological matters.

UTILITIES RELUCTANT

Because of the heavy costs involved and the continuous technological changes encountered in reactor development, private utilities are not inclined to venture deeply into the field.

The joint committee is unanimously of the view that progress must be made, and that the Government must, therefore assume the major burden not only of research but also of reactor development and construction.

What worries some of the critics from private industry is twofold: first, that the reactor program will run into multiple billions; and second, that the Government will insist on developing a socialized power industry no matter how much it costs.

AEC officials have told some of these critics that they are seeing gremlins where none are; and members of Congress declare that it is a race against the Communist world and that the money must be spent, no matter how much it comes to.

If it were only a one-shot business and the first reactors built would produce electric power at competitive prices, the private industries, it has been said, would jump at that chance to get into the business.

But they appear troubled by reports from Congressional sources that the Federal program will involve second and third generation large-scale reactors costing billions of dollars before anything approaching a competitive situation will occur.

Some of the critics point to the Shippingport reactor, built at a cost of around \$120 million and recently put into service.

COSTS COMPARED

The coal people charge, for example, that Shippingport "has been erected right on top of coal beds" where conventional methods can produce power for 5 mills per kilowatt-hour. But the Shippingport reactor power, they insist, will cost between 75 and 100 mills per kilowatt-hour.

The Shippingport power is being sold to the Duquesne Power & Light Co., they assert, for about 8 mills per kilowatt-hour and the Government absorbing the loss—estimated at \$25 million a year.

Some of the views of the private industry critics are due to be aired when the authorization bill comes before the Senate and House, but there is little likelihood that they will have any deterrent effect upon Members of Congress.

Their view is that for the long-range future their reactor program is a necessity and for the national security the weapon-material program must be pushed relentlessly.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, you will not be able to get any subsidized power proponents to admit it, but the total calculated dollar impact of the 1959 fiscal year atomic authorization bill is closer to \$700 million in spending authority than the nearly \$400 million publicly proposed by the Joint Committee.

The Joint Committee's bill contains 4 engineering feasibility studies of second generation reactors which when accomplished next year will supply the extra \$300 million. I am opposed to these reactors as unnecessary expenditures to

have principles already under study in other reactors being built.

Moreover, I am told that the grandiose 5-year plan of the Joint Committee contemplates expenditures of at least \$2 billion, although it admits reportedly to an expenditure of about \$1 billion. Most of these reactors, too, it is reported, closely resemble Chinese copies of reactor concepts already being investigated. I shall never think it necessary to build a \$145 million plutonium reactor whose second purpose is to produce power at an excess cost of \$20 million. Likewise, the gas-cooled project to cost \$51 million should not be constructed at taxpayers' expense. The British Government can tell us about these. Moreover, it is also a duplicate because a gas-cooled reactor is being constructed in Florida.

This is really a proposal to deprive the coal industry and my own State of its predominate place in supplying coal to the electric utility industry under the guise of helping foreign nations and less favorably supplied energy States in this country. How can a Representative of the greatest coal-producing State sit idly by while there are people planning to put the mine workers and the mine owners of his State and of his district into great economic distress?

The bituminous coal industry supplied the electric utility industry last year with approximately 157.4 million tons of coal, and this represented employment for at least 60,000 miners. It is the jobs of these thousands of miners which are at stake, as well as one more very important thing—the electric utility bills of every wage earner in the United States.

If the public utility industry which now has \$500 million invested in atomic power, and reportedly feels that this investment is ample to prove the economic feasibility of the atom, somehow is dragooned into investing more money against its will into uneconomic atomic energy plants, these sums must inevitably find their way into increased electric utility rates. Thus the poor consumer then will not only be faced with the prospect of seeing his tax dollars poured down a rathole, but will have to pay doubly and directly for the "great and noble atomic experiment."

The private electric utility business, in the 3¼ years since the passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, has embarked on a substantial number of nuclear projects, which together comprise a broad industry program aimed at bringing about economic nuclear power.

The utility industry, I am informed, believes that its contribution to nuclear power science is significant, and is unwilling to expend more hundreds of millions on a crash program of building large-scale plants which will be obsolescent before they are finished.

To all practical purposes, as much as this will please the public power proponents, the private utility industry's partnership with the Federal Government is in a moratorium of undetermined duration. Common sense dictates that this should be so.

Therefore the funds which the Joint Committee put into the fiscal 1959 authorization bill for a cooperative dem-

onstrator program will be devoted to just that purpose as the name indicates. Only power groups which do not have to pay taxes and make a profit—true cooperatives will be able to take advantage of these funds.

Today the private utilities, as previously stated, have a program which includes 14 announced nuclear power projects involving a total utility investment of \$500 million, which just about matches the Government investment thus far in its civilian reactor program.

Three of the private reactors are in operation; six are either under construction or under contract, and five are in various stages of planning. The nine projects that are either in operation, under construction or under contract, will involve utility company expenditures of more than \$320 million. The five projects in various phases of planning are expected to involve further utility company investments on the order of \$200 million.

Additionally, the program calls for construction of 12 other nuclear research development and study projects calling for continuing expenditures of substantial sums of money.

If \$1 billion has been spent to prove out the economic feasibility of nuclear power, and this is not enough to accomplish this purpose—what more can a crash program achieve other than a waste of both public and private funds? Even the wildest-eyed believer in the delusion of cheap atomic electric power now knows that it is expensive and that it will be a long time before anything like competitive power, that is, with conventional fuels can be achieved.

I am opposed to the Joint Committee's authorization bill because it is a blank check for a needless program to cost untold billions for no one knows how many years.

Atomic power is not needed in America now because of the great supplies of fossil fuels. The coal industry alone has reserves sufficient to last for hundreds of years, and there is at least a half century's supply of oil and gas. These are facts supported by everyone in Government and industry who knows anything about the energy picture at all.

I want to quote to you a statement made by the former president of Standard Oil of Indiana, Robert E. Wilson, who cannot by the stretch of anyone's imagination be called an electric utility or a coal industry spokesman.

In a recent speech Mr. Wilson said:

We have made much progress in the last decade. The research has uncovered, however, almost as many unanticipated problems as it has solved. Certainly the Atomic Energy Act did not turn over to private industry a bonanza. Private investment will have to be inspired by long-range hopes and public-service motives rather than any reasonable expectation of substantial early profit.

To be truly commercial, atomic energy must produce power at costs competitive with conventional fuels, and without direct or indirect subsidy. The plants now being built all enjoy one or another type of help. I am not implying that some form of subsidy cannot be justified, in this important new field, but they are subsidies nevertheless.

To qualify as unsubsidized, a commercial development:

1. Would be financed at commercial rates, paying the usual taxes, and making a reasonable profit on the large total investment, while charging for its electricity no more than is charged by a modern plant using conventional fuels.

2. Would provide safety precautions, including plant location, as adequate as those of the existing atomic piles.

3. Would pay for its fissionable material on a basis that fully covers the average going cost to the Government.

4. Would get no long-term Government-guaranteed price for byproduct plutonium. Before long the Armed Forces may have no great need for plutonium beyond the AEC's own production. Byproduct plutonium might be used for generating power, but there would be special difficulties.

If we define unsubsidized commercial production in this way, I believe most experts agree that:

1. There will be few, if any, unsubsidized atomic powerplants built in this country to produce power on a competitive basis within 10 years.

2. Between 10 and 25 years from now a gradually increasing proportion of the larger commercial powerplants may well be built without subsidy to utilize atomic fuel. However, no existing plant of reasonable efficiency would be shut down or converted to this fuel.

At the risk of being called old-fashioned, I firmly believe that the proposed crash atomic energy program is politically immoral.

My friends, something has happened to the definition of socialistic public power since last year. Some of my colleagues on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee last year felt so strongly about public-power dangers that they signed a separate report on the atomic authorization bill in June 1957.

In reporting last year's bill, which, in my opinion, was far more innocent than the one which the committee reported unanimously just a few days ago, the group, headed by former Congressman Sterling Cole, of New York, underscored the public-power threats of the fiscal 1958 bill.

Last year Mr. Cole characterized a \$259,230,000 authorization bill in this manner: "This is public-power advocacy run rampant."

It is very interesting that what was rampant in 1957 apparently is no longer a serious threat to free enterprise since the Joint Committee voted for the bill which contained identical items that last year caused some of them to say there is public-power advocacy run rampant.

The separate report also said:

When all of these amendments are gathered into one place, the main purpose they serve becomes obvious.

How can history repeat itself so identically as it has in the Joint Committee's report?

The separate report said:

Separated and scattered throughout the authorization bill, they appear to be no more than regular projects in the bill.

The separate report continued:

Together they are, in an even more objectionable form, the substance of the Gore-Holifield bill of last year.

The same may be said of the recently reported atomic authorization bill.

There is much more that the separate report said which should apply with greater emphasis to this year's bill.

To try to add these amendments to the program of the Commission is an attempt—

The dissenters to the Joint Committee's report said—

in fact, to blackmail the Commission into accepting the public power theories of these portions of the bill; merely in order to obtain enactment of the balance of the bill which is essential to the national defense and security.

This is the first time that public power advocacy has arisen in any way within the Joint Committee in connection with the funding of the Commission's operations—

The separate report added.

Of course, there have been differences of opinion in the Joint Committee before and we expect that there will be such long after this—

It was said.

