

around here. You have to carry it with you. Two days before he died, Dale gave me that. It was his." I turned the flask over and saw the initials H.D.M. in the silverplate.

A flask says nothing. You can't even tell much about a man by reading his words or talking to his friends. But by this time I wished heartily that I had some recollections of my own about Dale Meyerkord.

MERGERS AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as the chief sponsor and strategist of the 1964 mass transit bill, I have maintained a close and careful interest in the many problems of commuter mass transit which are plaguing municipalities all over the country. The question of how to efficiently and comfortably transport large numbers of working people during peak rush hours is one that is particularly troublesome to my own State of New Jersey.

Part of this problem arises from the absence of an overall, coherent policy which would integrate all transportation facilities—rail and bus, as well as highway.

I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial, from the April 1, 1965, issue of the Washington Post, which discusses this problem, and, in particular, relates it to the proposed merger between the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central Railroad.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 1, 1965]

MERGERS AND TRANSPORTATION

The proposed merger between the Pennsylvania and New York Central Railroads has been advanced a step further toward realization with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission's trial examiners. It now appears likely that the ICC will accept the examiners' recommendation. But before sanctioning the largest merger in this country's history, the union of the Pennsylvania and the Central should be appraised within the broad context of national transportation policy. For as the examiners aptly remarked, merger is not a panacea for the ills that beset the rails. Nor is merger a reliable route to the creation of an adequate network of transport facilities.

The Penn-Central merger, by eliminating duplicative facilities and increasing operating efficiencies, will result in a financially viable entity. But what of the eastern roads that are not included? Smaller paralleling roads such as the Erie-Lackawanna would be placed in an untenable competitive position. And more seriously, the exclusion of the Boston and Maine might well deprive much of the New England region of rail service.

Mergers must perforce result in the elimination of some weak roads, but they should not be permitted to tear great gaps in the rail network. Therein lies the weakness of the ICC's case-by-case approach to mergers. What is required is an overall plan for rail consolidation, an outline of a balanced network that would serve as a guide for future mergers.

In recommending the Penn-Central merger the examiners painted a rather gloomy picture of the railroad future. But much of their pessimism might be dispelled if the railroads were permitted to compete against trucks on an equal footing. Railroads are disadvantaged by their inability to reduce rates without performing a lengthy ritual before the ICC.

And unlike the trucks which bear a very small part of the cost of building and maintaining public highways, the railroads are burdened with enormous costs of their rights-of-way. Unless this balance is redressed by eliminating the archaic ICC rate regulations and imposing realistic user charges on trucks, the benefits that can be obtained through wise railroad mergers will be dissipated.

If there were a coherent Federal transportation policy, a verdict on the wisdom of the Penn-Central merger could be reached with relative ease. But in the absence of a policy, one can only point to its defects and dangers and hope that they will somehow be eliminated.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Friday, June 11, 1965, at 11 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Wendell Bohrer, Good Shepherd Church of the Brethren, Morgantown, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray: O most merciful Father in heaven, who governs the people of the earth, we offer to You again our thanksgiving for every divine blessing. Especially do we thank You for this Nation and for these men and women who have been selected from its people to serve as its leaders and stewards.

We therefore pray that Your divine blessing be bestowed upon them in these crucial times. Deliver them from blindness of heart, from love of ease, and from failure to do the good which You set before them.

Grant that, in the hours of this day and in every day, they may have the wisdom to know what is best to do and the courage and the dedication with which to act upon such wisdom.

May Thy blessing rest also upon the people of this Nation and upon Thy people everywhere.

May we find the courage to be the kind of true disciples those were who were disciples of Your Son, our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, in whose name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the

House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 5, 1965:

H.R. 806. An act to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act to permit the listing on labels of certain fibers constituting less than 5 percent of a textile fiber product;

H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of the Jefferson Construction Co.;

H.R. 3899. An act for the relief of C. R. Sheaffer & Sons;

H.R. 6691. An act to validate certain payments made to employees of the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

On June 7, 1965:

H.R. 2139. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes.

On June 8, 1965:

H.R. 7031. An act to provide for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2166. An act for the relief of Stalman Bros.-Simon Wrecking Co.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1000. An act to amend the act of July 29, 1954, as amended, to permit transfer of title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsibility for project works serving municipal and industrial functions.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6755) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, in the table following line 2, immediately under the center headings insert: "Alabama-Coosa----- March 2, 1945----- \$38,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2, in the line beginning "Arkansas River" strike out "\$115,000,000" in the third column and insert "290,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2, in the line beginning "Brazos River" strike out "6,000,000" in the third column and insert "14,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2, in the line beginning "Central and Southern Florida" strike out "11,000,000" in the third column and insert "30,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2, in the line beginning "Columbia River" strike out "73,000,000" in the third column and insert "223,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2, strike out:

"Los Angeles-San Gabriel----- August 18, 1941----- 10,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2, after the line beginning "Los Angeles-San Gabriel" insert:

"Lower Mississippi..... May 15, 1928..... 53,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2 in the line beginning "Missouri River" strike out "24,000,000" in the third column and insert "116,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2, in the line beginning "Ohio River" strike out "3,000,000" in the third column and insert "89,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2, in the line beginning "Ouachita River" strike out "1,000,000" in the third column and insert "11,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2, in the line beginning "Upper Mississippi River" strike out "14,000,000" in the third column and insert "27,000,000".

Page 2, in the table following line 2, in the line beginning "West Branch Susquehanna River" strike out "6,000,000" in the third column and insert "17,000,000".

Page 2, line 4, strike out "Act" and insert "section".

Page 2, line 4, strike out "\$263,000,000" and insert "\$908,000,000".

Page 2, after line 4, insert:

"Sec. 2. In addition to previous authorizations, the completion of the Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway, New York, project, approved in the River and Harbor Act of August 30, 1935, as amended, is hereby authorized at an estimated cost of \$5,000,000."

Page 2, after line 4, insert:

"Sec. 3. In addition to previous authorizations, the completion of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Los Angeles River Basin, approved by the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended and supplemented, is hereby authorized at an estimated cost of \$31,000,000."

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

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, let me state that this bill varies from the House-passed bill simply by making 2-year authorizations of the required extensions of river basin projects that have already been authorized as an overall program. The Senate amendments meet with the unanimous approval of the House Committee on Public Works members, because we have had difficulties in recent years with inadequate advance periods of authorization that have caused contracts to be running out of funds when they are half-way through. Therefore, we are in full support of the Senate bill on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object because I support the bill, but, as I understand, this bill does not contain any new authorizations but only continuing authorizations for existing projects and programs and thus should receive unanimous consent, is that not correct, I ask the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is correct. These are continuing projects that have heretofore been authorized.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 6755 provides for additional authorizations for certain river basin plans for flood control and rivers and harbors. This bill was passed by the House on May 12, 1965. The bill as passed by the House included additional authorizations to cover deficits in monetary authorizations for river basin plans which would occur during fiscal year 1966. The total amount of these increased authorizations is \$263 million.

As pointed out in the committee report at that time, the basin monetary authorizations were placed in effect by the Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1938 and subsequent acts. Their effect is to limit the authority to expend funds within a specified basin below the total authorized extent of development of the basin. It has been traditional to increase these authorizations in the omnibus river and harbor and flood control bills as the appropriations approached the limit of the authorization. The purpose of limiting the authorization, rather than authorizing the full amount for development in these large basins is to permit the Congress to review the programs from time to time to determine if changes are necessary.

As explained during the debate on the floor at the time the bill was passed, the reason for immediate action on these river basins rather than to wait for the passage of the omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill later this session was because the letting of contracts was being deferred because of the lack of authorization. The 1-year period covered in the bill as previously passed by the House was in the nature of an emergency measure to take care of this condition.

I am pleased to say that the House agreed to the necessity for this action and approved the bill.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, at this point that it was the intention of the committee to include an additional authorization covering 1 or 2 more years in the omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill which will be taken up later.

When the bill was considered by the other body it saw fit to increase the 1-year period of authorization to 2 years; thereby increasing the amount from \$263 million to \$944 million. This would take care of authorizations required in these basins, not only for the fiscal year 1966, but also for the fiscal year 1967. In other words, the other body included authorizations for the fiscal year 1967 in the

present bill, rather than waiting for the omnibus bill. In providing for the needs for the fiscal year 1967 in these basins three additional basins were added to those contained in the bill as passed by the House. These three basins, Alabama-Coosa, the Great Lakes Hudson River Waterway—the Erie Canal, and the Lower Mississippi River, were not included in the House version of the bill since they would not run out of monetary authorization until the fiscal year 1967. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the other body merely took an additional year's authorization out of what would have been considered in the omnibus bill and added it to the House version of H.R. 6755. There should be no objection to this, of course, because it merely means that action is being taken at this time rather than later in the session.

I would like to point out that it is probable that an additional authorization, perhaps for another year—fiscal year 1968—may be included in the omnibus bill when it is taken up for consideration. This will permit the program to be placed in a more favorable position in that the program for these river basins will always have sufficient authorization in advance to permit appropriations to be made.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there can be no possible objections to the amendments added by the other body and I strongly urge that the House approve H.R. 6755 as amended.

The amounts for the basins as passed by the House and the amounts as contained in the amendment of the other body are shown in the attached table:

River basin	Amount included in House version	Amount included in Senate version
Alabama-Coosa.....		\$38,000,000
Arkansas River.....	\$115,000,000	290,000,000
Brazos River.....	6,000,000	14,000,000
Central and southern Florida.....	11,000,000	30,000,000
Columbia River.....	73,000,000	223,000,000
Los Angeles-San Gabriel.....	10,000,000	31,000,000
Lower Mississippi.....		53,000,000
Missouri River.....	24,000,000	116,000,000
Ohio River.....	3,000,000	89,000,000
Ouachita River.....	1,000,000	11,000,000
Upper Mississippi River.....	14,000,000	27,000,000
West Branch Susquehanna River.....	6,000,000	17,000,000
Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway (Lake Erie Canal).....		5,000,000
Total.....	263,000,000	944,000,000

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill is urgently needed to prevent delays in orderly construction on 10 river basins.

It is another giant forward step for America in our water development program, and I urge its approval.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the pending measure, H.R. 6755, the Basin Authorization Act.

One of Alabama's greatest assets is its very fine system of rivers, and the district I have the privilege of representing is traversed by three of these fine systems. One of them, the Coosa-Alabama waterway, is the second longest in the entire Southeastern region that remains only partially improved.

The initial and ultimate comprehensive plan of development of the Coosa-Alabama was authorized in 1945 by the 79th Congress, with an authorization of \$60 million. At the end of the current fiscal year, appropriations totaling \$20.5 million will have been allocated to improvements on the system, thereby leaving a \$39.5 million balance in the authorization. The budget for fiscal 1966 contains requests for \$27.1 million for three of the projects on the Alabama River and one on the Coosawattee River in Georgia, and it appears that Congress will approve this full amount for the coming fiscal year.

Since the funding requirements for fiscal year 1967, as determined by the Corps of Engineers, will amount to approximately \$49.5 million, it is imperative that the Coosa-Alabama River System authorization be increased by \$38 million.

The economic benefits that will flow from this system when full development is realized are immeasurable, and I respectfully urge favorable consideration be given to this measure, H.R. 6755.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6767) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

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

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DENTON, KIRWAN, HANSEN of Washington, MARSH, MAHON, REIFEL, MCDADE, and JONAS.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Public Works Committee have permission to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 9, due to sudden illness in my family, I was unable to be present for the vote on rollcall No. 130, H.R. 8464, to raise the national debt limit. Had I been

present, I would have voted against augmentation of the limit of our national debt.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 408 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 408

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. 8439) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four 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 five-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.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. 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. 133]

Andrews.	Fogarty	Lindsay
George W.	Ford,	Mailliard
Ashley	Gerald R.	Matunaga
Bandstra	Fraser	Mills
Betts	Grabowski	Mink
Blatnik	Grider	Olsen, Minn.
Bolton	Halleck	Pike
Bonner	Harris	Powell
Bow	Harvey, Ind.	Price
Bray	Hébert	Reid, N.Y.
Brock	Helstoski	Rogers, Fla.
Brown, Ohio	Holland	Taylor
Callaway	Ichord	Teague, Tex.
Chamberlain	Karth	Toll
Clancy	King, N.Y.	Willis
Clawson, Del	Kornegay	Wright
Cooley	Landrum	
Devine	Langen	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 386 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

GENERAL LABOR SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the General Labor Subcommittee have permission to sit for the first 3 days of next week

while the House is in session under general debate. I have taken this matter up with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING].

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, House Resolution 408, which was just read, provides an open rule with 4 hours of general debate for the consideration of the annual military construction bill. I know of no opposition to the rule. I understand there is some controversy over the bill which it makes in order. I therefore reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 408 will make in order H.R. 8439, the military construction authorization bill under an open rule with 4 hours of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8439 is an authorization bill which is necessary for enactment before the appropriations can be provided to finance construction activities of the military departments during fiscal year 1966.