However, the place to resolve those differences of political opinion is not in connection with the legislation respecting the funding of the Commission's operations, but in connection with substantive legislation—

Was the separate report's conclusion.

Apparently, public power proponents are completely satisfied by the 5 reactors, 2 of them second- and third-generator reactors, for which studies are provided, in the committee's bill plus the huge plutonium-producing reactor and the useless gas-cooled reactor contained in the committee's bill—in the light of the unrevealed 5-year plan of the committee.

Until a contrary position is taken by the administration, we must think that it so has succumbed to the politically false glamour of publicly financed public power.

Apparently, tacking a public power program on the authorization bill is to become the usual thing, unless my colleagues are tired of being hoodwinked.

The separate report expressed concern that the Joint Committee puts itself in the place of the Commission in the making of arrangements and the letting of contracts and the pricing of proposals. The Joint Committee has done so again.

Last year there was opposition to a design study costing \$3 million of the plutonium reactor because "this is completely unnecessary because of the authority of the Commission under section 103 of this bill to undertake advance planning of design and architectural services. It is thus not only a wasted \$3 million authorization but also provides the initial steps which will involve an eventual expenditure of \$100 million." This year the Joint Committee has approved \$145 million for an unjustifiable dual-purpose reactor.

Last year the separate report said that if more plutonium is required, the decision as to the design of the reactor should be left to the Commission, free from Joint Committee pressures. This year the Joint Committee went ahead again in the face of Bureau of Budget and Defense Department disapproval.

Last year the separate report pointed out that the bill's provision of a gas-cooled reactor by the Government would be a senseless waste of funds because

private industry—the Florida Nuclear Power Group—plans to build gas-cooled reactors.

Last year a separate report said that "this is one case where we might learn lessons from the British without having to spend \$40 million ourselves." This year, we might save the \$51 million the committee proposes for this item.

Last year, the separate report said:

This bill and the committee report indicate a strong preference for public power, and a bias against private industry.

Gentlemen, if you do not think the stigma and fear of socialism has disappeared from public power or that perhaps public power has in some manner in 1 year's time become respectable, I refer you to all of my colleagues who will immediately arise and say: "I am opposed to public power and I am against socialism, but I intend to vote for the committee's bill."

Oh, Consistency, thou art a jewel.

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

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the gentleman for his statement and for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I know of no Member of Congress on either side of the aisle who has had at heart the interest of his constituents more fully and has been more diligent in the pursuit of that interest than the gentleman from West Virginia. I know that he has been a great advocate of the natural resource of his area, coal. I can assure him that I join him in every statement he has made, because the report of the Atomic Energy Commission is such that we will have to subsidize the coal industry if we are going to continue to have this uneconomic power produced by atomic energy and then sold at a loss. It means that we from the coal producing areas not only must pay our own utility bill, but we must contribute a part of our taxes to help pay for the power produced by atomic energy.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. I know that he, too, is directly interested, as I am because he also represents a large coal producing section of the country.

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. NEAL. I should like to commend the gentleman from West Virginia on the remarks he has made. To me it would seem that the one fuel that has always proved to be reliable at all times, in peace and war, should be protected insofar as the Federal Government is able to. Insofar as the Federal Government enters into other subsidized functions such as developing atomic power at the expense of the taxpayers, it seems to me it is quite unfair to an industry that has made all the efforts the coal industry has during past years to meet all of the emergencies in time of peace and war. The miners, coal operators, coal shippers, and people engaged in the coal industry are quite numerous, and insofar as we can see at

the present time, the development of atomic energy cannot compare in any way with the coal industry as far as the number of people involved and the people employed are concerned. We do not have much hope of increasing the employables of this country if we subsidize the development of atomic power. I think industry will be perfectly willing and able to go along and make such developments of atomic energy as the country needs from time to time. To me it seems quite irrational on the part of our Government to try to subsidize with the taxpayers' money the development of atomic power now that it is not needed because of the oversupply of the natural fuels we have had so long and on which our country has so long depended.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia. I know he is interested in the economy of our State. We know what this atomic power project will mean to our conventional fuels, that have supplied the Nation through its past wars and certainly will continue to supply it.

ALASKA STATEHOOD

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the admission of Alaska as a State of the Union is a historic event. After over 40 years of dreams and hopes and expectations by our fellow Americans in Alaska it is now an accomplished fact. The difficult obstacles have been overcome. I feel confident that the people of Alaska will overwhelmingly vote in favor in the referendum. I extend to the people of Alaska and particularly those who throughout the years actively led the fight, frequently disappointed but never despairing, my hearty congratulations. And I pay special tribute to our distinguished colleague the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. The people of Alaska, I know, will always remember him for the outstanding leadership he gave in the admission of Alaska. I extend my personal congratulations to Bob BARTLETT.

I congratulate my colleagues in both branches of the Congress who this year and in past years have voted for the admission of Alaska. I am particularly pleased that Alaska's admission was by a Democratic-controlled Congress.

Definitely related to Alaska's fight is the effort of Hawaii to be admitted as a State of the Union. The success of Alaska will be most helpful to success of Hawaii in her efforts. I am sure the people of Hawaii are aware of the significance of the admission of Alaska as a State. Alaska's admission is bound to produce results favorable to Hawaii.

While personally I wish both could have been admitted at the same time, I am confident Hawaii's case will be acted upon early in the coming Eighty-sixth Congress. The best chances of Hawaii's

admission will be if the next Congress is Democratic. At the present time it is quite evident that both branches of the Congress will be Democratic, and by sharply increased majorities.

This will inure to the benefit of Hawaii. I have always felt that Hawaii's case was a strong one and a just one. Hawaii possesses every element for its admission as a State of the Union. I repeat, with the next Congress Democratic, I look forward with confidence to Hawaii's success, and the dreams and hopes of her people will materialize.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding my remarks, I want to pay my respects to the distinguished Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. BURNS] who serves his people here in this body with ability and distinction and with courage. He analyzed the situation with wisdom and followed his judgment with vision and courage. He realized that Hawaii could have been used as a stumbling block to the admission of Alaska and thereby hold back the admission of both for many years. In following the course that he did, he displayed unusual political courage and he has advanced materially the cause of Hawaii. There were some persons who were trying to use Hawaii to block Alaska. Most of those persons oppose the admission of both Alaska and Hawaii. If they had been successful, it would probably be many years before Alaska and Hawaii would be admitted to the Union. JOHN BURNS saw this. He recognized that the admission of Alaska this year meant that the atmosphere would be helpful to Hawaii by making the issue clear and more direct. When Hawaii's case comes up again, the opponents cannot then attempt to use Alaska as a means to block Hawaii. The issue will be clear cut. Now that Alaska has been admitted to the Union, the argument that the Territory is noncontiguous to continental America falls to the ground. That can no longer be an argument, which has been a matter of concern to some Members. If the situation during this session of the Congress was such that Hawaii had had the best chance of being admitted to the Union, and if Hawaii had been admitted instead of Alaska, I would, of course, make these same remarks about Alaska that I am now making in relation to Hawaii. The admission of Hawaii would prove beneficial to Alaska in the next Congress just as the admission of Alaska will prove beneficial to Hawaii. Despite their disappointment that Hawaii was not admitted to the Union, the people of Hawaii, I am sure, will view it in a sound and logical way and look to the immediate future and recognize that with the admission of Alaska, the admission of Hawaii in the future is very close.

It is my hope and expectation that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, will make the resolution admitting Hawaii as a State of the Union the first order of business in the first session of the 86th Congress. I shall assist in that move in every way possible. Like the people of Hawaii, I am looking forward to the admission of Hawaii next year.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. SAYLOR. I want to commend the distinguished majority leader for the active part he took in seeing to it that Alaska became the 49th State of the Union. I commend him for his leadership in that fight. However, I feel he has probably done the cause of Hawaii a disservice, unintentionally, by bringing it to the attention of the House today in a partisan manner. However, one concedes that the House today is Democrat and the other body is Democrat, but we had a good bit of opposition by some folks on the Democrat side of the aisle just as we had some opposition from folks on this side of the aisle who did not vote in favor of the proposition that Alaska should be made a State. But the President is Republican and he has repeatedly urged that statehood be granted to both Alaska and Hawaii. And a majority of Republicans in both the House and the Senate voted for Alaskan statehood.

There are those on both sides of the aisle who disagree with the gentleman's views on the question of Hawaii becoming a State; I am not one of them. I am one of those who has always believed that both these great Territories should become States of the Union at this session of the 85th Congress. But I do not think we should allow our views to be colored by a partisan viewpoint. Let us be statesmen and approach this great issue of statehood for Hawaii in the best interest of our Nation regardless of which political party is in the White House or which party controls one or both Houses of Congress.