The bill as approved by the Committee on Armed Services totals \$1,934,927,000, and provides construction authorization in support of the Active Forces, the Reserve components, defense agencies, and military family housing.

This can be broken down as follows:

Army	\$365,026,000
Navy	319,722,000
Air Force	386,915,000
Defense agencies	100,051,000
Family housing	732,100,000
Reserve Forces	21,290,000
Deficiency authorization	9,823,000

Grand total..... 1,934,927,000

The authorization program for fiscal year 1966 is based on a 5-year projection of the missions and forces to be supported through fiscal year 1970. Assurances have been given by the Department of Defense and the individual military services that there are no present plans for reducing or deactivating any of the bases for which authorization for construction is included in this bill.

This is a large bill, but I believe it is a sound bill.

As the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. RIVERS] pointed out before the Rules Committee, the military forces of the United States are the strongest in the peacetime history of the world. Yet, while we have provided the necessary hardware to support these troops, we have not provided adequate facilities in which to house our

troops and their families. Even if the Congress authorized and funded at the rate requested in this year's bill for obsolete World War II facilities, it would take approximately 13 years to modernize the physical plant of the services.

It is significant to note that while the committee authorized the acquisition of 16,732 acres of land at a cost of approximately \$5.5 million, no new bases or installations are to be developed. Rather, the bulk of this land constituting approximately 15,000 acres, is for an addition to the western test range in California at a cost of slightly more than \$4 million.

Mr. RIVERS has indicated that one of the difficult decisions facing the Armed Services Committee this year was construction required as a result of the base closure announcements of November 1964. Construction was requested in the amount of \$49.8 million, and involved work at 31 different bases. All of the construction requested in this area was approved except for the small arms research and development facility at Rock Island, Ill., and this was omitted because the Secretary of Defense is having an outside firm make an audit of the alleged cost savings, and the final determination has not yet been made.

I recognize that the Committee on Armed Services had difficult decisions to make regarding construction required as a result of bases scheduled to be closed. In my opinion, the committee had no alternative but to follow the course that they adopted. They were assured that there would be recurring annual savings in the amount of \$477 million and, in addition, construction costs alone would result in a savings of \$25 million.

Now, I would like to touch upon a few highlights of the bill. The bill provides new operational facilities in the amount of \$1,193 million to support the Active and Reserve Forces, and authorizes for military family housing the amount of \$732.1 million.

It provides support for our strategic and defensive forces, our general purpose forces, our airlift and sealift forces, and Reserve Forces.

It is significant to note that there is nothing in the bill this year to take care of facilities for the Army National Guard or Army Reserve Forces because a final determination has not as yet been made as to a possible realignment.

In addition, the committee authorized new construction in support of various research and development programs in the amount of \$118 million.

The largest single element in the construction program is the provision of general support facilities. This authorizes construction of facilities totaling \$89 million for military training facilities, and \$62 million for communication facilities.

The committee also authorized 57,700 new barracks spaces and 5,700 new bachelor officers' quarters.

In authorizing \$735,600,000 for all costs related to military family housing, the committee approved a request for construction of 12,300 new units of family housing and 600 trailer spaces for military personnel owning their own trailers.

While this amount is extremely large, it is significant to note that over \$500 million in quarters allowances will be forfeited because family housing has been provided.

During the hearings on military construction the Committee on Armed Services modified the bill submitted by the Department of Defense in several major regards.

First. It modified section 605 of the bill by requiring that whenever practicable, construction shall be under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Yards and Docks, and makes the application of this provision worldwide rather than merely within the United States and its possessions. This has the effect of fostering competition between the two construction agencies and will, in the opinion of the committee, reduce the cost of construction to the Government.

Second. The committee added a restriction that housing constructed under this act shall be insofar as possible, detached single family units or semidetached units unless other types of construction shall have been justified to the Armed Services Committee on individual project basis.

Third. The committee added a provision giving the Secretary of Defense the discretion to operate former Wherry housing units on a fair rental determination basis or on an adjusted forfeiture of basic allowance for quarters basis rather than on the full forfeiture of basic allowance for quarters. This would have the effect of correcting many inequitable situations.

Fourth. The committee added section 608 to the bill, which has the effect of requiring notification to the Armed Services Committee of the House and Senate an opportunity for the Houses of Congress to act on a resolution of disapproval submitted by the respective committees before any military base or installation could be closed, substantially reduced, or consolidated.

It is my opinion that this is a good amendment. Not only does it make Congress full partners with the Executive in the running of the military, but it will give to Congress the opportunity to make its strength and wishes known to the executive branch and to the American people.

Fifth. The committee also added section 609, which requires a specific act of Congress before the land comprising the Bolling-Anacostia complex could be transferred from the military inventory. Many committees of the Congress are interested in the future use of this land. I agree with the Armed Services Committee that Congress should have the right to determine the future utilization of this land.

Sixth. The committee also wrote language into the military construction authorization bill requiring that the military services provide in all replacement hospitals in the United States, care and treatment of retired military personnel and their dependents to the extent that such care has been provided at the same installation over the last 3 years. It also requires that in every hospital construc-

tion within the United States, facilities be included for obstetrical care.

Seventh. The committee wrote language requiring that in all construction authorized under this act, techniques be utilized to maximize fallout protection where this can be done without impairing the purposes for which the construction is authorized.

I think each of these changes represent significant improvements in the bill which was submitted by the Department of Defense. I believe, too, that this bill which will be presented by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee reflects the painstaking care with which he and the committee scrutinized the Department's request.

I urge the adoption of the rule, and reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTEREST RATES ON FOREIGN OFFICIAL TIME DEPOSITS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 401 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read 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. 5306) to continue the authority of domestic banks to pay interest on time deposits of foreign governments at rates differing from those applicable to domestic depositors. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. 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, with or without instructions.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] and, pending that, to myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 401 is self-explanatory. I know of no opposition to it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order a bill which would permit domestic banks to pay higher interest rates on time deposits of foreign governments, central banks or other monetary authorities, of which the United States is a member.

Apparently this program is necessitated by the difficulties we have suffered with respect to our balance of payments. The report succinctly points out that by permitting American banks to pay higher interest charges holders of American dollars are discouraged from converting them to gold and encouraged instead to deposit them in American banks. The program has evidently been successful. This bill would permit and extend for an additional 3 years the authority which banks now have to pay these higher interest rates on time deposits.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SBA AUTHORITY TO LEND TO SBIC'S AND STATE AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT COMPANIES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 402, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 402

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. 7847) to amend the Small Business Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON]; pending that, such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill made in order by House Resolution 402 provides for an increase by \$120 million of a portion of the Small Business Administration's revolving fund which may be on loan to small business investment companies and State and local development companies pursuant to the Small Business Act of 1958.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule and reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency. Apparently there is some urgency attached to this matter, as I understand it. By the middle of this month unless this bill is passed, the authority which the Small Business Administration now has to make loans of this character would lapse. It does not provide for authorization of any new funds. It merely increases the amount of the revolving fund or the share of the revolving fund of the Small Business Administration that is now available for the purpose, as the gentleman from Missouri has said, of making this particular category of loans.

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE DOCUMENT, "DOCUMENTS ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE FORMATION OF THE UNION OF THE AMERICAN STATES"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 400) to provide for printing additional copies of House document entitled "Documents Illustrative of the Formation of the Union of the American States" and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 400

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be reprinted twenty thousand copies of House Document Numbered 398 of the Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, entitled "Documents Illustrative of the Formation of the Union of the American States", of which one thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate and one thousand copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

"That there shall be reprinted three thousand copies of House Document Numbered 398 of the Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, entitled 'Documents Illustrative of the Formation of the Union of the American States', of which five hundred and fifteen copies shall be for the use of the Senate, two thousand one hundred and ninety-five copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and two hundred and ninety copies for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

"Sec. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert

to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms."

Estimated cost: \$12,412.00.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I understand from the amendment that this is a substantial reduction in the number of copies to be printed of this particular item?

Mr. HAYS. That is correct. The original resolution called for 20,000. This is a document that contains all of the documents relating to the formation of the Union of the American States and it is a document that has been in some demand. However, we reduced it from 20,000 to 3,000 giving each Member of the other body and this body 5 copies.

We have informed the Public Printer and he will ride the order and it will be for sale at the Government Printing Office for those people who want them. I might tell the gentleman that in the last 2 years, the Government Printing Office has sold 500 of these and they are out of print.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that the House Administration has reduced substantially the printing that is to be authorized in the numerous resolutions that are being reported today?

Mr. HAYS. I would say to the gentleman, we have reduced the quantity in every instance except one, substantially, and that one was a document entitled "History of the House of Representatives" which is also out of print and which has been in great demand.

As a matter of fact, the requests which came to us would have cost a total of \$77,975.69. After committee action, they total \$35,246.24, a savings in the reductions of \$42,729.45.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I have seen, as I am sure other Members of the House have seen, some of the corridors of the office buildings stacked with material of one kind or another which does not seem to move.

I do not suggest that copies of material in demand should be drastically curtailed, but I do want to commend the gentleman and his committee. They are in a position to ascertain whether there is a demand for much of this printing. I commend the committee for reducing the amount of material that is being printed.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. This is a saving to the taxpayers that ought to be appreciated.

Mr. HAYS. I say to the gentleman that the committees which have materials stacked in the halls have been notified that any further requests for printing will get short shrift from the committee until they clean up the halls.

Mr. GROSS. That is good.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF A REPORT ON THE SINO-SOVIET CONFLICT, TOGETHER WITH HEARINGS THEREON

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 415, with committee amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 415

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the document entitled "Sino-Soviet Conflict and Its Implications", a report by the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, together with hearings thereon held by that subcommittee, dated May 14, 1965, be printed as a House document and that an additional ten thousand copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 7, strike out "ten" and insert "three".
Line 8, following "thousand" insert "five hundred".

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF A REVISED EDITION OF "HISTORY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 428 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 428

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed as a House document a revised edition of the publication entitled "History of the United States House of Representatives," and that there be printed twenty-one thousand nine hundred and fifty additional copies to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the House document room.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF "COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE BUFFALO, N.Y., AREA"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Reso-

lution 411, with an amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 411

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities six thousand additional copies of the publication entitled "Communist Activities in the Buffalo, New York, Area," Eighty-eighth Congress, first session.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 3, strike out "six" and insert "three".

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE REPORT 1739, ENTITLED "ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE YEAR 1963, COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 412, with an amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 412

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities ten thousand additional copies of the committee's annual report for the year 1963, House Report 1739, Eighty-eighth Congress, second session.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 3, strike out "ten" and insert "five".

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF "VIOLATION OF STATE DEPARTMENT TRAVEL REGULATIONS AND PROCASTRO PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES, PARTS 1 THROUGH 5"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 413, with a committee amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 413

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities ten thousand additional copies of each part of "Violation of State Department Regulations and Pro-Castro

Propaganda Activities in the United States, Parts 1 Through 5."

With the following committee amendment:

Line 3, strike out "ten" and insert "five".

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF "COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., AREA"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 414, with an amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 414

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities six thousand additional copies of the publication entitled "Communist Activities in the Minneapolis, Minnesota, Area," Eighty-eighth Congress, second session.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 3, strike out "six" and insert "three".

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF "THE COMMUNIST PARTY'S COLD WAR AGAINST CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION OF SUBVERSION—REPORT AND TESTIMONY OF ROBERT CARRILLO RONSTADT"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 390, with a committee amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 390

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities seventeen thousand additional copies of a publication entitled "The Communist Party's Cold War Against Congressional Investigation of Subversion—Report and Testimony of Robert Carrillo Ronstadt", Eighty-seventh Congress, second session.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 2, strike out "seventeen thousand" and insert "eight thousand five hundred".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION TO APPOINT DELEGATION TO ATTEND A MEETING OF THE COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 418) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 418

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives is authorized to appoint four Members of the House of Representatives as a delegation to attend the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, to be held in Wellington, New Zealand, at the invitation of the New Zealand branch of the Association, and to designate the chairman of said delegation.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the delegation, including staff members designated by the chairman to assist said delegation, shall not exceed \$10,000 and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Expenses of the delegation shall include such special expenses as the chairman may deem appropriate to carry out this resolution.

A member or employee of such delegation (1) shall receive subsistence expenses in an amount not to exceed the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964, (2) shall receive actual transportation expenses, and (3) shall not expend appropriated funds for the purpose of defraying expenses in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LENDING TO SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Mr. PATMAN. 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. 7847) to amend the Small Business Act.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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. 7847, with Mr. HOLFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 7847 is to allow the Small Business Administration to increase by \$120 million the amount of money that it may spend for programs under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. These functions include purchase of subordinated debentures of small business investment companies, loans to such SBIC's as well as the making of loans to State and local development companies.