I sincerely hope that the distinguished majority leader may change his views and that the cause of Hawaii may be advanced this year. It was with remarkable rapidity, that just 5 weeks after the Alaska bill was brought to the floor of the House it was signed by the President. I know as does the majority leader, that we will be in session 5 weeks from today. If he would urge the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to report the Hawaiian bill out immediately and then dispose of it under the excellent leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, such as he gave us in the Alaska bill, it would pass with votes to spare. Let this the 85th Congress be known in history as the Congress that saw its responsibility with regard to statehood and accomplished it and admitted the 49th and 50th States to our Union.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say to my friend that, of course, from his angle, I can distinctly understand his viewpoint. Certainly there was not anything about my remarks that were of the partisan nature imputed by him. I have no criticism of my dear friend from Pennsylvania, and I admire him for attempting to inject in my remarks a note that the remarks did not justify; because he, being a Republican, naturally has those considerations in mind. If anyone were to have injected partisan remarks—and I do not accuse my friend of intentionally doing so—it is my friend's attempt to

make his contribution to the remarks that I made, and I yield to him for that purpose. I want to pay my compliments to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The gentleman will note I said, "I congratulate my colleagues in both branches of the Congress who this year and in past years voted to grant Alaska statehood." That included everybody. It is a fact that we have a Democratic-controlled Congress. The gentleman will admit that. It is a fact that the resolution was reported out of a Democratic-controlled committee. It is also a fact—the RECORD speaks—and I am proud to state, that the passage through the House was bipartisan in nature and under the leadership of the Democratic Party. There had to be that leadership in order to get the bill before the House.

I want to say for the RECORD that nobody worked harder for the admission of Alaska than did the gentleman from Pennsylvania and others of his colleagues. When I saw the rollcall vote—I think I can state publicly now what I stated privately to the gentleman at the time—when he told me he thought he could get 100 Republican votes, I frankly told him I did not think he would. There were 84 Republican votes, as I remember. Is that correct? Mr. SAYLOR. It was 91 on final passage.

Mr. McCORMACK. But as I recall, 84 on one rollcall. So my remarks were not partisan, but a statement of fact. It is self-evident that this is a Democratic Congress. It came out of a Democratic committee. When the Democratic leadership brought it up, it passed by a bipartisan vote; and, of course, the gentleman, I am sure, if a Republican Congress had accomplished that, would be down here congratulating Alaska as I am, expressing the hope that I have, that Hawaii next year would be admitted; and I believe the gentleman would state that the best chances would be through the election of a Republican Congress. Is that not reasonable?

Mr. SAYLOR. No; this is a bipartisan issue and should be treated as such.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well?

Mr. SAYLOR. It might be assumed that I would make that statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course the gentleman would not make the statement now. I am giving the gentleman credit, full credit. He worked hard; as a matter of fact, I think the people of Alaska could well erect a monument to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEO O'BRIEN] as a manifestation of their appreciation for the efforts of these gentlemen on this bill. I might say that if by any chance there is a Republican House in the next Congress, I will be fighting with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] and others in a bipartisan effort in the cause of Hawaii.

The fact is that the Democratic leadership was for the resolution, which materially eased and paved the way.

TVA AND SOUTHERN FORESTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRIEDEL). Under previous order of the

House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the whirl of the sawmill is one of the most typical sounds of the rural and small-town South. Most every southern Member of the House even from the most urban areas has a sawmill or two somewhere in his district. Timber has been the basis of one of the oldest of southern industries. It provides jobs and income for thousands of our citizens.

Because the Tennessee Valley Authority is most noted for its power operations, flood control, and navigation, the contribution of the TVA in aiding the forest-products industries of the South is sometimes overlooked. This particular service has been very effective and I am glad to take this opportunity in the 25th anniversary year of TVA to give a brief accounting of TVA's efforts in behalf of forestry.

Forestry is no small industry in the South, Mr. Speaker. Forest products of the Tennessee Valley area alone are now valued at \$450 million a year.

In this same area the forest-products industries employ approximately 50,000 people. They earn as a result of their employment some \$100 million a year.

Forests in the TVA area are growing at the rate of 1.5 billion board feet a year, consumer use of which is estimated at 1 billion board-feet. There is great significance in these figures. They mean that this great resource is now not only being preserved, but increased every year.

It is not my purpose to give TVA full credit for this happy situation, and TVA would not accept full credit. The improvement in forest practices and in our forest resources is the result of the combined work not only of the TVA but of the seven States in the TVA area, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Forest Service. Nevertheless, TVA provided much of the impetus which got effective forestry programs operating in this area.

Forests were one of the early concerns of TVA when it was established 25 years ago. At that time forests covered 54 percent of the total area of valley land. They covered no less than 14 million acres. TVA realized the importance of our heritage of forests not only from the economic value of forest products, but as protection against erosion, to recreation and to the preservation of wildlife.

TVA understood that since this great forest acreage was 80 percent in private ownership, its protection and development depended in large measure on understanding and support from the thousands of individual landowners and the general public. The TVA program was planned so as to obtain this cooperation and understanding.

In those days only about half the forest land received protection from fire. An average of a million acres a year were lost due to this cause. Erosion, another enemy of forests, had taken a half million acres out of production, yet no more than 1,000 of these acres had been replanted. Systematic timber manage-

ment was being practiced in 1933 by only a handful of private landowners.

State resources applied to guarding the forests were small—far too small in comparison with the size of the problem. In 1933 the 7 valley States employed a total of only 36 foresters. Their total forestry budgets came to little more than half a million dollars a year. The forest products industries employed few foresters of their own and in the whole area there was no private consulting forester.

Now after 25 years, Mr. Speaker, that dark picture has changed. It is a change that every southerner should be proud of.

Today over 95 percent of the vast forest acreage of the valley is given State protection against fire. Of the 125 counties in the valley, 111 give substantial financial support to fire control.

More than 326,000 acres have been reforested and over half a million acres have been included in 285 forest management demonstrations. An additional 1.2 million acres are being put under management by industry and private forestry consultants.

In 1933 a few small State nurseries in the area produced only 4 million forest tree seedling. In the current planting season nurseries in the area will produce 572 million seedlings; and the two TVA nurseries alone will produce nearly 40 million seedlings in addition.

As much as has been done, much more is to be done. The plantable area in the valley States is estimated at 2,700,000 acres or more. Of this, 657,000 acres are of open land subject to erosion. Another 773,000 acres is idle open land and has been judged better suited to timber production than any other use. And there are 1,270,000 acres of understocked forest land which need additional planting. Over the past 25 years of TVA forestry work, close to 45,000 individual landowners in the valley States have planted trees on 326,000 acres. This planting required 366 million seedlings of which TVA nurseries supplied 314 million.

TVA experts have also been active in forest management demonstrations. These demonstrations have been effective and will pay dividends through the years. They have promoted efficiency in forest products utilization.

To date more than 3,800 persons have attended sawmill conferences arranged by TVA foresters. There have been 67 such conferences. As a result, mill operations have shown a drop of 22 percent in nonproductive time. The average mill-day production is up 15 percent and the average man-day production is up 19 percent.

To many this brief account of TVA's forestry activities will be an unknown story. But it is a story known in the valley States to the forest products industry which has thrived and whose future is assured by these activities. And I am glad to say that the cost in comparison to the benefits has been negligible.

It is a remarkable thing that in this age of science wood has never been re-

placed. Despite advancements in metallurgy, in plastics, in ceramics, wood is still supreme in its ancient uses. It remains what it has always been, one of the useful and versatile products of nature.

The advances in forestry which resulted in the early part of this century from the efforts of such men as Gifford Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt were long in coming to the Southland. It was clear to thinking people that without sound management of our forests we of the South would lose one of our great resources. Efforts of the TVA in forestry have brought us up to date. Today there need be no fear that this magnificent resource will be lost to us. To the contrary, it is a more useful and valuable resource now than it has been in many generations.

And so during this the 25th anniversary year of the Tennessee Valley Authority, when TVA is so deservedly being paid tribute for its service to mankind in the distribution of electric power, in controlling devastating floods, and in promoting navigation, the record would be quite incomplete, Mr. Speaker, without noting the great contribution which the Tennessee Valley Authority has made to forestry—another sound reason why this Congress should approve an adequate self-financing bill for TVA.

The urgent whirl of the spinning blades of the sawmill will long be heard in the Southland which has now learned, with the help of TVA, to manage and control the countless trees of its broad forests.

ARE BOND SPECULATORS GAMBLING ON THE STABILITY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCormack). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, is it not strange that bonds of the United States are a fit subject for speculation? Is it not odd that the promises to pay of this great Nation have a changing market worth on which speculators, both professional and amateur, may gamble? Is it not absurd that prices of United States obligations fluctuate so violently from day to day and from week to week that these securities offer the "smart money" boys a more attractive vehicle for gambling than even the market for corporate stocks?

What are the speculators in securities of this Government actually betting on? Are they betting for or against continuing stability of Government in the United States? Do their estimates of the worth of United States obligations reflect changing prospects that this Government will be able to meet its obligation? No, I do not think so.

The speculators are, however, gambling on changes in the monetary policies of the Federal Reserve System, and upon their guesses as to future actions of the Treasury Department. In short, the cause for speculation is the knowledge or belief that our Government will

do things which will change market prices of these securities frequently, and by large amounts. As a result, pending actions, leaks of pending actions and rumors of leaks of pending actions all set off waves of buying and selling, and bring about sharp changes in the prices of the obligations of the Government?

REPORTED CHANGE IN CREDIT POLICY STARTED PRICES DOWN

For example, on June 19 there was a great wave of selling and sudden drop in prices, in both the bond and stock markets. The financial section of the New York Herald Tribune of that morning had carried a headline saying, "Fed Says Turn Is Here, Slows Easy Money Drive." Then a feature article backing up this headline reported that the Federal Reserve System had changed its policy toward easy credit, saying:

The shift in credit policy suggests that the end of the recession decline in interest rates is in sight and perhaps is at hand. This would mean that the prices of bond and other fixed return obligations will go little, if any, higher.