H.R. 7847 does not provide an increased appropriation for SBA, but merely gives the agency authority to spend money already available in its revolving fund.

Section 4(a) of the Small Business Act limits the amount of money that may be outstanding in the SBIC and development company programs to \$341 million. Once that figure has been reached, SBA is prohibited from lending additional money until repayments have reduced the figure below \$341 million. Most of the loans made by the agency for these programs are for 10 years or more and, consequently, the major repayment period is still several years in the future since both the SBIC and local development company programs are fairly new. H.R. 7847 would amend section 4(a) of the Small Business Act to provide that \$461 million may be outstanding in the investment company field. The proposed increase is based upon a projection of requirements for these programs through June 30, 1966. SBA officials estimate that loans and commitments outstanding for investment division purposes would total about \$461 million by that date. In closing, I would like to quote a paragraph from the statement presented by SBA Administrator Eugene Foley when he testified before the Banking and Currency Committee on this legislation:

Action to increase this authorization is urgent, since the present amount of \$341 million is estimated to be adequate to meet requirements only until the middle of next month. Once the statutory limit is reached, no further loans may be made under the Small Business Investment Act, regardless of the amounts available in SBA's revolving fund. Of course, such a loan cut-off would adversely affect the SBIC program and would block progress on local development company projects in communities throughout the Nation.

For the benefit of the Members of this body, I would like to give an up-to-date progress report on the outstanding funds of the SBA Investment Division:

SBA Investment Division is authorized to have \$341 million outstanding in programs under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. At the present time \$329.1 million has been loaned for these purposes. This means that there is \$11.9 million remaining. However, at the present time, SBA has in "the works" \$12 million in additional loans. These loans are comprised of \$8 million for development company lending and \$4 million for SBIC lending. If SBA honors all of these commitments, it would exceed its total authorization for Investment Division activities.

Mr. Chairman, after hearing Mr. Foley's request for urgent action on H.R. 7847, the Banking and Currency Committee voted unanimously to recommend passage of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I strongly urge passage of H.R. 7847, which provides for increased revolving fund authorization to be used by the SBA in its investment company and development company programs.

It is apparent that the present authorization ceiling of \$341 million must be raised in order that these programs not be curtailed. These programs are aiding small business concerns throughout the Nation and should be fully utilized.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I am familiar with the benefits that small businesses derive from these programs and the necessity that the revolving fund authorization be increased in this regard. After extensive investigations and hearings, our committee reported to the Congress this past year, in House Report 1934 concerning the investment company program, that:

The program is making a valid and substantial contribution to the small business community and to the entire national economy.

The House Small Business Committee unanimously recommended in that same report—House Report No. 1934—that legislation be considered early in the 89th Congress to increase the revolving fund for the small business investment program. The committee concluded in that report, on page 29, as follows:

With the steady expansion of the program and the increased authority to SBA under Public Law 88-273 to increase initial capital loans to SBIC's and because of the fact that this early in the program repayments to SBA are not substantial the committee feels that legislation raising the revolving fund authorization should be considered early in the 89th Congress.

Today the more than 700 small business investment companies have provided equity capital, and long-term loans totaling more than \$700 million to many thousands of small businesses. Nothing should be done now that might impede or delay the full growth of the program.

The development company loan program is also of special benefit to small business and shows greater and greater promise. This week SBA Administrator Foley, in testifying before Subcommittee No. 5, chaired by our very able colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], advised that 607 development company loans have been made by SBA; that SBA has supplied \$82 million of total investments of \$124 million on development projects creating 30,468 new jobs. This program must also be developed to its fullest capacity.

I congratulate Chairman PATMAN and the members of the Banking and Currency Committee who unanimously reported this bill recommending passage. This legislation is needed now and I wholeheartedly support its passage.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of our committee has explained this bill. It increases the available money by using the revolving fund money that is available at the present time. There are no new authorizations involved. The committee unanimously approved the bill.

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

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7847, to amend the Small Business Act to increase the authority of the SBA to lend under the small business investment program and

to State and local development companies.

This legislation does not appropriate or authorize the appropriation of any new funds for SBA, it merely gives the agency authority to utilize funds already available in its revolving fund.

The bill would increase by \$120 million—by raising to \$461 million from the present ceiling of \$341 million—the portion of SBA's revolving fund which may be on loan at any one time under these programs pursuant to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

There is a certain urgency in the passage of H.R. 7847 because SBA is now reaching the present statutory limit for outstanding loans under these programs, and without prompt action in the Congress they will come to an abrupt halt.

Such an eventuality would have a very serious and damaging effect on small business investment companies, as well as on the many small firms receiving assistance from them, and would delay and impede local development company projects across the country.

Because of this urgency, therefore, and because of the tremendous proven value of the small business investment program and the development company program, I hope the Members of this House will give their full support for passage of this vital legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 7847

A bill to amend the Small Business Act *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That section 4(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 633(c)) is amended—by striking out "\$341,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$461,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, 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. 7847) to amend the Small Business Act, pursuant to House Resolution 402, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTEREST RATES ON FOREIGN OFFICIAL TIME DEPOSITS

Mr. PATMAN. 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. 5306) to continue

the authority of domestic banks to pay interest on time deposits of foreign governments at rates differing from those applicable to domestic depositors.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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. 5306, with Mr. HOLIFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5306 reported out by the Banking and Currency Committee on May 11 would continue the legal exemption enjoyed by commercial banks permitting them to pay higher rates of interest on time deposits of foreign official institutions.

Ordinarily, our commercial banks may not pay a rate of interest to these foreign depositors higher than the rate payable to any other depositor. The Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation by law fix the maximum rate of interest on time and savings deposits paid by our commercial banks. The present law, enacted October 15, 1962, provides an exemption from the interest rate ceiling for a 3-year period and runs out this October 15.

The intended purpose of this legislation is, of course, to keep dollars within this country which might otherwise be redeemed for gold, thereby further depleting our gold reserves. In the opinion of a number of experts, there is a place for this legislation in the Government's program for dealing with our balance-of-payments deficit.

This is discriminatory legislation; we are discriminating against our own citizens. But since this is also emergency legislation, we feel that the Government should be able to provide this discriminatory exemption as long as the emergency continues.

Hopefully, that will not be too much longer. The executive branch is optimistic that our payments situation will show a great improvement this year and preliminary evidence strongly supports that conclusion. For this reason, we amended the bill in committee, agreeing to a 3-year extension rather than a permanent extension as requested in the original bill sent up.

The authority of this legislation is, of course, only permissive. It does not compel higher rates of interest to be paid. As a practical matter, only a small handful of the larger money market banks will be affected.

It must be recognized that the decision as to whether they hold dollars, gold, or other reserves is influenced by many considerations other than interest rates. As a matter of fact, it is not possible to say with certainty that interest rates play a significant role at all in international money flows. And, the administration has repeated emphatically that they vigorously oppose any general increase in interest rates or tightening of credit which would only aggravate our payments

deficit by putting the economy into a tailspin.

Since November 24, 1964, our commercial banks have been permitted to pay as much as 4½ percent interest on time deposits of 1 year or more and have paid up to 4 percent since January 1, 1962. The 4½-percent figure is presently the maximum permissible rate payable on domestic deposits. Therefore, our interest rates are already very high. So, while any benefit derived from this legislation is not measurable, the committee feels that the exemption should be continued as a minor but possibly helpful tool in the Government's overall balance-of-payments program.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any opposition to the bill and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, this bill was approved by the committee unanimously, I believe.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, this is a program that has been working quite well since it was instituted and became the law. In the committee one change was approved—an amendment to provide a 3-year expiration date instead of making permanent the exemption of foreign official deposits from interest rate ceilings.

I believe this is a good bill and should be approved by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will report the committee amendment as a substitute bill for the purpose of amendment as an original bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last sentence of the fourteenth paragraph (12 U.S.C. 371b) of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act is amended by changing "the effective date of this sentence and ending upon the expiration of three years after such date," to read "October 15, 1962, and ending on October 15, 1968."

SEC. 2. The last sentence of section 18(g) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(g)) is amended by changing "the effective date of this sentence and ending upon the expiration of three years after such date," to read "October 15, 1962, and ending on October 15, 1968."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, 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. 5306) to continue the authority of domestic banks to pay interest on time deposits of foreign governments at rates differing from those applicable to domestic depositors, pursuant to House Resolution 401, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and include relevant extraneous matter on the two bills just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am proud to transmit the Annual Report of the Office of Alien Property for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964.

This is the 22d report, as required by law, of proceedings under the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended. There is special significance in this report because it signals the completion of the functions of the Office of Alien Property in the near future. I feel it is appropriate, therefore, to review the record of this Office which has led to the successful conclusion of the purpose for which it was established by the Congress.

Upon our entry into World War II, Congress broadened the terms of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917 to permit effective use of enemy owned or controlled property in our own war effort, and also to deny its use to the enemy.

The Office of Alien Property Custodian was reconstituted as an independent agency in 1942 and, by February 1943, personnel of the Office had reached its peak of almost 1,300 persons. Offices were opened in Washington, New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Manila, and Honolulu—and after the war in Munich, Germany, and Tokyo, Japan. In 1947, the Office of Alien Property Custodian was terminated and its functions transferred to the Office of Alien Property within the Department of Justice.

Thus far, a total of \$861 million has been realized from all World War II vestings. Seizures affected assets of every description from the huge General Aniline & Flim Corp. stockholdings to scrip certificates valued at only a few

cents. Assets administered and liquidated have included personal property, trusts, estates, patents, copyrights, trademarks, stocks, bonds, industrial equipment, mineral rights, farms, urban real estate, mortgages, entire businesses, and objects of art.

In 1946, following the cessation of hostilities, Congress authorized return of vested property to individuals who were within countries which had been occupied by the enemy and to individuals who had been substantially deprived of their rights of citizenship on racial and religious grounds. Additionally, Congress authorized the payment of claims of American creditors from the vested property of their German debtors. More than 67,000 claims were filed under this authority—and, at this writing, only 134 claims involving about \$25 million remain for processing and decision.

Under the act, the net proceeds of vested property which are not returnable must be placed in the War Claims Fund where it will be used to compensate American citizens who have suffered war damage. To date, about \$314 million has been transferred by the Office of Alien Property to the War Claims Fund. An additional amount of \$165 million recently obtained from the sale of the stock of General Aniline & Flim Corp. will also be available for deposit to the War Claims Fund in the future.

During the years since 1942, the Office has participated in more than 7,000 litigated cases involving its assets. I am pleased to report that this caseload has now been cut drastically so that only 60 cases remain in litigation currently.

I am able to report to you now that the Department of Justice expects to complete the administration of World War II property, and to terminate the Office of Alien Property as an organizational entity, by June 30, 1966. This achievement is the result of a planned and purposeful effort made since 1961 to close the Office within 5 years.

Throughout its entire existence, the Office of Alien Property has been self-supporting from the proceeds of its vested property. Since July 1, 1961, the annual budget authorization of \$690,000 for each year has supported a staff of about 50 persons. The Office's budget request of \$369,000 for fiscal year 1966 is designed to support a staff of 21 persons during its last year as an organization.

After June 30, 1966, certain minimal functions will remain, including the administration of the blocked assets of several satellite countries which cannot be terminated until adequate financial agreements are reached with those countries. This function which requires the full-time services of only one employee may be assigned to another agency. At present, no other alien property matters are expected to require the full-time services of any employee beyond June 30, 1966.

At an appropriate time, in connection with the budget for fiscal 1967, I will propose recommendations on how the burden of the few remaining alien property functions can continue to be discharged with nonappropriated funds even though

the functions may be performed by persons on appropriated fund payrolls.

The termination of the Office of Alien Property as of June 30, 1966, will bring to a close a chapter of American history which began in World War I. The first provision for an Alien Property Custodian in U.S. legislation is found in the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917.

The termination of the last remaining World War I functions—impeded by the outbreak of World War II—was not accomplished until 1956, some 38 years after the conclusion of hostilities. Fortunately, we shall be able to conclude the affairs related to World War II in only 21 years, and I welcome this occasion to report that this objective is now finally in sight.

I would take this opportunity to observe that we of the United States enjoy the unique and blessed distinction of having, as a Nation, no traditional or historic, and certainly no "natural" enemies, among other nations and other peoples on this earth. We greatly prize this good fortune and I know it is the will of the people, of the Congress, and certainly of the Chief Executive that such amity and friendship may be preserved forever, through growing understanding and unwavering pursuit of our objective of peace with honor among all men and nations.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 10, 1965.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. 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. 8439) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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. 8439, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, it is with pleasure that I come before you today to present the fiscal year 1966 military construction authorization bill. In so doing, I want to assure the membership of this body that I am bringing to you a bill which was approved by the Armed Services Committee by a unanimous vote. We believe it is a good bill—squarely meeting the needs of the military departments. We believe, too, that certain provisions in this bill will return to the Congress the powers which the framers of the Constitution meant for us to have and to retain. We believe it is a well-conceived bill—without austerity and also

without frills—permitting us to meet our responsibilities in these troublesome times.

GENERAL FACTS

The purpose of this bill is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments during fiscal year 1966.

This is an authorization bill which is necessary for enactment before appropriations can be provided to finance these activities of the military departments during fiscal year 1966.

Mr. Chairman, we have today the strongest military forces in the peacetime history of the world.

Our Armed Forces have now achieved an excellent balance in both nuclear and conventional war capability so that we are capable of providing the flexible response that might be necessary to meet any emergency at any time any place in the world.

OUR MILITARY STRENGTH

Our military strength is a combination of nuclear and conventional war capability.

Our nuclear capability consists of: Our Strategic Air Command forces with 935 bombers.

Our existing fleet of 26 Polaris submarines which, by fiscal year 1967, will be increased to 41 Polaris submarines, which will have 656 missiles.

Our 854 intercontinental ballistic missiles which, by the end of 1965, will be increased to 1,054 ICBM's made up of Titan and Minuteman missiles.

This is our nuclear capability today and as it will be next year.

Our conventional forces include 16 combat-ready Army divisions, 3 combat-ready Marine divisions, 885 naval vessels, of which 672 are combatant types, and our tactical air support.

These nuclear and conventional war forces are supported by a total of 2,640,266 personnel distributed among the several military departments, as follows:

Army.....	953,094
Navy.....	684,848
Marine Corps.....	193,190
Air Force.....	809,134

Total..... 2,640,266

In summary, therefore, these are the operating forces which this proposed construction will support and enable them to continue to provide for our national security.

The bill as submitted by the Department of Defense, together with subsequent requests for adjustments, totals \$1,953,293,000, which included \$9,823,000 for deficiency authorizations.

The bill as submitted by the Department included \$735,600,000 for all housing expenditures of the Departments proposed for fiscal year 1966.

Therefore, the bill, exclusive of housing costs, represents a total of \$1,217,693,000.

In comparing this year's departmental request to that of last year, I find them reasonably comparable.

Last year the Departments requested a grand total of new construction authorization in the amount of \$1,847,200,000.

This year the Departments requested \$1,943,470,000 of new construction authority.

Therefore, the request this year for new construction authorization is approximately \$96 million greater than that made by the Departments last year.

Last year the Congress reduced the Department's requested new construction authorization by \$315,516,000, and granted approval for construction for fiscal year 1965 in the amount of \$1,531,684,000, all of which was proposed for funding. And the Department is requesting the funding of its entire fiscal year 1966 military construction request, except for the \$30 million in emergency construction authority contained in sections 103, 203, and 303 of the bill.

In summary, therefore, the Department's request is approximately \$96 million greater than that requested last year, and approximately \$412 million more than that authorized by the Congress for fiscal year 1965.

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE ACTION

The Armed Services Committee, after extensive hearings by the full committee, reviewed each of these line items requested by the Departments and ultimately reduced the bill by \$10,570,000.

The committee reduction of only \$10½ million is minor when compared with the \$315 million reduction made by the committee last year on the annual military construction bill.

Why was such a small reduction made when the bill was for nearly \$100 million more than was requested last year? Rather than reflecting lack of consideration of the items, I believe the results of the committee action show that we are realistically meeting our broad responsibility in providing to the Department of Defense and the services the essentials they need for operation, training, and the facilities needed to attract and retain much-needed personnel.

The committee recognized that not only do we have military commitments all over the world, we also have strong military involvements in several areas of the world—and military commitments and military involvements require military construction.

In times such as we are now experiencing, military construction at military bases overseas is not in itself sufficient. Operational and training facilities in the United States are required also.

And the cycle does not end there.

At a time when the retention rate is the lowest in years, it became essential to look at its causes. As I indicated when I appeared before you on the military hardware bill, pay is one of the chief causes for lack of retention, but another major factor is housing, not only for the troops, but also for their families.

In assessing these broad areas of need, the committee became convinced that the facilities are essential.

The Committee on Armed Services is convinced that this minor reduction, the major part relating to one classified project, will certainly not impair the operational effectiveness of the armed services nor will it in any way jeopardize our national security.

NUMBER OF BASES AND LINE ITEMS IN THE BILL

This bill authorizes construction at 427 military bases throughout the world.

Included in the construction authorization for these 427 bases are approximately 1,372 line items.

Also included in this construction authorization are 12,300 individual units of military family housing.

There are no new bases proposed for construction in this bill.

All the construction authorized by this bill will occur at existing bases and military installations throughout the world.

HOSPITALS

Included in H.R. 8439 are authorizations amounting to approximately \$52 million for medical facilities of all types. These include hospital additions, dispensaries, dental clinics, and complete hospitals.

Approximately \$22 million of this total authorization is allocated for the construction of eight new hospitals.

These eight hospitals are distributed as follows:

Place	Number of beds	Cost
Army:		
Fort Devens, Mass.....	116	\$4,794,000
U.S. Military Academy, New York.....	100	4,930,000
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.....	40	2,088,000
Fort Stewart, Ga.....	38	1,887,000
Fort Irwin, Calif.....	24	1,847,000
Navy: Classified location.....	100	2,000,000
Air Force:		
Turner AFB, Ga.....	55	2,443,000
Ankara AFS, Turkey.....	65	2,301,000
Grand total.....		22,290,000

The costs for the military hospitals contained in this bill have been carefully reviewed, and it is gratifying to note that these continue to compare very favorably with the costs for civilian Hill-Burton hospitals.

The costs for Hill-Burton hospitals have shown a 2.5-percent increase over the past years, whereas military hospital costs have remained unchanged for the past 4 years.

The actual dollar cost for military hospitals in a normal cost region varies from \$29 to \$33 per square foot, depending upon the size of the hospital.

During the hearings on last year's construction bill a special subcommittee was appointed to look into the matter of requirements for military hospitals. As an outgrowth of their findings, and recommendations of that subcommittee, this committee approved a new section 610 to be added to H.R. 8439 which will require that beds for retirees and their dependents and obstetrical facilities will be provided in all new military hospitals.

UNUSED AUTHORIZATION

The Committee on Armed Services has made a determined effort over the past few years to reduce the amount of unfunded and unused construction authorization available to the military departments.

In order to avoid the unnecessary accumulation of unused authorization, the committee has reduced the period of validity of authorizations provided in the annual military construction bill to a 2-year period for all facilities other than military family housing.

In the case of military family housing, the authorization is limited to a 15-month period.

As a consequence of this action, the unused authorization of the military departments has decreased from a high of approximately \$2½ billion in fiscal year 1957, to an estimated \$95 million in fiscal year 1965.

LAND ACQUISITIONS

The bill as submitted by the Department proposed the acquisition of approximately 17,000 acres of land at a total estimated cost of \$5½ million. This is substantially less than 1½ million acres at an estimated cost of \$32 million requested in fiscal year 1965.

The committee approved without change the departmental request for land acquisition.

The bulk of the land acquisitions included in the 17,000 acres approved by the committee involves the fee acquisition of 15,000 acres of land for the Western Test Range in California at a cost of slightly more than \$4 million.

And speaking of land, the committee was convinced that there was a military necessity to retain in the Department of Defense inventory the land comprising the Bolling-Anacostia complex. Experience shows that when prime land such as this is disposed, there is a necessity to acquire other land at premium prices. Therefore, the committee included in this bill a provision requiring a specific act of Congress before the Bolling-Anacostia land could be removed from the Defense inventory.

I have also asked the Real Estate Subcommittee to make a thorough inquiry into the whole matter.

BASE CLOSURES

Certain of the construction authorized in this bill is related to base closure action recently announced by the Department of Defense.

The committee was advised that construction projects associated with base closures included in the bill total approximately \$50 million, with an additional \$27 million being required during the next 4 fiscal years—fiscal year 1967 through fiscal year 1970—for a total requirement of approximately \$77 million.

The Department advised the committee that when the base closures made possible by these projects are completed the construction economies resulting from these consolidations of activities will produce savings of \$25 million by terminating approved prior year construction projects, plus the cancellation of projects totaling \$69 million no longer required during the period fiscal year 1966 through fiscal year 1970; for a total of \$94 million. This would indicate a net savings in construction of \$17 million.

In order to insure that the Congress is properly informed and consulted prior to the closure or substantial reduction of any base, the committee has added a new section 608 to the bill which states:

The Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department, or the designee of either, may not close, substantially reduce, or consolidate any military camp, post, station, installation, or facility located in the United States and Puerto Rico, until the expiration of 30 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on

which the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department reports the pertinent details of the action to be taken to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

If during such period a resolution is reported by either of the said committees stating that the proposed action should be rejected by the resolving House because if carried out it would in the judgment of the said resolving House tend to impair the defense of the United States such action shall take effect after the expiration of the first period of forty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which such resolution is reported; but only if, between the date of such reporting in either House and the expiration of such 40-day period such resolution has not been passed by such House.

Now, there will undoubtedly be those who will seek to nit pick this section of the proposed legislation with technical objections.

I think it is quite clear what the committee has in mind.

No camp, post, station, installation, or facility may be closed, substantially reduced or consolidated until the Congress has had the opportunity to study its effect upon the national security.

This does not mean that a division of troops needed for military operations cannot be ordered overseas. It does not mean that a squadron of aircraft located on an air base cannot be relocated for tactical reasons because of necessary military operations or possible military operations.

But it does mean that an air base cannot be closed down and the aircraft transferred to another base permanently, until the Congress has been advised.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present. I think this is a very important subject, and I wish all Members were here to listen to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services explain this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-eight Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 134]

Andrews,	Fogarty	Matsunaga
George W.	Ford, Gerald R.	Miller
Bolton	Fraser	Mink
Bonner	Frelinghuysen	Mosher
Bow	Cridler	Nedzi
Bray	Halleck	Pike
Brock	Hansen, Idaho	Powell
Brown, Ohio	Hansen, Wash.	Price
Callaway	Harvey, Ind.	Reuss
Cameron	Hébert	Selden
Chamberlain	Helstoski	Smith, Calif.
Clancy	Holland	Steed
Clawson, Del.	Ichord	Teague, Tex.
Coillier	King, N.Y.	Toll
Cooley	Kornegay	Wilson,
Dawson	Landrum	Charles H.
Devine	Langen	Wright
Diggs	Lindsay	
Evins, Tenn.	Mailliard	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having assumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consider-

ation the bill H.R. 8439, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 381 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the point of order of no quorum was made, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] had consumed 26 minutes.

The gentleman from South Carolina. Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, as I was attempting to explain to the membership of the Committee, section 608 means that a division cannot be transferred from one base to another base, on a permanent basis, with the idea of closing the base as soon as the troops are transferred.

There is no intention of tying the hands of the President or the Joint Chiefs of Staff with respect to the movement of troops to meet tactical situations, threatened aggression, or actual military commitments.

But I am confident that there will be some who will raise objections to this provision on the grounds that troops cannot be transferred without the prior approval of Congress.

This is not the intent of the provision and I am sure that no Secretary of Defense would interpret it in this manner if he had to meet a military situation.

You know the purpose of the provision. I know the purpose of the provision. And any responsible person who interprets the provision knows the purpose.

But there is a game that goes on in some parts of the executive branch of the Government, whenever they want to shoot down any original idea that emanates from the Congress. Their idea is that the Congress is not supposed to have any ideas of their own.

Instead, we are supposed to rubber-stamp only what is submitted for approval.

I was not elected for that purpose.

And section 608 is our way of once again advising the executive branch of the Government that we are partners in maintaining the defense of the Nation.

We will meet the other branches of Government more than halfway.

But bear in mind that the Constitution specifically mentions national defense and gives the Congress the power to raise and support armies and provide for a Navy.

If we have the exclusive authority to raise and support armies and provide for a Navy—are we powerless to prevent their dissolution? If we—and we alone—can build military camps and stations—are we powerless to prevent their closing? I certainly hope not.

Does it make any sense that four committees of the Congress are required to act on every request for facilities costing over \$25,000 and yet, at the same time, the Secretary of Defense can close installations costing hundreds of millions of dollars without getting the consent of Congress? We of the Armed Services Committee believe that this does not make any sense.

Therefore, I ask each of you to join with me in supporting this provision of this bill.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

The military construction authorization for fiscal year 1966 as reflected in H.R. 8439, contains two distinct parts:

First. The authority to provide and construct new operational facilities in the amount of \$1,193 million to support the Active and Reserve Forces, and second, the authority for military family housing in the amount of \$732.1 million.

Now, I would like to briefly review the \$1,193 million authorization for the Active and Reserve Forces by relating it to the nature of the support which this construction is intended to provide the operating forces.

STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE FORCES

In support of these forces, which I will treat together in this statement, we have authorized \$71 million in construction. This includes facilities for offensive missiles, our manned bomber force and our continental air and missile defense forces. Facilities to support these missions are sharply reduced over previous years, amounting to only 6 percent of the fiscal year 1966 program. Work on new ICBM sites is essentially completed except for silos for the last Minuteman squadron authorized last year for Malmstrom Air Force Base, and placed under construction contract in February 1965.