The next day, a distinguished economist who makes a profession of analyzing trends in securities and money rates sent me this clipping from the New York Herald Tribune, saying that the report "had a large part in creating the anxieties which led to the selling of bonds and stocks yesterday." Then he added:

What occurred is an outstanding demonstration of the enormous power which Congress has given to the Federal Reserve without limiting or defining the objectives for which it may be used.

I have no doubt that this newspaper report and others like it added materially to the price break in Government bonds, if it was not the sole cause. The belief has persisted that the Federal Reserve is on a new credit program—a belief which is not without factual evidence—and the price of Government bonds has continued a general downward trend.

YESTERDAY'S PRICE BREAK ATTRIBUTED TO THIN MARGINS AND GANGUP OF BIG SPECULATORS

In addition to the price fluctuations which could normally be expected under these conditions, the ups and downs are greatly magnified as always when there is speculation on thin margins in a disorderly, unsupervised market. Such is the market for bonds of the United States.

In recent weeks, the Government bond market has become more and more disorderly. And, finally, yesterday it underwent a complete debacle. The price of 1 long-term bond, the 3½-percent bond, maturing in 1990, dropped within the day by \$1 on the \$100. The New York Times of this morning reports on a number of speculative causes for this price drop. It reports that the "commonest reason given," by Wall Street operators, was "liquidation of speculative accounts on thin margins."

Now is that not an absurd reason for a bond of the Government of these great United States to be worth a dollar less in the afternoon than it was in the morning? Speculators gambling on price changes and on such thin margins that they are put through forced liquidation.

Another reason being given in Wall Street for yesterday's price break, according to the New York Times, is that the bond dealers are giving the Federal Reserve System an "object lesson." The Times said:

There was a comment that the bond dealers were giving the Federal Reserve Board an object lesson in how far down the market could go unless it got some assistance.

In other words, if this report is correct, the big speculators in Government bonds have embarked on a program to force the Federal Reserve System to take some action which they wish it to take.

Now is this not an amazing situation? The market for securities of the United States is so disorderly and so subject to a gangup of a few big speculators that the Federal Reserve System could be forced into a corner where it would have to take some action which these speculators want taken.

I am not saying that the big speculators have in fact ganged up to force the Federal Reserve to take some action. I am saying that the fact that such a thing is so much a possibility that an informed and responsible journal would give credence to the possibility signifies that something is radically wrong.

TELEGRAM TO FEDERAL RESERVE ASKING FOR ORDERLY MARKET

It seems to me that we have allowed this disorder, this lack of supervision and this junglelike condition in the market for securities of the United States to continue much longer than any properly civilized country should allow.

This morning, I sent a telegram to Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board, asking whether or not the Federal Reserve System has adequate authority to put the market for Federal securities under some proper supervision, and if not, whether the Board of Governors can find it appropriate to recommend to Congress what authority it needs to do this job. My telegram, which I will quote, is as follows:

JULY 9, 1958.

Hon. WILLIAM MCC. MARTIN, Jr.,
Chairman, Board of Governors
of the Federal Reserve System,
Washington, D. C.:

In view of the increasing disorderly conditions in the Government bond market, such as the record debacle of yesterday, may I ask if there is not something which the Federal Reserve System can do to check the jungle-like activities being carried on by gamblers and speculators which are causing a loss of confidence in bonds of the United States and a distaste and a disrespect for our Government's obligation on the part of conservative investors. Gambling in securities of the United States on thin margins in markets having no adequate supervision seems to me a breach of public order which would hardly be tolerated under the private rules of exchanges for trading in commodities. Furthermore, the violent day-to-day fluctuations in bonds of the United States which the world is now witnessing can hardly reflect changes in the prospects for stability in our Government or in its ability to meet its future obligations. If the Reserve System does not have adequate authority to remedy this situation, such as it might use if it untied its hands from the Open Market Committee's bills only policy,

then may I ask if the Board would consider it appropriate to recommend to Congress what authority is needed to remedy this condition.

It seems to me there must be some answer to this problem, some better way for this Government to handle its debt obligations than to dump them on an unordered market and then invite speculators to gamble on what actions the Government will take to change their market worth. And on this, I know that many of the Members will agree.

MARKETING FACILITIES FOR HANDLING PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Agriculture has had under consideration H. R. 4504, a bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities. I am in favor of this bill. It involves no grant of Federal funds and it authorizes no direct loans by the Federal Government for the construction of facilities. Basically, it authorizes a certification by the Department of Agriculture that a modern market facility for a city is needed, that the proposed plans are adequate, that the expected income will more than amortize the cost, and that it will bring about savings in the handling of perishable merchandise. When a proposed improvement or construction of a market measures up to these qualifications the Federal Government would be authorized to insure loans by private financial institutions for up to 85 percent of the cost of improvement or construction. The proposed legislation embraces the same principle of mortgage insurance as has been employed in the Federal housing program. The program would operate without cost to the Government, and some slight profit might be yielded by the annual charge of one-half of 1 percent of the principal for mortgage insurance. Once financial institutions have observed the investment potentialities in the construction of these markets, many such institutions are likely to undertake financing entirely on their own in order to save the charge for mortgage insurance. Technical assistance and research of the Department of Agriculture would be available in planning market facilities upon request.

Mr. Speaker, the improved handling of foods through modernized market facilities would result in improving the quality and wholesomeness of perishable foods. This bill would pave the way for such an improvement in the handling of fruits, vegetables, and other perishable items. Such modern marketing facilities as would result from this legislation would also help to eliminate some of the things that contribute to the high food costs inasmuch as one reason for the upward trend in prices is the uneconomic practice in marketing perishable com-

modities through obsolescent and inadequate facilities. The legislation would thus benefit the consumer.

The legislation would also benefit the farmer. Improved marketing facilities would result in increased sales and increased demand for the products of the farm. A more representative price for the things produced would result, and a more sound agricultural economy would follow. The spread between what the farmer gets for his commodities and what the consumer pays would also be reduced as a consequence of unnecessary handling costs being eliminated and as a result of reduction of losses through spoilage and the more efficient distribution through modern markets.

Small retailers and independent wholesalers would also benefit from this legislation. They would be able to operate under conditions comparable to those under which their larger competitors operate.

Chain stores which own retail outlets have been able to conduct their wholesale operations outside the local market area. The small grocery owner must continue to obtain his perishable goods in the market area where a wide variety of products can be obtained at competitive prices. In the same way, the independent wholesaler supplying these retailers cannot move out of the market area and both the retailer and wholesaler are forced to use antiquated markets with their crowded conditions and prohibitive costs which make it difficult for the small operator to function.

West Virginia, Mr. Speaker, is a State which has mostly small farms and it is peculiarly suited for such modern marketing facilities. This program, being one which would help the farmer, the housewife, the small retailer, and the independent wholesaler, has my support.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my very sincere, very deep and very humble acknowledgment to the distinguished and knowledgeable majority leader for the very fine and generous compliments he paid me in his statement on statehood for Alaska and the prospects for Hawaii. It is extremely difficult for a representative of a constituency to take a position that cannot be easily understood by his constituents, particularly when the decision is on a matter which is closest to their hearts. The making of such a decision, when your natural instinct is to support the cause of your constituency without regard to attainment of the result desired by your constituents, is particularly difficult.

The fact that Hawaii has, figuratively speaking, been knocking at the door of statehood since 1854, when the death of a king of Hawaii halted statehood nego-

tiations—thus making statehood a subject of concern to the people of Hawaii for more than a hundred years—increased immeasurably the torments.

However, Hawaii has for a great number of years been on the brink of statehood time and time again. In the last decade statehood has been around the corner at frequent intervals.

Being fully aware of the psychological impact of successive failures and the explanations therefor, having shared with the people of Hawaii the bitter disappointment and knowing of the rationalizing explanations which they made to themselves, I could not and would not be true to myself nor to the responsibilities imposed on me by the great honor accorded me by the people of Hawaii in electing me their Delegate to the Congress of the United States, if I supported only an issue.

The people of Hawaii want statehood. They need it. As their representative, I want a bill—not an issue.

After considerable consultation with Members on both sides of the aisle and with experienced observers of the Congress as well as a careful review of the past history of statehood, it was my considered judgment that achievement of statehood for Alaska was in the enlightened self-interest of the people of Hawaii. In my judgment, any other course would have resulted in neither Alaska nor Hawaii being admitted.

Thus, though the decision may be difficult, it was to me right as I was given the light by the Almighty to see right. Consequences to me as an individual can be given no consideration in such case.

I am positive that the admission of Alaska as a State is in the best interest of the people of Hawaii and their admission as a State. I am positive that if we are unable to bring Hawaiian statehood up in this session—and I sincerely question the wisdom of bringing it up—the fair and just Members of the Congress will bring it up in the next session of the Congress and pass it expeditiously as something long overdue and in keeping with our integrity as a Nation.

The people of Hawaii want statehood. No desire is closer to their private hearts where there is a burning fire. Hawaii's people can make a substantial contribution as citizens of a sovereign State within the Union of States. The United States of America needs Hawaii, it needs the contributions her citizens can make, more effectively as citizens of a State, to her internal and external affairs.