GENERAL PURPOSE FORCES

The committee has allocated approximately \$330 million of new construction in support of our general purpose forces.

These projects include almost \$108 million for troop housing and community facilities for the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

This category of construction also includes new operational, training, and maintenance support facilities for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. Of particular significance, some \$22 million is proposed for tactical aircraft shelters in Europe and in the Pacific area.

AIRLIFT AND SEALIFT FORCES

The committee provided \$29 million in support of our airlift and sealift forces. Some \$23 million of this would go into the Department of the Air Force to provide support facilities for troop carriers, cargo aircraft, and MATS; while some \$6 million would be provided the Department of the Army to consolidate facilities of Army transportation activities principally at the Bayonne Naval Supply Center, N.J.

RESERVE FORCES

Authorization for construction of Reserve facilities proposed in fiscal year 1966 is substantially reduced over fiscal year 1965 since no additional authorization is proposed at this time for the Army Reserve Forces. The Department of Defense recommended that residual lump-sum authorizations for the Army Reserve and Army National Guard enacted during the last session of Congress should provide sufficient construction authority during fiscal year 1966, while decisions with respect to the proposed realigned force structure are being made.

Since the committee has not yet ascertained its final position in regard to the proposed merger of the Reserves and National Guard, H.R. 8439 omits such provisions.

The amounts approved for the Air Force and Navy Reserve Forces again follow the lump sum authorization procedures reinstated by the Congress in 1963 under which the Congress is notified in advance of the specific projects to be undertaken. A total of \$21.3 million is programed for these purposes, consisting of the following:

	Million
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve.....	\$8.9
Air National Guard.....	9.0
Air Force Reserve.....	3.4

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The committee authorized new construction in support of various research and development programs amounting to \$118 million.

Twenty-four million dollars of this is intended for support of the Nike X development and test program on Kwajalein Island.

An additional \$94 million will provide various research and development laboratories and support facilities for the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

GENERAL SUPPORT

As might be anticipated, the largest single element in the military construction program is the provision of general support facilities.

Included in this category, which totals some \$594 million, are approximately \$89 million of new military training facilities and \$62 million for communications facilities. Some \$177 million is included for troop housing and community support facilities. I am pleased to state the committee has approved some 57,700 new barracks spaces and 5,700 new bachelor officer quarters in this bill.

EMERGENCY UNFORESEEN REQUIREMENTS

Sections 103, 203, and 303 provided contingency unfunded authorization for the three military departments in the amount of \$10 million each—a total of \$30 million. Use of this authorization to proceed with construction made necessary by changes in missions and responsibilities due to unforeseen security considerations, new weapons development requirements, or improved production schedules, is subject to the prior scrutiny of the Committees on Armed Services to insure that the statutory criteria has been observed.

Unused portions of this emergency authorization automatically expire on September 30 of each year following enactment.

FAMILY HOUSING

As members of this committee will recall, the military construction authorization bill contains within it authorization for all costs related to military family housing.

The total amount requested by the Department of Defense in support of military family housing for fiscal year 1966 was \$735,600,000.

The committee authorized \$732,100,000.

This authorization is reflected in section 508 of this legislation. Subsection

(a) of section 508 authorizes \$242,400,000 in support of new construction and certain construction related projects.

This includes: \$224,934,000 for 12,300 new units of family housing; \$1,080,000 for the construction of 600 trailer spaces for military personnel owning their own trailers; \$18,196,000 for improvements to adequate quarters; \$1,500,000 for relocation of 200 relocatable housing units from Glasgow Air Force Base; minor construction in the amount of \$1,210,000; planning moneys of \$1 million.

The total of these authorizations amounts to \$247,920,000. Against this total, the Department of Defense is applying \$5,520,000 of construction savings from previous years programs. This then leaves \$242,400,000 authorized by this committee for appropriation.

Subsection 508(b) of H.R. 8439 provides the balance of the support costs of military family housing. These items which were approved in their entirety include the following:

Operating expenses.....	\$171,786,000
Leasing.....	21,465,000
Maintenance for real property.....	133,951,000
Debt payment—principal.....	74,016,000
Debt payment—interest and other expenses.....	87,179,000
Mortgage insurance premiums, Capehart and Wherry.....	3,495,000
Servicemen's mortgage insurance premiums.....	4,940,000

The total of these items is \$496,832,000. The Department of Defense anticipates reimbursements to the family housing account of approximately \$7,132,000. Consequently, the amount of new appropriations authorized by the committee for the support of family housing is \$489,700,000.

Although this figure of almost a half billion dollars in support of military family housing seems unfortunately large, let me point out that more than this amount of money would be required as an annual Federal disbursement whether or not we have any military family housing. This would occur since military families occupying the more than 365,000 sets of family quarters will forfeit their quarters allowances in an estimated amount of \$510 million. Thus, if there were no quarters available, these individuals would be eligible for and receive a monetary allowance in lieu of Government quarters. The cost would then be reflected in additional requirements by the departments for military pay and allowances.

CHANGES IN COST LIMITATIONS ON FAMILY HOUSING

The committee has eased some of the cost limitations on family housing in order to provide required flexibility in the administration of the housing program.

Specifically, an increase in the cost limit to the 5-foot line for housing for general officers from \$24,000 to \$26,000 has been approved. In conjunction with this, the total cost limitation for general officers' housing has been increased to \$32,000. These changes were required in order that general officers' housing may have a similar cost per gross square foot as the housing for all other ranks.

In lieu of increasing the average unit cost of \$17,500 which previously was applied per project, the committee changed this limitation to be applicable to each military department's domestic program.

In a similar vein, the \$160 average per month limitation for the leasing program has been applied upon the military departments' overall leasing program rather than on an individual unit.

This year, a special exception to the cost limitations is being granted for the project at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. The total average cost at West Point will not exceed \$36,000 per unit. This exception is required due to the extremely rocky and steep terrain of the housing site and the high cost of labor in the area.

A further special exception to the cost and space limitations is for the acquisition or construction of two sets of representational quarters. These quarters would be authorized at \$100,000 each and are over and above the 12,500-family housing units previously mentioned.

LEASING AND RENTAL GUARANTEE

The committee has authorized an increase in the Department of Defense's domestic leasing program from 5,000 units per year, with the leasing on a single-unit basis. The committee feels that leasing may offer a desirable alternative to construction in some instances and should be expanded to help alleviate the problems encountered by the departments in some areas.

Finally, in the legislative changes for military family housing, we are extending the current limitations upon the rental guarantee program.

COMPETITIVE BIDDING

I would like to point out that, historically, practically all of this construction is accomplished through competitive bidding.

The Department advises that in fiscal year 1964, 96 percent of this construction was accomplished through competitive bidding, and the Department anticipates the same approximate percentage during fiscal years 1965 and 1966.

SUMMARY

I have attempted to provide a general review of the more important features of this legislation.

As I mentioned at the outset of my statement, approval of this legislation by the Congress will authorize construction for the military departments for fiscal year 1966 in the amount of \$1,934,927,000, which includes \$1,925,104,000 for new authorization and \$9,823,000 for deficiency authorization.

Mr. Chairman, the House Armed Services Committee worked long and hard on this bill. It was unanimously supported by the members of the Armed Services Committee. In my opinion, it is a sound bill, and I urge the support for the bill in its entirety by the Members of this great body.

I want to thank you for your kind attention. I want to tell you we worked pretty hard on this bill. We got it out in record time. There are over 12,000 line items in the bill and almost 500 bases. We worked day and night with an amazing attendance. There are 37 members

on the committee and generally 37 members were present. It is a great tribute to the Congress and a great record for this committee, and I am honored to be chairman of this dedicated committee.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California. I know he has an important announcement to make.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to announce the Russians have Lunik-6 on its way to the moon. They tried to make a midcourse correction. They could not bring it back and they are going to miss the moon by about 99,000 miles.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is good.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has consumed 40 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, your Committee on Armed Services has met in day and night sessions over the past several weeks for hearings on the defense military construction authorization bill for the fiscal year 1966. Before these hearings started, every member of the committee was furnished a set of program books by each participating Department, and these were most helpful in acquainting members with the items involved preparatory to the actual testimony being presented. In 2,517 pages of hearings, the committee examined in great detail the requirements of the Department of Defense.

As the ranking minority member of your Committee on Armed Services, I agree fully with the remarks by our able chairman in his presentation of the military construction authorization bill. It has my personal support. The committee chairman has been clear and succinct in his outline of the details of this complex bill. He has pointed up several problems with which the committee was confronted and the proposed solutions. I believe these recommended solutions will reaffirm the related constitutional responsibilities and prerogatives of the Congress.

The bill would authorize approximately 1,370 individual construction line items. Many of these are new types of facilities needed to keep abreast of the developments in modern warfare, to keep up with technological improvements in equipment and weapons systems. The various types of structures run the gamut of facilities required to operate and maintain today's military installations for support of the operating forces. A relatively large segment of the line items is for our uniformed people, to better their living conditions with decent barracks, bachelor officers' quarters, mess halls, chapels, athletic fields, and family housing.

One other subject deserves comment—"gold flow." The committee carefully examined all overseas projects in gold flow areas to insure, first, that only essential items were included in the bill and, second, that construction procedures

will minimize the funds flowing into international balance of payments.

This legislation represents the second of three increments in support of the Military Establishment. The first, the Military Procurement Act, is now law. The third phase, personnel problems, will be presented in a series of bills with primary attention to compensation.

I should now like to speak in support of the specific titles.

TITLE I—ARMY

Title I proposes new authorization for the Army in the amount of \$365,026,000. Of this amount \$267,795,000 is for projects inside the United States, \$7,391,000 is for projects outside the United States, \$79,840,000 is for classified projects and \$10 million is authorization to meet unforeseen emergencies.

The Army is continuing its effort initiated several years ago to emphasize replacement of its inadequate temporary facilities. In 4 years, this effort has more than doubled. Approximately one-quarter of the Army's physical plant at its permanent installations consists of World War II and prior temporary structures. Members of this body who served in the Army during World War II remember the cantonment-type construction thrown together hurriedly with green lumber and only the barest of utilities. Who would have guessed then that many of those buildings, designed for a 5-year life, would still be in use 25 years later? While the total building floor area actually occupied by the Army at all of its active nonindustrial installations is considerably greater than that occupied by the Navy and Air Force, the Army has the smallest percentage of permanent facilities and the largest percentage of temporary facilities. More than one-quarter of the Army's assets are in temporary space. This is five times as much temporary space as either the Navy or the Air Force occupy. Therefore, the Army's replacement program is urgent.

Let us now consider title I from a standpoint of major categories of construction. In the category "Troop housing and community facilities," we have approximately \$133 million. We now authorize troop housing largely in terms of barracks complexes which are manageable units of barracks construction with essential associated troop support facilities. This bill would authorize 25,000 enlisted men's barracks spaces in the United States. This leaves a deficit of 127,000 barracks spaces the Army hopes to provide by 1973. The bill would also provide for 1,800 spaces for bachelor officers which will raise the Army's permanent assets to 11,000, or one-half of the total requirement.

The next important category is "Operational and training facilities," \$72 million. This provides for a wide range of items such as air defense—Nike-Hercules and related facilities—a POL pipeline in Alaska, Army Security Agency facilities, Army airfield facilities, and completion of the Southeastern Signal School at Fort Gordon, Ga.

The largest single requirement in the \$40 million research and development facility package is \$24 million for facil-

ties required to support the test and evaluation of the Nike X missile system. Decision concerning future deployment of this system will depend upon test and evaluation using the proposed facilities.

To keep the Army's materiel in first-class fighting condition, ready to respond to any emergency, requires first-class maintenance facilities at all echelons from the tactical unit shops to the rebuild depot. This bill would provide \$32 million for such facilities. It includes the first of the Army's new consolidated field maintenance shops developed after extensive study and based on the latest industrial engineering concepts borrowed from American industry. The first of these will be located at Fort Carson, Colo., to support the 5th Infantry Division—mechanized—and will maintain over \$225 million worth of division materiel. This bill would also provide 16 tactical equipment shop projects for organizational maintenance of wheel and track vehicles.

This year we are supporting the Army's request for \$22 million in administrative facilities, including three major command headquarters. After hearing the Army's testimony, the committee is convinced that senior staffs making important decisions regarding training, equipping, and deploying, the Army should be housed in office space reasonably comparable to that used by the business community. The continued use of improvised makeshift buildings not functionally suitable for major command headquarters adversely affects the high standard of performance expected in the management of our military resources. No suitable facilities exist.