In acknowledging the generous compliments of the able and distinguished majority leader, I want to take advantage of this opportunity to extend to him the very real appreciation of the people of Hawaii for his ever-abiding and active support of Hawaii statehood over the years. Certainly the forceful and dynamic majority leader yields to no one in the sincerity and reality of his activity on behalf of statehood for Hawaii.

In view of the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I want to acknowledge also his steadfast and continuing support of Hawaii statehood.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania led the other side of the aisle in an outstanding manner in the successful effort for favorable consideration of Alaska statehood in this House. His deep and abiding faith in the people of Hawaii and in statehood for Hawaii has encouraged and inspired flagging hearts many times in the past. I am positive that in the next session of Congress, if that is when Hawaiian statehood will be considered—and I think it will be—the gentleman from Pennsylvania will again be in the forefront of those leading the fight for successful achievement of statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make the point that statehood is a bipartisan issue and that it needs the support of Members of both political parties for its attainment. I know that there are many others in this body who are not presently on the floor who have rendered able and distinguished service to the cause of statehood. I know they will be contributing materially and substantially to the efforts of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and the great majority leader of this House when Hawaii achieves statehood in the 86th Congress. The door to statehood has been opened by admission of Alaska.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 13140.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DAIRY PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include certain extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, recent refusal of a majority of the House to approve a rule which would have brought the omnibus farm bill to the House floor for debate prevented discussion of the merits of a proposed dairy program. The program had been painstakingly evolved in a bipartisan manner over a long period of time in hearings and discussions of the Dairy Products Subcommittee with dairy farm and industry leaders. Several important amendments to the committee bill were approved by the full Agriculture Committee on the eve of the House consideration of the rule for the farm bill. It is very important that dairy farmers and industry leaders have the opportunity to review the dairy bill with amendments as approved by the committee.

For that reason I am submitting for the RECORD the following copy of the milk title of the omnibus farm bill which includes important committee-approved amendments. The bill has been en-

grossed and the amendments are enclosed within black brackets in the following transcript:

TITLE VI—MILK

SEC. 601. Section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, by means of payments, support the price to producers of milk and butterfat used in manufactured dairy products at not less than 90 percent of the parity equivalent price [of manufacturing milk, to be calculated as 83 percent of the parity price of all milk wholesale, and the parity price of butterfat, respectively.] during the marketing years ending March 31, 1960, March 31, 1961, and March 31, 1962: *Provided*, That the Secretary may reduce the level of price support for any such marketing year by 3 percent of the parity equivalent price for each 1 percent of marketing base by which the Federal Dairy Board establishes marketing quotas for such marketing year above the lowest quota authorized by subparagraph (3) (A) hereof: *Provided further*, That the total amount of payments to producers for any marketing year shall not exceed an amount equivalent to the total amount of compliance deposits forfeited by producers in the same marketing year [and any excess of such forfeited compliance deposits of previous years not used for making price-support-deficiency payments in such years, less costs of purchases to fulfill Government distribution programs not normally charged to other Government appropriations excepting appropriations for price-support purposes. Price support as authorized in this subsection shall be accomplished by the Secretary by the purchase of the products of manufacturing milk and butterfat, or payments, or a combination of the two methods, except that the purchase method is to be used by the Secretary to fulfill Government distribution program requirements and as an adjunct to payments in such manner as to so correlate the market prices of manufactured dairy products that prices to producers for milk and butterfat used in the different manufactured dairy products are maintained in a normal relationship to each other: *Provided*, That price support may be accomplished by use of the product-purchase method alone if the Board and the Secretary find that surpluses, during any marketing year established under this section, will be of such minor magnitude as not to warrant a payment-quota program.]

"(1) Not later than March 1 of each calendar year, the Federal Dairy Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") shall estimate and determine for the marketing year starting in that calendar year the average market price of milk used in manufactured dairy products which would be received by farmers in the absence of any Federal price-support operations. If the Board determines that such price will be less than 90 percent of the probable parity equivalent price therefor, it may establish as a condition of eligibility for price-support payments for such marketing year a requirement that producers comply with such marketing quotas as may be established for each individual dairy farm.

"(2) The national marketing base for milk and butterfat shall be the average annual marketings of milk and milk equivalent in the first 3 of the immediately preceding 4 marketing years and shall be distributed by the Secretary to States, counties, and individual producers with full regard for the several provisions of this subsection.] The Secretary shall establish a base for each producer desiring to market milk or butterfat. Bases shall be assigned to producers, including partnerships, corporations, or other bus-

iness entities, and not to herds or farms. The Secretary shall provide by rules or regulations for the transfer of bases in whole or in part, for the assignment of bases to new producers, for the equitable adjustment of bases to avoid hardship, for such other adjustments consistent with the objectives of this act as he deems appropriate, including adjustments for deficit production areas, and for such other matters as may be necessary or appropriate to set up and operate effectively and efficiently the program herein authorized; [Provided, That an area may be exempted from quotas for any year because of deficit production upon a determination and finding by the Secretary that the area does not produce sufficient milk to meet the market requirements for fluid milk for consumers in the area and has no reasonably satisfactory alternative source of supply available to it, except that an area which limits or restricts the entry of milk of suitable quality from other areas shall not be exempted from quotas.] In establishing such bases the Secretary shall take into consideration historical production, trends, abnormal production during the historical period, and such other factors as may be appropriate to establish such bases in an equitable and practical manner. Bases established by the Secretary shall continue in effect from year to year, but such bases shall be subject to modification and adjustments from time to time.

"(3) When marketing quotas are required under provisions of paragraph (1) above the marketing quota for each farm may be calculated by deducting not to exceed 2 percent from the farm marketing base for each 5 percent by which the Board estimates that the average market price of milk used in manufactured dairy products would be below 90 percent of the parity equivalent price, in the absence of any Federal price support operations.

"(4) When marketing quotas are required, compliance deposits of not less than 25 cents nor more than 50 cents per hundredweight of milk, as determined by the Board to be the amount required to encourage compliance with marketing quotas, shall be withheld from and shall be collected from each producer who sells milk, butterfat, or dairy products. Every person purchasing milk, butterfat, or dairy products from a producer (except purchasers by consumers for other than commercial uses) shall withhold from the purchase price an amount equal to the compliance deposit and shall remit the same to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. For the purposes of this section, milk, butterfat, or dairy products delivered by a producer to a cooperative association of producers shall be subject to the withholding of the deposit upon such delivery. Returns shall be filed and remittances made monthly by such purchasers in accordance with rules prescribed by the Commissioner. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall collect the compliance deposits provided for herein and shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to accomplish that purpose. Compliance deposits collected shall be credited to a special account of the Secretary of Agriculture to make refunds to milk producers who comply with marketing quotas as provided herein. The Secretary of Agriculture, annually prior to July 1 following the close of the immediately preceding marketing year, shall issue drafts on such special account to refund to each producer who complies with his marketing quota the entire amount of the compliance deposit withheld from such producer. The Secretary shall release to the Treasurer of the United States the total of compliance deposits of each producer who exceeded his marketing quota.

"(5) A price-support deficiency payment shall be paid on all sales of milk and butterfat for manufacturing to each individual producer who complies with his marketing quota

and shall be such as, within the limitations of the second proviso of the first sentence hereof, the Secretary determines to be sufficient, when added to the State average price received by producers for milk and butterfat used for manufactured dairy products, to equal a total return of not less than the support level established pursuant to this subsection for milk and butterfat used for manufactured dairy products on milk sold for manufacturing purposes for that State. Such payments shall be made to producers to July 1 next following the close of the marketing year. The Secretary shall calculate the monthly average net price received for milk and butterfat used in manufactured dairy products received in each State, using the price at the point of first sale out of the producers' hands. A producer who sells milk under the terms of a Federal milk order and who complies with his marketing quota shall be eligible for a payment on milk diverted into manufactured dairy products.

"(6) In December 1958 the Secretary shall conduct a nationwide referendum of milk producers to determine whether those voting approve the provisions of this subsection. If more than one-half of the producers voting in the referendum oppose this subsection, this subsection shall not be placed into effect and the price-support operations of the Secretary under subsection 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to milk and dairy products shall remain in effect. The Secretary shall conduct the referendum, prescribing such rules and regulations as may be necessary. Only milk producers shall be eligible to vote. Any milk producer shall have only one vote and shall vote as an individual, rather than as a business entity. The ballot shall be in the following form:

"UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"Official ballot

"National Referendum of Milk Producers

"Mark this square if you favor—

Establishment of a dairy income protection program, utilizing deficiency payments, compliance deposits, and marketing quotas based on 90 percent of the parity equivalent price, in addition to Government purchases, storage, and diversion as provided in the Agricultural Act of 1958.

☐

"Mark this square if you favor—

Continuation of price support utilizing Government purchases, storage, and diversion with support at 75 to 90 percent of the parity equivalent price, as provided by section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

☐

"The price support operations of the Secretary under subsection 201 (c) of this act with respect to milk and dairy products shall be suspended after the first 6 months during which this act shall be in effect, and remain suspended during any subsequent marketing year during which this act shall be in effect.

"FEDERAL DAIRY BOARD

"(7) There is created in the Department to make the determinations and perform the functions provided in this subsection, a Federal Dairy Board consisting of 15 members to be appointed by the President after receiving nominations from milk producers as provided herein. Only persons who are milk producers shall be eligible to serve on the Board. [There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as the Board may require for carrying out its functions and duties as provided in this act.]

"(A) In order to secure appropriate regional representation on the Board, the United States shall be divided into 15 Federal dairy districts to be designated by the Secretary. In designating such districts, the Secretary shall give consideration to (1) complete geographical representation of the United States and (2) the designation of districts, so that districts will be areas hav-

ing equal annual sales of milk and butterfat, as nearly as possible without dividing any county into two or more districts.

"(B) Each Federal dairy district shall be assigned one place on the Board. The milk producers in each district shall by ballot select three nominees for the place on the Board assigned to their district. Each milk producer shall be entitled to submit one name for nominee for the place on the Board to be filled from his district. The three candidates receiving the highest number of votes for nominee for each respective place on the Board shall be nominees for appointment to such place. The Secretary shall conduct an election of nominees between January 1 and January 15, 1959, and shall conduct any subsequent elections for the selection of such nominees, prescribe such rules and regulations as he may consider necessary in the administration of the duties assigned herein, determine all questions involving the qualifications of such nominees, members of the Board, or milk producers, resolve all tie votes for such nominees, and certify such nominees to the President. The decision of the Secretary in all such matters shall be final. The three nominees so selected for each place on the Board shall be received by the President, who shall select 1 of the 3 nominees for appointment to each place on the Board for which such nominees were selected. In making appointments to the Board, the President shall give careful consideration to securing an equitable representation of the various forms in which milk and its products are sold.

"(C) Terms of Board members shall expire on June 30, 1962. Board members may be removed for cause or ineligibility by the President. Vacancies on the Board may be filled for the unexpired terms by appointment by the President, taking into consideration the nominees from which the original appointment was made, or, in the discretion of the President, in the manner herein prescribed for the appointment of members for a regular term. Vacancies on the Board shall not impair the power of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Board, except that in no event shall the Board be empowered to act unless eight or more places on the Board are filled. Each member of the Board, other than the Secretary or the Secretary's representative, shall receive a per diem of \$50 for each day's attendance at meetings of the Board and while traveling to and from said meetings, together with actual, necessary travel subsistence, and other expenses incurred in the discharge of his official duties without regard to other laws with respect to allowances which may be made on account of travel and subsistence expenses of officers and employed personnel of the United States. The Secretary, or an official of the Department designated by him, shall be an ex officio member of the Board. He shall meet and confer with the Board but shall not be entitled to vote.

"(D) The Board shall meet as soon as practicable following their initial appointment, and thereafter, annually on the second Monday in December and at other times upon the call of the Chairman. In addition, special meetings of the Board may be called at any time by a majority of the members of the Board in office, or by the Secretary. The Board shall meet at least once in each calendar quarter of each year. [In addition the Board shall meet in special session within the first 10 days of any month following any month in which the national average price received by farmers for manufacturing milk or butterfat was below 90 percent of the parity equivalent price. At all regular and special meetings the Board shall make the determinations and take the action provided in subsections (1), (3), and (4) with respect to the remainder of the marketing year.]

"(E) The Chairman of the Board shall be selected by the Board. He shall hold office for a term of one calendar year and until his successor shall have been selected and shall have taken office. Vacancies in the office of the Chairman of the Board shall be filled for the unexpired term by the Board.

"(F) A majority of the members of the Board in office shall constitute a quorum, and action may be taken by a majority vote of those present at any regular or special meeting at which a quorum is present. The findings and determinations of the Board made under the authority of this section shall be final and conclusive. The Board may adopt, alter, and use an official seal which shall be judicially noticed. It may adopt rules and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and its powers may be exercised.

"(G) The Federal Dairy Board is directed, in addition to its other duties, to cause to be made a comprehensive study of the production and marketing of manufacturing milk, including producers' costs of production, prices received by farmers, areas of production, the relationship between changes in the farm price of butterfat and milk for manufacturing and changes in the volume of market supply of each commodity, the relationship between changes in national income and changes in the volume of consumption of manufactured dairy products, marketing and processing spreads, relationship between prices received by farmers for milk used for fluid consumption and that used for manufacturing, returns to milk producers on capital investment and labor relative to other farmers and other segments of the national economy, and trends in these factors. [The costs of production shall be determined through an audited cost accounting survey of typical dairy farms in each region covering all costs of production on the farm attributable to milk production, with hired and family labor assigned a cost computed on the basis of wage rates for comparable work in milk manufacturing and processing plants in the area and return on invested capital equal to the average annual return on net worth earned by milk handlers and manufacturers during the preceding 5-year period.] The Board shall submit to Congress not later than January 3, 1961, a detailed report thereon with recommendations for legislation related to the protection of producers' returns on and market supply management of butterfat and milk for manufacturing, including programs to be operated and financed by dairymen, covering the probable costs and effects of the proposals recommended and the legislation required to put the proposal into effect. The Federal Dairy Board may conduct such hearings and receive such statements and briefs in connection with such study as it deems appropriate.

"(H) The Secretary is directed to make available to the Federal Dairy Board the services of such of the facilities and personnel of the Department of Agriculture as it may require for the appropriate conduct of its duties."

SMALL BOAT SAFETY LEGISLATION

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks and include various editorials.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, with the summer season now in full swing, the use of small boats for pleasure and recreation is increasing daily. The people throughout the country are realizing the

necessity of some type of regulation so as to enhance the safety of operation.

I include in the RECORD these four editorials which are from various parts of our country, and I think, adequately show the feeling of the people in regard to this proposed legislation.

[From the Winston-Salem, (N. C.) Journal of June 21, 1958]

CONGESTION ON THE WATERWAYS

Would a proposed new Federal licensing law for small boat owners "bedevil everybody who has a rowboat and wants to go fishing?" That's the crusty charge of the measure's chief opponent, North Carolina's Representative GRAHAM BARDEN.

On balance, BARDEN's case won't stand up. In the first place, the new law wouldn't apply to rowboats. In the second place, it would not even apply to boats equipped with outboard motors classed under five horsepower.

If passed by the House, where it is pending now, and by the Senate, it would apply to practically all other boats propelled by machinery, including sailing craft with auxiliary engines. Power boats under 16 feet in length, regardless of their propulsion equipment, do not now require licenses. And therein, contend such proponents of the new law as the Coast Guard and the Outboard Boating Club of America, lies the trouble.

In 1947, there were only 2.5 million pleasure craft on United States waters. Today there are about 7 million. At one time or another, they whip 30 million people around the Nation's rivers, harbors, and lakes. That's 17 percent of us all. This joyriding costs United States boatmen \$2 billion annually—of which \$391 million was spent in 1957 for new boats and motors.

In view of all that, the waterways have become almost as jammed and dangerous as the highways. The two problems are even linked, because more than 750,000 boat trailers are in use today. Accidents, from collisions to drownings, are on the increase. Hotrodders have invaded the once peaceful boating scene, and now it is not uncommon to see two 30-horsepower outboard motors propelling craft not much bigger than the rowboats for which Mr. BARDEN fears.

Licensing would provide the first effective control over the problems bobbing in the wakes of all those boats. State agencies, supervised by the Coast Guard, would issue the licenses for 3 years, at a cost of about \$3. Numbers would be carried on boat bows, and certificates like auto registration cards would be issued to boat owners. The State issuing agencies would have to meet uniform Federal requirements. In any State, if no action were taken, the Secretary of the Treasury would issue licenses directly from the Federal Government. Notices of ownership transfer and accident reports would be required, just as they are for automobiles.

The bill which would institute this system would also set up a system of traffic violations and fines, to be administered by the Coast Guard. Without licensing, the traffic rules could hardly be effective. And without such overall policing of the waterways, even the boating industry itself concedes that accidents will happen in ever-greater number.

Everyone can share GRAHAM BARDEN's concern for the unpainted old rowboat and the lazy good times it implies. Something more important is at stake, however—the safety of 30 million American pleasure-seekers.

[From the Green Bay, Wis., Press-Gazette of June 14, 1958]

BOATING ON NAVIGABLE WATERS

At the same time that a Green Bay man was pleading lack of jurisdiction in Federal water after his arrest by a Brown County

undersheriff for allegedly operating a motor boat in a reckless manner, Federal, county and city officials were meeting in Appleton to try to figure out a way of establishing a "law of the river" for pleasure craft. Undoubtedly the death of a high school boy in the Fox River near Appleton prompted the meeting whether or not there was any carelessness involved in that particular case.

The statute under which the Green Bay man was charged is a State law, which says, "any person who shall drive, operate or use a motor boat on the waters of the State in a careless, negligent or reckless manner so as to endanger the life, property or persons of others," is subject to a fine or imprisonment after conviction. An earlier part of the statute, dealing with required lights and life preservers, speaks of waters under the "exclusive jurisdiction of the State of Wisconsin." Of course, the Fox River is under Federal jurisdiction for maintenance purposes. Authorities in Appleton, however, seemed to feel that a county ordinance would have effect if all counties involved adopted the same type. Appleton City Attorney Don Jury said that officials of the city's police boat, which Mayor Clarence Mitchell was ordering to patrol the river channel near the Appleton Yacht Club, could arrest reckless operators probably for disorderly conduct.

Whatever the court decision in the Green Bay case, there must be some sort of authority with more scope than exists today. The Coast Guard is undermanned for such patrol duty and limits its safety precautions in general to checking boat equipment. The commander of the Two Rivers station explains that the Federal citation for recklessness is difficult to prove.