This bill includes \$22 million for medical facilities. It provides for the replacement of five deteriorated, inadequate hospitals at Fort Devens, Mass.; Fort Stewart, Ga.; Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.; Fort Irwin, Calif.; and at the Military Academy. It also provides for an addition to the hospital at Fort Belvoir, Va., construction of several dental clinics, and an area medical laboratory at Fort Sam Houston, Tex. The Army Medical Service is to be complimented on the progress made in improving the general health of the Army, lowering the number of ineffectives due to sickness and injury, and the number of hospital beds occupied. Were it not for the accomplishment in this field, the size and cost of the hospitals now being programed would be considerably larger.

The remainder of the proposed authorization is devoted to essential items such as utilities and supply facilities and \$10 million of emergency authorization.

You will recall that authorization to increase the corps of cadets at the Military Academy necessitated a comprehensive program for expansion of facilities at West Point carefully time phased so as not to disrupt the normal operations of the Academy. In addition to the hospital already mentioned, this bill continues the expansion and modernization plan initiated last year. Members of the committee have reviewed plans on the ground at West Point with the Super-

intendent to insure that the architectural plans will preserve the nature of the Academy as a national shrine as well as an educational institution.

TITLE II—NAVY

The Navy would be authorized military construction in title II in the total amount of \$319,722,000. This amount includes \$234,187,000 for projects inside the United States, \$34,436,000 for projects outside the United States, \$41,099,000 for classified projects, and \$10 million for emergency projects.

In recent past years the Navy has had to modernize its shore facilities in keeping with its advanced ships, aircraft, and weapons systems. Major portions of its budgets during those years were for projects having direct impact on its operations. As a result, less than 15 percent of those budgets were for improving living conditions for the sailors and marines. Many of these dedicated officers and enlisted men serve protracted tours of duty at sea and at advanced bases separated from their families and friends. To mitigate these hardships the Navy has assigned over 25 percent of its program this year to what I would call people facilities. These include new and rehabilitated barracks, bachelor officers' quarters, messhalls, and a few athletic and recreational facilities, and chapels. Approximately 40,000 spaces would be provided in these barracks and bachelor officers' quarters for the Navy and Marine Corps enlisted men and women and officers.

The Navy has continuing requirements ashore to support its fleet of surface ships and submarines.

This bill would authorize the modernization of various facilities totaling \$28 million. This program would affect all the naval shipyards remaining in active status.

The other projects include consolidation of shops for maintenance and repair of equipment and devices common to modern warships; improvement of existing drydocks to accommodate the longer and deeper draft nuclear submarines and destroyer-type ships; additional and increased scope of utilities to support modern ships; and several other facilities within the modernization framework, such as crane tracks at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. Convinced by testimony of certain deficiencies at the Boston Naval Shipyard, the committee approved two additional line items for this yard.

The need for shore support of our ships extend beyond naval shipyards. From time to time ships must return to their homeports or stop at other bases for logistic reasons. They berth at piers to conduct routine maintenance or emergency minor repairs, to refuel, to off- or on-load troops, supplies, and so forth. The bill would authorize approximately \$34 million for the construction of projects at a number of our naval stations and bases to improve their capabilities for carrying out these functions efficiently and effectively. Projects in the bill for these needs are at east and west coast stations; at Guantanamo Bay; and in Okinawa.

Within the Navy's bureau organization, the Bureau of Naval Weapons sup-

ports Navy and Marine Corps aviation and ordnance installations. Projects in the bill for these activities total nearly 40 percent of the Navy program, or \$124.7 million. Nearly 30 percent of the amount is for personnel support facilities. The remaining projects will provide improvements at five different groups of stations. Three of these groups consist of 47 aviation installations; the fourth group is composed of 7 ordnance stations; and the fifth group is made up of 4 research and development stations.

Projects in the bill for the air activities range through the construction categories. They include such line items as airfield lighting, pavement, fueling and communication facilities, training buildings, maintenance hangars and shops, storage and administration buildings and utilities. The first of the air groups consists of nine naval air training stations where the embryo pilots and ground technicians are trained, mainly at the Pensacola and Corpus Christi complexes. The second group of 28 stations is widespread—from north to south on each coast and in the Atlantic and western Pacific areas. These stations conduct operational training of naval aviators and perform actual operations in support of the fleet. The third air group consists of 10 Marine Corps air stations on the east and west coasts and in Japan and Okinawa. They perform much the same mission as the preceding group, but with emphasis on close air support of the Marine ground forces.

The ordnance stations are on the east and west coasts and in Hawaii. Most of the facilities are for handling, maintaining or storing special weapons and disposing of faulty ammunition. The research and development stations are on the east and west coasts. The projects will provide research or development facilities peculiar to the specialty of each station.

The committee has also approved projects in the amount of \$20.2 million at five installations for the Marine ground forces. Approximately 40 percent of these are for personnel support. One of the others is for a utility at the Barstow supply center. The remaining projects are for construction of training, maintenance, supply and administrative buildings and utilities. The four Marine bases, at Camp Lejeune, Camp Pendleton, Twentynine Palms, and Camp Butler, Okinawa, are utilized for operational training to maintain the Marines in combat readiness for rapid deployment.

The relatively large turnover of naval personnel and the increasing complexity of ships and weapons systems dictate the continuing induction and training of recruits and officers, and training of rated enlisted men in advanced technical skills. Projects are in the bill for 10 training stations in the amount of \$46.8 million. Approximately 44 percent of this total is for barracks and mess halls. The remainder is for training buildings and essential station utilities. A project of special importance will complete the construction of the science building at the Naval Academy.

Projects approved at nine naval hospitals in the United States total \$13.5 million of which approximately one-third is for replacement barracks. The balance of \$9 million will provide a consolidated dispensary and dental clinic at Pearl Harbor, a long-delayed replacement of the outpatient clinic at San Diego, and a replacement of temporary hospital wards and related spaces at Newport. The Navy has testified that this hospital will have the capability to care for obstetrical cases and for retirees and their dependents.

Because of the nature and sphere of its operations the Navy places great dependence on reliable, accurate, and rapid communication. The bill would include \$21.6 million for projects at 25 shore installations within the Navy's worldwide communication system. These are mainly for updating the communication, intelligence collection, and associated facilities, with particular emphasis on provision of increased electrical power.

The remaining three groups of naval installations provide Navy-wide support. One of these, supply facilities, approved for \$1.4 million, includes two projects for administrative facilities and a third for a ship-support POL pipeline at Newport. The second group covers research facilities for which three projects are included in the bill for \$11.1 million. One project is for a chemistry laboratory at the Navy's renowned basic research laboratory, here in Washington. The last group consists of six projects for \$6.1 million for yards and docks installations in the United States and at Subic Bay. These activities are operated by the Navy's civil engineers for support of major naval complexes and for training and supporting the famed fighter-builder Seabees.

As for the Army and Air Force, the bill contains \$10 million authorization for the Navy to accomplish emergency construction.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

Title III proposes new authorization for the Air Force in the amount of \$386,915,000. Of this amount \$227,516,000 is for projects inside the United States, \$93,463,000 for classified projects, \$55,936,000 for projects outside the United States, and \$10 million is for emergency projects.

The Air Force real property facilities, like those of its sister services, consist, to a surprising degree, of buildings that have been kept in use long beyond their expected life span. Although the Air Force has received the largest portion of the construction authorizations over the past years, 95 percent of these authorizations have gone to house our Dewline, Sage, Bomarc, Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman and other similar systems of national priority. Only 5 percent of the authorizations were directed toward the replacement or modernization of the existing Air Force plant. This amount is entirely inadequate by any business or Government standard to protect our invested capital.

It is appropriate that the first Air Force construction program since fiscal year 1957 which does not contain authorization for a new operational strate-

gic, defense, or tactical missile unit, should switch its emphasis to the modernization, replacement, and upgrading of facilities for our airmen and officers. In spite of the ever increasing sophistication of our aerospace forces, the training, attitude, and motivation of the people manning these forces is still the primary measure of their effectiveness. Over 25 percent of the Air Force authorization request is in the replacement and modernization of the plant, predominantly in the "people facilities" area I mentioned earlier.

Let me emphasize that this is the start of a program that will be with us again in the coming years. A 1-year effort cannot solve the problem built up over the past 15 or 16 years. Aerospace developments continue at a rapid pace. I should like to highlight some of the significant projects in this portion of the bill that reflect these activities. We are providing \$36.7 million in the support of the strategic forces. These are facilities for our B-52's, KC-135's, and the supersonic SR-71 strategic reconnaissance aircraft. For the continued defense of our continent against air and missile attack some \$27 million is required. These projects range from the replacement of a critical A.C. & W. station on the northern Alaskan coast to the second increment in our over the horizon radar net.

Our tactical forces are those that bear the brunt of our contingency operations in Vietnam, and must respond promptly in emergency situations such as the Dominican revolution. Here we are spending one quarter of our construction funds to insure their continued capability. A major project in this segment of the program is for the construction of aircraft shelters at overseas locations to protect tactical aircraft on the ground against conventional weapons attacks. The cost of these shelters is \$22.4 million which is only a small fraction of the value of the aircraft they will protect. Also, new buildings to house the Tactical Air Command and the Strike Command will enhance the operational effectiveness of these headquarters.

In overseas areas our major efforts will be to provide for fuel and munitions storage, to expand our capabilities at Clark Air Base in the Philippines, and to consolidate all U.S. support activities in Ankara into one area which has been supplied by the Turkish Government.

I share our chairman's support for the airlift forces. I am tremendously gratified to see the first all jet aircraft specifically designed for air transport, the C-141, coming into use. There is \$20 million in this bill to support the Military Air Transport Service. Half of that is for support of the C-141 aircraft.

Construction support of research and development continues as a significant and essential part of the Air Force program. Major expansions in our technology laboratories, wind tunnels, and test chambers are included. Improvement of our missile ranges and tracking stations are also provided. At the western test range a Titan III space launch booster complex and related land acquisition will yield a significant increase in our capabilities to make polar orbit space

launches at a construction cost of \$22 million.

The balance of title III provides a myriad of facilities essential to the housing, training, maintenance, and logistical support of our aerospace team as it is deployed around the globe. We have reviewed all of them, and have found them to be essential to the continued smooth functioning and rapid response capabilities of our Air Force. I recommend your continued support of the military construction program of the Air Force.

TITLE IV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

Under title IV, the bill would authorize \$100,051,000 for projects in support of five Department of Defense agencies. Of this total \$30,051,000 is for specific projects to construct new or to rehabilitate existing buildings at 12 military installations. These facilities are minimal to further the work of the agencies in the fields of atomic support, supply, security, and intelligence. Of particular significance are two projects for operational buildings in the greater Washington area, which are highly important to our military intelligence effort; and a project at Johnston Island to support nuclear weapons tests.

The balance of \$70 million is for the Office of the Secretary of Defense and will serve two purposes; \$50 million is to be used for unforeseen emergency construction to support operations vital to the security of the United States. The need for this amount was discussed prior to enactment of Public Law 89-18. Your approval of it would be in agreement with our decisions at that time. The remaining \$20 million is necessary to provide support facilities for advanced research projects.

TITLE V—FAMILY HOUSING

Title V of the bill would authorize family housing. Your Armed Services Committee approved virtually the entire Department request for military family housing. Such housing is a vital portion of the Military Establishment. If we are to retain our experienced personnel in the services, it is essential. The committee approved 12,300 new family housing units at a cost of \$224.9 million. It also approved \$507.2 million for general support of the housing program. This includes the building of some trailer court facilities, improvements to adequate quarters, minor construction, planning, and relocatable housing units. It also includes authorization of operating and maintenance expenses, debt payment and mortgage insurance premiums. I strongly urge your support of this program.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Title VI contains the general provisions of the bill. These are, in a sense, the rules for utilizing the authorization that would be granted in this bill. In the main, they follow the pattern of recent years. In my opening remarks I mentioned, by inference, certain special provisions that have been added by the committee this year. I invite your particular support of them. One, section 608, would set up a procedure for the Department to report to both Armed Services Committees of the Congress

any planned base closure or substantial reduction; and to allow the Congress time to study the plans and to accept or reject them. The next section, 609, would require the Department to retain the land comprising the former airfield complex at Bolling-Anacostia. The third provision of special importance, section 610, would require the Department to include in every hospital it builds in the United States, facilities for obstetrical care and for the care of military retirees and their dependents. This is a debt that we owe to the military servicemen and their families.

TITLE VII—RESERVE FORCES

Title VII would authorize \$8.8 million of construction for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, about half of which would be for facilities for aviation elements and the other half for training center or armory type facilities for non-aviation units. The Air Force Reserve would be authorized \$3.4 million for its construction and the Air National Guard \$9 million; this \$12.4 million for these Air Reserve Forces would be divided almost equally among three missions—air defense units, tactical support units, and transport units. No additional authorization is proposed for Army Reserve or Army National Guard for fiscal year 1966. The proposal for realignment of these Army components has precluded use of the construction authorization already available during fiscal year 1965 and this will accommodate the construction needs during fiscal year 1966.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I conclude my remarks with the recommendation that you approve this military construction authorization bill, H.R. 8439.