Pleasure boats are increasing in numbers every day upon the lakes and streams of the State, along with water skiers. There most definitely must be a way to avoid a "twilight" zone in which neither local, State nor Federal authorities can act with practicality.

[From the Appleton (Wis.) Post Crescent of June 14, 1958]

BOATING SAFETY MEASURES A MUST

The tragic death of an Appleton youth on the Fox River last week has brought quick action from city leaders to insure greater safety for boaters on the Fox River, plus a lot of discussion on how a more permanent solution can be found. Mayor Mitchell has ordered the city's police boat to patrol the river on weekends, a move which reportedly already has caused a distinct improvement in the way boaters handle themselves in the area.

City police, however, cannot provide a permanent, effective patrol setup for the river, much less for other waters in this area. Presumably they can act only within city limits, which means that such a large body of water as Little Lake Butte des Morts is without enforcement, to say nothing of Lake Winnebago, Green Bay, Waupaca's Chain O'Lakes and other places where boaters are active.

One of the legal problems any enforcement program will run up against is the question of Federal versus State authority. Recently a Green Bay man was arrested by a Brown County undersheriff and charged with reckless operation of his boat on the river. The defendant immediately claimed that the county had no jurisdiction because the Fox is a navigable waterway and therefore under Federal jurisdiction. The State law under which he was charged says that "any person who shall drive, operate or use a motorboat on the waters of the State in a careless, negligent or reckless manner so as to endanger the life, property or persons of others" is subject to fine or imprisonment, but an earlier part of the statute dealing with life preservers speaks of waters under the exclusive jurisdiction of the State. Ob-

viously something has to be worked out so that either the Federal Government provides adequate enforcement on waters under its jurisdiction, or permits the State and its subdivisions to do so.

The Coast Guard is charged with maintaining safety on Federal waters such as the Fox River, Green Bay and Lake Winnebago, but does not have anywhere near enough manpower or equipment to do so. Officially it has authority to make arrests, but in practice does so only when a citizen files a complaint, which doesn't happen very often.

With the tremendous increase in the number of boats, and people operating them, something must be done to protect the vast majority who operate their boats safely from the reckless or ignorant few. It is something that Federal, State, county and municipal authorities are going to have to work out so that there is no twilight zone either of jurisdiction or enforcement into which violators can escape.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News of June 15, 1958]

ON BOATS AND BOATING—GOOD LAW TO STOP WATER RECKLESSNESS IN MAKING

(By Jerry Bryan)

There may be relief in sight for people like Miles Young. Acts of flagrant recklessness on water; damaging of boats and endangering lives of young children, may in the future be curtailed by law. Two years in the burning, Congress is expected to bring forth this session the most significant bit of legislation ever passed for water traffic control.

Introduced in the House by Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER, of North Carolina, H. R. 11078 would require registration of every boat driven by motor on every kind of water.

But what has that to do with Miles Young? Well, it would provide a pretty effective vehicle for punishing such aquatic cowboys as the one who smashed Young's brand new boat last week and endangered the lives of his children, 7 and 12 years old.

Only for the second time Young took his family for a cruise on the Warrior in his beautiful new Lyman. But his anticipated pleasant boat ride was short lived. On the scene came the too-often evident smart aleck with the big motor intent on showing off with some real stunts.

Cutting swaths dangerously close around Young's boat our cowboy succeeded in driving them to safety, so they thought, of the dock. But escape was not there. The aquatic hotrod started buzzing the dock. Then something happened. He lost control. The heavy glass boat, with 40 horsepower behind, headed straight for the new runabout.

Young just had time to lift out his two children before the oncoming boat practically climbed on top of the Lyman.

The party was over for the cowboy cutup. It was now time to pay the fiddler. And Young laid it on straight. He knew something about Coast Guard regulations and he had a registered boat.

Alternatives faced by our hotrod pilot were criminal charges for reckless and dangerous driving on navigable waters, along with civil suit for damages of the price of a new hull amounting to some \$750.

So now Young is pursuing the channels open to bringing criminal charges. And the case has been turned over to a lawyer for a good stiff damage suit. Our cowboy finds himself faced with the necessity of hiring lawyers to defend a case in which he had about 1 chance in 10 of winning. Young has more than a half dozen witnesses standing by to testify to wanton recklessness on the part of the driver.

But greater tragedy was the possibility. Suppose those children had not been pulled from the boat and one or both killed. Then indeed this irresponsible driver would have

been in deep trouble. On a charge of manslaughter it is beyond reason of doubt the brightest legal talent could have saved him from Kilby with any jury in the county sitting on the case.

Incidents like this, multiplied thousands of times, inspired the Bonner safety bill.

With more than 4 million Americans owning boats and some 30 million taking part in recreational boating last year legislation to control boating is a must.

This bill requiring all motor-powered boats to register will go a long way.

The measure provides for States to set up their own regulatory programs by April 1, 1960. Where States operate the program all water would be included. A reasonable fee would be charged for the registration which would be renewed every 3 years.

Where States do not enact their own legislation the Coast Guard will handle the program on navigable streams. That of course brings up the controversial issue of what are navigable streams. If the State works the program this will not be a consideration.

The benefit of the registration is immediately evident. For flagrant recklessness a boat's registration could be cancelled, just as an automobile driver's license is taken up. Identification of boats involved in accidents also would be possible.

No longer would the aquatic cowboy be able to harass frightened pleasure seekers in protective anonymity. That bold registration number will prevent that.

With a brand new legislature just elected, one which in a poll showed it was overwhelmingly interested in conservation and outdoor recreation, it could leave a lasting monument to itself with a strong boating law. One equipped with teeth to curb flagrant recklessness on our rivers and lakes.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ABERNETHY, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. PATMAN, for 20 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRD, for 10 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HUDDLESTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOYLE in two instances and in each to accompany the same with appropriate material.

Mr. MARSHALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HASKELL and to include a letter.

Mr. ALGER in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING (at the request of Mr. HENDERSON) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found

truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. R. 10347. An act to amend section 73 (q) of the Hawaiian Organic Act; to approve and ratify Joint Resolution 32, session laws of Hawaii, 1957, authorizing the issuance of \$14 million in aviation revenue bonds; to authorize certain land exchanges at Honolulu, Oahu, T. H., for the development of the Honolulu airport complex; and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10504. An act to make the provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act applicable to certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 602. An act to provide for the acquisition of additional land to be used in connection with the Cowpens National Battle-ground site;

S. 628. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located at Boston Neck, Narragansett, Washington County, R. I., to the State of Rhode Island;

S. 832. An act for the relief of Matilda Strah;

S. 1524. An act for the relief of Laurance F. Safford;

S. 1593. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Lesch and her minor children, Gonda, Norbert, and Bobby;

S. 1901. An act to amend section 401 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended;

S. 1975. An act for the relief of Peder Strand;

S. 2108. An act to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to name, rename, or otherwise designate any building under the custody and control of the General Services Administration;

S. 2109. An act to amend an act extending the authorized taking area for public building construction under the Public Buildings Act of 1926, as amended, to exclude therefrom the area within E and F Streets and 19th Street and Virginia Avenue Northwest, in the District of Columbia;

S. 2318. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States, to the city of Salem, Oreg.;

S. 2474. An act directing the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain land situated in the State of Virginia to the Board of Supervisors of York County, Va.;

S. 2630. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment, and to provide certain services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, and to permit use of certain lands of the Air Force Academy for use at the Girl Scouts Senior Roundup Encampment, and for other purposes;

S. 2638. An act for the relief of Nicholas Christos Soulis;

S. 2665. An act for the relief of Jean Kouyoumdjian;

S. 2944. An act for the relief of Yoshiko Matsuhara and her minor child, Kerry;

S. 2950. An act for the relief of Peter Liszczynski;

S. 2964. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to a compact between the State of Connecticut and the State of Massachusetts relating to flood control;

S. 2965. An act for the relief of Taeko Takamura Elliott;

S. 2984. An act for the relief of Taka Motoki;

S. 2997. An act for the relief of Leobardo Castaneda Vargas;

S. 3019. An act for the relief of Herta Wilmersdoerfer;

S. 3080. An act for the relief of Kimiko Araki;

S. 3159. An act for the relief of Cresencio Urbano Guerrero;

S. 3172. An act for the relief of Ryfka Bergmann;

S. 3173. An act for the relief of Prisco Di Flumeri;

S. 3175. An act for the relief of Giuseppina Fazio;

S. 3176. An act for the relief of Teofilo M. Palaganas;

S. 3269. An act for the relief of Mildred (Milka Krivec) Chester;

S. 3271. An act for the relief of Souhail Wadi Massad;

S. 3272. An act for the relief of Janez (Garantini) Bradek and Francisca (Garantini) Bradek;

S. 3314. An act for the relief of the city of Fort Myers, Fla., and Lee County, Fla.;

S. 3358. An act for the relief of John Demetriou Asteron;

S. 3364. An act for the relief of Antonios Thomas;

S. 3431. An act to provide for the addition of certain excess Federal property in the village of Hatteras, N. C., to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, and for other purposes; and

S. 3506. An act to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7349. An act to amend the act regulating the business of executing bonds for compensation in criminal cases in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7452. An act to provide for the designation of holidays for the officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia for pay and leave purposes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8439. An act to cancel certain bonds posted pursuant to the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, or the Immigration and Nationality Act;