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

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, first I should like to commend the gentleman for his presentation, and also the distinguished chairman of this committee [Mr. RIVERS] for his presentation. The explanation of this important legislation has been very clear. I congratulate both these gentlemen and the committee on the job they have done on this bill. Will the gentleman yield further for a question?

Mr. BATES. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. In a prior year the Congress authorized planning to improve and expand the Naval Ordnance Test Station at Pasadena, Calif. Can the gentleman tell me whether there is an authorization in this bill to go ahead with that improvement and expansion?

Mr. BATES. I regret to say that although this item was originally approved, as the gentleman will observe in the committee report, under a letter from the Secretary of Defense, they asked the committee to delete the item this year, and that is what we did.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I think the decision at this time not to go ahead, as the gentleman points out by order of the Secretary of Defense, is a mistake. This is a laboratory that has had great accomplishments. They are working in their present laboratory under very difficult circumstances. The decision was made

several years ago to go ahead with this particular improvement, and I believe the action taken by the Secretary of Defense to delete this item will delay construction of a needed laboratory in the vital field of underwater weapons. It could break down morale and hold up the work. NOTS Pasadena is doing important work in undersea warfare and I hope that the committee will persuade the Secretary of Defense to come to a decision and carry it out in the future.

Mr. BATES. I thank the gentleman for the information.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to offer my congratulations to my chairman and the gentleman in the well for very excellent statements respecting this legislation. I, too, feel that the bill represents a very solid contribution to the security of our Nation and also a recognition of the economies that must be practiced if we are to protect our basic strength.

Under the leadership of our distinguished chairman [Mr. RIVERS] we have given close scrutiny to all line items, having been furnished detailed information well in advance of our hearings. This preparation expedited our action and gave additional objectivity to the testimony.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join in the support of H.R. 8439. This measure is the result of careful study and analysis. Of special significance is the fact that our committee, during its hearings on the bill, received assurance that construction authorizations have been requested only for those installations that are expected to be operating for some time and in no instance, for an installation whose future is in immediate doubt. This, to me, is very vital and I am confident that my colleagues share this viewpoint.

The bill this year also represents, in my opinion, a forward step in the elimination of one of the major causes for trained personnel leaving the service; namely, inadequate family housing.

The family housing program as proposed by the Department of Defense reflects a well-balanced effort to provide additional facilities which are essential to retain in uniform highly skilled military personnel, as well as to assure continuing improvement in the management of a sizable, existing housing inventory. The Armed Services Committee, after making a comprehensive review of the proposals in this area is pleased to support them virtually without change.

Pursuant to a legislative requirement instigated by the House Armed Services Committee, the annual Department of Defense family housing authorization program embodies not only new construction, but all of the cost elements associated with the housing program. The total authorization requests approved by the committee amount to \$744,752,000, of which \$247,920,000 is for new construction and related activities,

and \$496,832,000 is for support costs including operation and maintenance of the existing inventory.

The committee supports a proposed expenditure of \$224,934,000 for construction of 12,300 units of new on-post housing. We have been assured by the Department of Defense that such housing is proposed only for locations where the private community is unable to meet the need. The committee has examined the justification for every project and is convinced that all of those contained in the bill meet this essential criteria.

The committee noted with favor that the proposed construction program continues to give primary emphasis to the needs of enlisted men and junior officers. About 80 percent of the proposed construction is for enlisted men, and much of the balance is intended for junior officers. The proposed construction will permit separated families to be reunited in decent housing and will make available improved living conditions for families now in substandard housing, as well as alleviate hardships for families paying excessive charges for private housing or living at excessive distances from the serviceman's duty station. A small portion of the program will meet needs associated with current or planned mission expansions.

The Defense Department's comprehensive housing program also provides for construction of 600 trailer spaces for families which own their own trailers and prefer trailer living. These spaces will be located at four installations where there is a shortage of private adequate trailer court facilities in the community.

The committee received testimony concerning the domestic leasing program of the Department of Defense, and has given favorable consideration to the request that this program be increased from 5,000 to 7,500 units. The committee concurred in the Department of Defense views that leasing of private housing facilities is preferable to new construction, not only in areas where the duration of need is uncertain, but also in a number of high cost areas where military construction would be extremely expensive.

Other highlights of the proposed legislation include the following:

First. Improvements to existing quarters: The committee supports the request of the Defense Department for \$18.2 million for this purpose. It is noted that this amount represents only about one-third of 1 percent of the acquisition value of the existing Department of Defense inventory, and we believe it is good business management to make this modest investment in order to preclude obsolescence of aging assets and to extend their useful life.

Second. Relocation of 200 units of relocatable housing from Glasgow Air Force Base, Mont. Department of Defense witnesses referred to the fact that Glasgow Air Force Base will be phased out and reported as surplus to the General Services Administration by July 1968; accordingly, the Department of Defense requested authority to proceed with relocation of these units in

an orderly fashion in anticipation of that date. The committee fully supports the relocatable housing concept as a device to minimize losses resulting from military redeployments. It is noted that these units can be moved and reerected on new foundations at another location for a cost of about \$7,500 each, which is less than one-half the cost of new construction. The language of section 507 of the bill provides that the Armed Services Committees receive advance notice of the proposed new locations and the estimated cost of relocation.

Third. Revised cost limitations: The bill as approved by the committee provides for a more flexible application of the existing \$17,500 average cost limit per unit. It also provides for a more realistic cost limit for housing for general officers. Furthermore, owing to high labor costs and difficult site conditions, it provides a special cost ceiling for the proposed project at West Point.

Fourth. Representational quarters: The Department of Defense advised the committee that there are a limited number of positions, some 61 in all, within the Military Establishment which involve extensive public relations and representational responsibilities. The incumbents of these positions are called upon to represent the interest of the United States in numerous social activities involving foreign and/or U.S. dignitaries of high governmental and military rank, as well as outstanding members of the business, industrial, labor, scientific, and academic communities. Persons occupying these positions are in ranks 0-8 to 0-10. Typical of these positions are the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chiefs of Staff of the Army and Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine corps, commanders of joint commands, and the Superintendents of the various service academies.

In general, the incumbents of the positions identified as military representational positions are adequately housed. There are, however, a few who lack appropriate accommodations. In addition, there are some who reside in units which are not economical to operate and maintain. It is proposed to provide satisfactory quarters for those who do not now have such facilities and to replace those which are too expensive to continue in the defense inventory.

Military representational quarters cannot be obtained under current statutory size and cost criteria. At present, there are size limitations of 2,100 square feet—net—for family housing. Further, there are statutory cost limitations of \$24,000 for the unit itself—and \$28,000 for all costs including the site development work.

In fiscal year 1966, the Department of Defense proposes to acquire or construct two sets of military representational quarters. They are intended for use by the commander in chief, North American Air Defense Command in Colorado Springs, and the commander in chief, Strike Command, at MacDill Air Force Base. Both of these positions are occupied by four-star incumbents, and both

of them qualify under the criteria noted above.

The committee is satisfied that this proposal is intended, not to provide extraordinary features for the personal enjoyment of the occupant of the quarters, but rather, to provide facilities of sufficient size and quality to permit senior military officials to appropriately fulfill their representational responsibilities.

Other important provisions of this measure have been adequately covered by our able chairman and my other colleagues on the Armed Services Committee. In summary, let me say that I am convinced that this bill is a good one and merits the support of every Member of the House.

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

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the family housing which the gentleman touched on, is this a blanket authorization or is it an authorization for a certain number of units, we will say, for the Air Force; and do you specify how these units shall be distributed among the various installations?

Mr. BATES. I want to say to the gentleman that on each page of the justification sheets presented to us there were a certain number of houses to be built at certain bases within the various services. So, each of these units will be built at a particular base and have been so designated in the report before you.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is that in this report?

Mr. BATES. Yes, and it is also in the committee bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the gentleman will yield further, each base is specified as to the number of units you have authorized for that particular base?

Mr. BATES. In the backup information; that is correct. In the bill it will indicate family housing but not indicate the number of units. However, in the backup information you know specifically how many units will be placed at each individual base.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In glancing through the report I read that these units would be constructed if the local people did not meet the demand: Is that correct? These units are authorized and if private industry does not meet the needs—

Mr. BATES. Of course, as a matter of fact even after you investigate, you still find that there is a shortage of housing, but any time the local community can satisfy the needs, then we do not authorize these houses.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Who takes the side of private industry to point out that private industry can meet these needs? Do you have someone on the staff who does that?

Mr. BATES. I will say to the gentleman that this information is public knowledge. Generally, an area will know how many units will be placed there. It is debated and discussed in the hearings and the committee bill is

public information. There is no secret about it. Oftentimes communities resent more houses being built in their area. With reference to this particular bill the gentleman from Pennsylvania appeared before the committee and he said that the building of some 200 units at Johnsville in Pennsylvania was not favored by the local people and, therefore, it was eliminated from the bill.

In years gone by we have gone down to North Carolina and we have gone down to South Carolina and made investigations of housing down there, on the complaints of military personnel and on the complaints relayed to us by chambers of commerce. We investigated the matter ourselves.

So, I will say to the gentleman that any time any area wants a day in court, we will investigate the matter very thoroughly.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, insofar as Offutt Air Force Base is concerned, which is located in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent, if the Air Force stated they needed x number of units, would there be anyone from your committee or staff member who would investigate that request to see if their request was justified?

Mr. BATES. No, and no one appeared before us to the contrary. However, they indicated how many houses they were short there and at each base, and in the absence of any information to the contrary we went along with it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I believe it was last year that I appeared before the Committee on Armed Services relative to Offutt and your committee cut down the request made by the Air Force. Then, when the appropriation bill came up they did not specify where these units should be built. They just said that the Air Force could have x number of units.

So, what the Air Force did in effect was to overrule what was done by the Committee on Armed Services and put the full number of units at Offutt that they had originally requested but which your committee had cut down.

This is what the Committee on Appropriations allowed them to do.

Mr. BATES. If there is no authority to build units at a particular base, I do not see how they could do it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. They did it. Mr. BATES. I wish we had known about that and I think our committee would have taken action.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BATES. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MIZE. On page 79 of the report where you outline the amounts of money to be spent in the various States other than housing construction, I notice that in the State of Kansas we have only four major installations, Fort Leavenworth, Fort Riley, McConnell Air Force Base, and Forbes Air Force Base located at Topeka, there is no money for construction authorized at Forbes Air Force Base in Topeka.

Does that mean they did not apply for anything or did they apply and were turned down?

Mr. BATES. It means they did not get this far. Whether it was turned down by the Department of Defense or the Bureau of the Budget, I do not know.

I do know that our committee did not turn that down. No request came to our committee on this particular matter.

Mr. MIZE. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to call attention specifically to page 7 of this bill, line 7, the item:

Letterkenny Army Depot, Pa.: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$2,239,000.

At the same time I would like to call his attention to page 1936 of the hearings dealing with this subject, and I would like to recall a little history.

Several months ago the Secretary of Defense announced to the Nation, with a lot of fanfare, they were going to save millions of dollars by closing certain installations throughout the country. One of these installations happened to be Erie. At the time this closing was ordered I pointed out there were certain facilities, to wit, a building used and constructed especially for rebuilding of missiles which required a certain humidity content. I said it would seem to me this would have to be built if this facility was transferred. At that time it was pointed out there were not going to be any facilities built at Letterkenny, that they were adequate. Time has passed, and the Erie Army Depot is in the process of being phased out. But it seems as though we find now an item to provide a new shop to do the identical work they are doing at Erie at Letterkenny. I think the people out in Erie deserve some kind of an explanation of the matter.

Can the gentleman give us any enlightenment on that?

Mr. BATES. The justification for that is indicated on page 1936 of the hearings. I would like to say if functions are being performed and if those functions are necessary, if this function is transferred elsewhere the same work must be done. Ofttimes it is necessary to reconstruct a facility that was occupied previously somewhere else. I have seen overall figures indicating they will save overall but, as the gentleman indicated, if a function is important enough it has got to be done somewhere even if it means it must be developed somewhere else.

Mr. LATTA. I well realize the gentleman is giving the same argument that the Secretary of Defense gave at the time he ordered these closings. We also realize that the same people are being offered a transfer to Letterkenny, in this instance, and are being paid transportation costs, many of them upgraded at additional cost to the taxpayers to do the same work they were doing at Erie. I am not one who believes we are saving money by that. They had a specially

constructed building that cost a million or two million dollars at Erie to do this work which was transferred to Letterkenny, and they were not doing the work. Now we find that in this bill.

I feel this is something that requires a little more attention than was given by the committee on page 1936 of the hearings, and apparently it is the reasoning given by the Department as the real answer to this problem. I do not think it is an answer at all.

Mr. BATES. I do not want the gentleman to misinterpret what I say. I do not attempt to justify the position of the Department of Defense.