H. R. 9285. An act to amend the charter of St. Thomas' Literary Society;

H. R. 10347. An act to amend section 73 (q) of the Hawaiian Organic Act; to approve and ratify Joint Resolution 32, session laws of Hawaii, 1957, authorizing the issuance of \$14 million in aviation revenue bonds; to authorize certain land exchanges at Honolulu, Oahu, T. H., for the development of the Honolulu Airport complex; and for other purposes;

H. R. 10504. An act to make the provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act applicable to certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12643. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to consolidate the police court of the District of Columbia and the municipal court of the District of Columbia, to be known as the municipal court for the District of Columbia, to create the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 1, 1942, as amended;

H. J. Res. 479. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May of each year as Loyalty Day;

H. J. Res. 576. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 580. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday, July 10, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2108. A letter from the Chairman, the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, transmitting the 20th semiannual report on the educational exchange activities conducted under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.) from January 1 through June 30, 1958 (H. Doc. No. 419); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2109. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report and findings on the Norman project, Oklahoma, pursuant to section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 420); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2110. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an application for a loan of \$2,080,000 to the Goleta County Water District in California under the provisions of Public Law 984, 84th Congress, as amended by Public Law 85-47, pursuant to Public Law 85-47; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2111. A letter from the Deputy Managing Director, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed \$1 million from the Development Loan Fund to Corporacion de Obras Sanitarias de Asuncion has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2112. A letter from the Chief of Information Services, Civil Air Patrol, transmitting the annual report of the Civil Air Patrol for 1957 to the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2113. A letter from the executive secretary, National Music Council, transmitting the annual report as of April 30, 1958, of the National Music Council, pursuant to Public Law 873, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2114. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act of 1956 to authorize the enrollment of a handicapped eligible person in a specialized course of vocational training"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2115. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2116. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, relative to the case of

Jerzy Kudrawcew, alias Piotr Wedrogowski, A-9757090, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 506. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1360, current session; without amendment (Rept. No. 2120). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 619. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; with amendment (Rept. No. 2121). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 623. Resolution fixing the basic compensation of an employee in the office of the Doorkeeper, House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 2122). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 624. Resolution for consideration of S. 1411, an act to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security; without amendment (Rept. No. 2123). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 625. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 13121, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2124). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 626. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 11078, a bill to promote boating safety on the navigable waters of the United States, its Territories, and possessions; to provide coordination and cooperation with the States in the interest of uniformity of boating laws; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2125). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 3076. An act to amend section 12 of the act of May 29, 1884, relating to research on foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases; without amendment (Rept. No. 2126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6542. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the town of Dayton, Wyo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 12840. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 2128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee of conference. H. R. 7963. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended (Rept. No. 2135). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 13140. A bill to revise the laws relating to depository libraries; without amendment (Rept. No. 2136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5169. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Farley; without amendment (Rept. No. 2129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MONTROYA: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7793. A bill for the relief of Bernardine M. A. de la Motte; without amendment (Rept. No. 2130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9487. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tyra Fenner Tynes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9756. A bill for the relief of Gerald K. Edwards, Lawrence R. Hitchcock, Thomas J. Davey, and Gerald H. Donnelly; without amendment (Rept. No. 2132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11108. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Christina Tules; without amendment (Rept. No. 2133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 167. Resolution providing for sending the bill H. R. 3875 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 2134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER:

H. R. 13328. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the State of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 13329. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire certain real property in the county of Solano, Calif., to transfer certain real property to the county of Solano, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. BLITCH:

H. R. 13330. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 with respect to its application to the processing of shade grown tobacco; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 13331. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit certain acts involving the importation, transportation, possession, or use of explosives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 13332. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 to provide that the Civil Rights Commission shall have until June 30, 1960, to submit its report, findings, and recommendations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 13333. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide relief with respect to the tax treatment of damages in antitrust actions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 13334. A bill to stabilize production of copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten from domestic mines; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 13335. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to eliminate the present restrictions upon the right of an individual to receive unemployment benefits while receiving benefits or payments under certain other Federal or State laws; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 13336. A bill to provide that where an individual continues to receive his regular remuneration while absent from his employment on account of injury or illness, such remuneration shall continue to constitute "wages" for social-security purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 13337. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 13338. A bill to amend title 4 of the United States Code, to provide a new design for the flag of the United States to be adopted upon the admission of the 49th and 50th States into the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 13339. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H. R. 13340. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia approved June 19, 1934, as amended by the acts of July 2, 1940, and July 12, 1950; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 13341. A bill to amend section 2324 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to change the period for doing annual assessment work on unpatented mineral claims so that it will run from September 1 of one year to September 1 of the succeeding year, and to make

such change effective with respect to the assessment work year commencing in 1959; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 13342. A bill to provide for a survey of Parish Line Canal, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 13343. A bill to authorize the appropriation of \$500,000 to be spent for the purpose of the Pan American games to be held in Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. J. Res. 650. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the fourth Sunday in the month of June as National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. J. Res. 651. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the inability of the President of the United States to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and providing new duties for the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Res. 627. Resolution to amend paragraph (n) of section 9 of rule 11 of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 13344. A bill for the relief of William J. Kaiser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 13345. A bill for the relief of Steve Elias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 13346. A bill for the relief of Lucio Yglesias Bernabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 13347. A bill for the relief of Biondina Timpani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 13348. A bill for the relief of Oliver O. Newsome; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 13349. A bill for the relief of Dr. Josephine Shou Chen Chu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 13350. A bill for the relief of Marion Osaduczuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

699. By Mr. SCHENCK: Petition of the Hamilton, Ohio, Traffic Club recording its opposition to House bills 3349, 3350, 7006, and Senate bill 932 or any similar bills which are designed to prevent, and make unlawful, the practice by other than attorneys at law before Government departments, bureaus and commissions, including the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

700. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Alexander Meiklejohn, Berkeley, Calif., relative to Denton Porter and others endorsing the petition of Alexander Meiklejohn, relating to a redress of grievance pertaining to the House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of July 12, 1958:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The military construction bill for 1959 provided funds of \$1,763 million for projects relating to our military bases within the continental limits and throughout the world. Approximately \$149 million was earmarked for installation outside the United States. The military public works and reserve facilities totaled \$54 million for Texas in 21 projects, 2 being in the Dallas district—the Naval and Marine Reserve at the Naval Air Station (\$259,000), and the Air National Guard at Hensley Field (\$1,862,000). The day's big debate came over the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, 15 miles from Houston. Should the Army be forced to move the depot to Alabama?

Arguments for the removal: (1) The ordnance depot is dangerous, a health hazard; (2) the 5,000 acres of 5-mile-long Houston

channel frontage can be used more profitably for business; (3) building a new depot, less the sale of the present facilities, will not cost the Federal Government more than \$2½ million. Arguments against: (1) There is no danger—300,000 tons of munitions were handled in 6 months of Korean fighting without incident; also, it is 15 miles from Houston; (2) the facilities' present value of \$16½ million plus the \$25 million to \$45 million cost of a new depot totals \$15 million to \$25 million more than present facilities can be sold for; (3) this is a bad precedent, moving the depot for reasons of economic gain to business alone. The local chamber of commerce invited the Government there in 1941 in the first place. The move to recommit the bill to change the mandatory order on the Army to permissive was defeated, and the bill to change the mandatory order on the Army to permissive was defeated, and the bill passed. So the depot will be moved, if the Senate concurs.

Other legislation: (1) An additional Secretary of State to handle African affairs passed; (2) additional property for the Senate was defeated; (3) an act relating to suspension of Government workers as security risks sought to undo the mischief of the Supreme Court's decision last year (*Cole v. Young*). The Court misconstrued Congress' intent in Public Law 733, stating that only sensitive positions were involved. This bill removed this difficulty of definition, providing that any person in sensitive or nonsensitive position found to be subversive could be removed from a Government position.

A bill to provide one additional judgeship in each of the northern, western, and south-

ern United States judicial districts of Texas was a legislative contribution of mine this week. The omnibus judicial bill (nationwide) which includes these judgeships has been delayed for 2 years. Further delay only increases the hardship—the backlog of cases, the overburdening of the judges and the inconvenience to litigants. Twice the Texas bar has unanimously agreed upon the need for the additional help. Should politically minded House and Senate leaders, awaiting 1960 outcomes to see who appoints the new judges, further delay the omnibus bill, Texas will need this help. My bill would provide the needed judgeships already long overdue.

As Congress goes into the homestretch I wonder where the sense of fiscal responsibility has gone. Running an estimated \$10 billion to \$12 billion deficit this year, we have facing us many new spending bills—(1) Increased housing and local projects; (2) the community facilities bill; (3) the depressed areas bill; (4) the Alaskan statehood expense; (5) Federal aid to education, including scholarships. These cost billions more, beyond the present estimated deficit.

Most discouraging is the joining of big business and big labor in the huge variety of Federal expenditures for the military, public works of all kinds, and foreign aid. The vested interest of business concerns—manufacturing, shipping, and others—in Government spending, and the Federal wage specification, plus labor leaders' determined lobbying for more and more Federal spending of all kinds writes a clear hand on the wall. How can John Doe Taxpayer be heard or fight this giant amalgamation? How can we cut back Federal spending against such spend-