Mr. LATTA. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. BATES. I want to make this comment as definite as I possibly can. We have a section in this bill, 608, that will require the Secretary of Defense to come before us in the future to avoid the very kind of situation the gentleman brings to our attention; but at the moment we do not have the right to keep open a base unless we put it in here very specifically by legislation. The gentleman has made the best case in the world that can be made for 608, which I support.

Mr. LATTA. I intend to support that section and I want to commend particularly the gentleman and the chairman of the committee for their foresight in putting this section in. I think this case in particular points out the need for that section and I intend to support it.

Mr. BATES. I thank the gentleman very much for his cooperation. I feel exactly the way he feels.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has consumed 26 minutes.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, there is little that need be added to what our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], and our ranking minority member, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], have detailed for us with respect to this bill. From their fine presentations it is evident that our Armed Services Committee as a whole, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and the gentleman from Massachusetts in particular, have prepared this military construction authorization bill and painstaking care.

In reporting this measure, authorizing an appropriation of almost \$2 billion, our committee has sought to have authorized no more, and no less, than is actually needed for our defense purposes. While the bill embodies practically everything the Department of Defense recommended, it nonetheless constitutes the independent judgment of our committee.

Our able chairman [Mr. RIVERS] has made it abundantly clear, in what he has said and in what we have done since he assumed the chairmanship, that our Armed Services Committee is determined to reassert its constitutional prerogative—duty and responsibility—of

deciding the size and nature of our Military Establishment.

Our committee will not rubberstamp anything. If we find a recommendation of the Secretary of Defense to be valid and justified, we will support it wholeheartedly and without hesitation. If, on the other hand, after careful evaluation of his request we find otherwise, our committee will have no hesitancy whatever in rejecting it.

We are not interested in the political implications—the political overtones, undertones, or what have you—of any given military project or proposition. We are solely interested in the facts, let the political chips fall where they may, that we may have a sound national defense and that we get a dollar's worth of defense for each dollar expended.

This may account for the Defense Department's request this year being somewhat more realistic than in prior years. It may account for the careful screening made by the Department, as well as by the Secretary of Defense personally, of the requests for new facilities submitted to our committee.

As I indicated at the outset, I have no intention of discussing this bill in any detail. It would be merely repetition of what has already been so fully and so accurately presented.

There is one aspect of the measure now before us which, in a very significant way, distinguishes it from the military construction bills of prior years. In previous bills the emphasis has been on "operational facilities." In this bill we have, at long last, emphasized "human facilities."

At long last, we have before us a military construction bill that takes cognizance of the fact that how our servicemen and their families are housed is as important as to how our missiles and planes are housed.

Around 30 percent of the amount embodied in this bill is for facilities—to provide adequate housing, medical care, eating and recreational facilities—for our service personnel.

This is why I call this a "human facilities" bill. And this is what especially commends this bill to me. We are proposing to correct a deficiency all too long neglected.

The bill before us provides for 89,551 space units for our enlisted personnel—7,093 bachelor officer's quarters units and 12,300 family housing units. This by no means provides all the current need, but it is a substantial beginning for correcting the substandard military housing conditions.

One of the basic problems of all the services, and particularly the Army, is the retention of its highly trained personnel. When the Secretary of the Navy appeared before our committee last March, he stated:

The most important problem which confronts me today as Secretary of the Navy involves procurement of personnel and the retention of skilled, experienced military personnel as careerists in the naval services.

You may recall that a few weeks ago the Secretary of the Navy urged Navy personnel to extend their tours of duty

in order to have adequate personnel of experience to meet the current defense needs arising from the international developments.

That we are obliged to continue the Selective Service Act and that we are obliged to have such an extensive Reserve training program, which is not entirely voluntary, in itself bespeaks the military personnel procurement and retention problem confronting us.

It takes a great deal of money and a great amount of time to train men to the skill necessary to operate today's intricate weapons and complex weapons systems. Every time one of our servicemen leaves the service we lose his technical skill and we lose our investment in him. We must repeat the cost of training his replacement.

There are two reasons why many young men decide not to remain in the military service. One is the poor living conditions and the other is the inadequate pay.

The military construction bill before us today is designed to improve the living conditions of our service people. It merits your support.

Our Committee on Armed Services is currently holding hearings on a military pay raise bill. We will shortly report a bill which, I am confident, will merit your full support.

Permit me to add that in my judgment it is utter nonsense for this Congress to consider any general Federal pay raise, as has been recommended, until we first of all grant a long overdue and much deserved military pay increase. The average pay of classified civil service personnel is now \$7,368, while the average military pay, which includes basic pay, quarters and subsistence allowances, is only \$5,692—a difference of \$1,676. And I will frankly say that personally I am not at all impressed with the recommendation of the President's Special Panel on Federal Salaries, particularly as it relates to the pay of our uniformed personnel.

To say the least, the problem of procuring and retaining qualified Government civilian personnel is not by any stretch of the imagination near as serious as the problem of procuring and retaining qualified military personnel.

Let us put first things first. Let us first pass this bill to help deal with the living conditions of our service people. Let us then proceed with action of an adequate pay raise for our servicemen. If we do this we will have done much toward our continuing to have a National Defense Establishment second to none.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I take some pride in the fact that I am an alumnus of the great Committee on Armed Services. It is one of the great committees of the House of Representatives and it has contributed much to the positive, stabilizing, and reassuring fact of a powerful and positive defense. I am proud of the fact that my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, is in fact, a chair-

man. Nobody now discounts or denies that. The House has had time to watch him in action. We can be proud of the job he and his committee are doing. I am proud of this leadership and these contributions. Very fine work being done by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in particular to talk about section 608 of the bill now before the House, and to express my support for that section.

The need for this section is attested by the confusion which now accompanies last November's base closing order. I have conducted hearings on military construction appropriations during most of the past month. The more fully I have become acquainted with the mechanics of the proposed base closures, the more disenchanted I have become with the entire procedure.

This is not to say that all bases should be maintained regardless of location and use. Of course, they should be closed when there is no justification for continued operation, or modified in scope if this will produce greater economy of operation. However, I think it proper that Congress should be a party to the changes in base structure. I believe this is a definite part of the constitutional authority which is granted to Congress in military matters. In any event, the Congress is an integral part of the national team and there is no reason on earth why Congress should be shut out on such considerations; left to learn about major changes in the defense program by reading it in the papers.

Let us look at the adverse side of the base closing picture. First there is the problem of moving people and equipment; this is costly. Wholesale shifting of families from communities in which they have taken root is not in any sense a desirable practice. But that is only the beginning of the problem. At the new base to which an activity has been moved, we find invariably that new facilities are required. It is not a case of moving into a vacant facility and setting up shop; new buildings must be constructed and today's construction is costly.

Then there is the problem of housing for the families that have moved; there is the problem of additional traffic congestion on the base and in the community; there is the problem of schools, shops, community facilities, and all the other things which must be provided for new families.

Yet this may be the least consequential part of the problem. Let us look at the community in which the base was closed. First you take jobs out of the community with a single stroke of the pen. For instance, there is the case of Brookley Air Force Base in Mobile where 12,000 jobs are being lost to the community. All of these are Air Force jobs. I think it undoubtedly true that when this much earning capacity is taken away from the Mobile community an additional 12,000 jobs will be lost from the business activities of the local community itself. This is a tremendous blow to any city. A smaller city would scarcely survive it. Mobile will be hard hit.

When you take away the earning power of people, you destroy their ability to pay taxes. I am not at all sure that you are not going to hurt the taxpaying ability of the Mobile economy more annually than the savings which are claimed. Magnify this to greater or lesser degree by the 94 communities in which bases are closed or consolidated and I suspect the tax reductions in Treasury receipts over the period in which savings are claimed will more than offset those savings.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, with respect to Mobile?

Mr. SIKES. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. If Members of Congress do not know this, Brookley Air Force Base, at Mobile, Ala., is a vital installation, where they are rebuilding the F-105's. They have had to put in 300-plus hours on every one of those planes, to get them back off the ground. Those planes are vital in South Vietnam, yet the Department of Defense is closing this base, and shifting most of its operations all the way to Sacramento, Calif. This is one of the most vital bases we have, yet somebody is closing it.

We have had nothing to do with that. They are shifting it way across the continent, without our having had any opportunity to go into it.

If there has been a mistake made as to the closing of any base in America, that has been at Mobile. Why should the committee not go into these things?

In addition to all of that, the impact on the community is staggering. This is the only air base in the Nation where one can bring a tanker up and take it up to the dock and give it all the oil it needs. It is one of the most important bases we have, yet they are going to close it. That does not make sense, particularly now when the world is on fire.

If section 608 were a fact, this would have to be justified.

Mr. SIKES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, it is significant that the Department of Defense is going contrary to the findings of industry when it continues to build great military complexes. Industry has learned the hard way that if plants become too large they become inefficient. I predict the Department of Defense will have the same experience through overexpansion at some of our military facilities. Some of these are approaching 30,000 people—that is too many. As a result, many communities must go through all the growing pains which are associated with the growth of installations. Many other communities suffer retrenchment. They are left with an excess of nearly every type of facility. Not the least of these problems is that of surplus houses which have been built to house families now sent to another location.

Then there is the problem of the vacated base. There is not anything much more useless than the buildings, the utilities, the roads and all the other facilities which are associated with a closed base. Despite the fact that all of this was built upon the insistence of the Department of Defense that it was for a re-

quired and continuing need, it now becomes a costly and meaningless monument to somebody's bad judgment.

Nothing has been said about vulnerability to enemy attack. For years we have heard about the danger of overconcentration of military facilities, yet this is exactly what is being done. We are taking a bigger chance with each consolidation on having an essential part of our defense program plus an undetermined number of people wiped out with a single atomic strike. I am convinced that the Department of Defense has not looked carefully enough at the long-range effects of these proposals on local economy, on efficiency, and on base vulnerability. It is not too late to take a second look, and I think this should be done.

Apparently, no one foresaw the escalation of the fighting in Vietnam when the base closing order was issued last November. Nor was there any indication we would be called upon to occupy the Dominican Republic. If there should be continued escalation of warfare anywhere in the world, and there may well be, some of these bases will have to be reopened. This still does not say bases should not be closed when they are not needed. But if Congress were made a party to these things, I confidently and fully believe that a higher degree of order would be established. It would be difficult, I know, to bring Congress into the picture of base closings but so is the achievement of democracy difficult—only dictatorship is simple but that does not make it right. *

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior majority member of the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable PHIL PHILBIN.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important bill we are discussing today. It is important to the national defense, and it is important to the Nation and to the free world.

I would especially like to congratulate the brilliant and most dedicated chairman of my committee for his outstanding speech on this bill and the complete explanation that he gave concerning its terms, provisions, impact, and adequacy with respect to the constitution of our armed services.

I would also like to compliment my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], for his fine contribution, as well as the other Members who have spoken here.

I think, my friends, that one of the most important parts of this bill deals with the impressive and massive efforts we have made regarding research and development, test and evaluation.

This Nation of ours has achieved impressive successes as a result of an imaginative research and development program covering the full spectrum from basic research to the engineering of military operational hardware. We have every reason to be very proud of these accomplishments. They have been un-

precedented in many instances. Many have been spectacular and have received wide publicity.

The near revolutionary progress in science and technology has been opening up an ever-increasing number of technological choices. We must continue to explore the most promising prospects and initiate new research and development projects as well as continue support of promising lines of investigation started in previous years.

The challenge of technology is compounded by the challenge of communism. The Soviets have a clear-cut objective—world domination. They have repeatedly declared that they will use science and technology as their instruments to help attain that objective. As part of the national effort to meet this threat, we need to take the technological initiative. In the area of technology we need to take the actions needed to attain superiority. We need to meet the challenge. We have ample warnings of the ultimate Soviet objective and several demonstrations of their scientific and engineering skills.

How do we meet the technological challenge and continue to widen the scientific and technological lead of the free world? One of the most significant ingredients is the timely availability and adequacy of a high quality, modern research and development physical plant. Advances in research and development are dependent upon technical facilities. These facilities are basic resources, essential weapons in the technological war. The vision which resulted in the investment in research and development facilities in past years has made a significant contribution to the position of leadership which we enjoy today. This vision needs to be duplicated today to provide the building blocks essential to the retention of this position.

Industry can and does make significant contributions in new developments, and this is as it should be. However, industry cannot do the entire job for our total military capability. We must rely on the laboratories of the armed services to provide the knowledge and ideas that are aimed primarily at military applications. A strong research and development capability within the services is absolutely essential to, first, foster and exploit research and development that is vital to our military efforts yet has little commercial appeal; second, to review and evaluate the results of research which is privately sponsored or accomplished by contract with the Government. The evaluation function is extremely important to insure a maximum return from our overall national investment in research and development.

Air Force achievements in research and development have provided much of the technological foundation we enjoy today. These achievements—of which we all are justly proud—have been realized to a large degree by the efforts of dedicated Air Force scientists and engineers. The accomplishments of these people have provided a manifold return on past investments in technical facilities. Exotic fuels, new materials, ad-

vanced communications, improved intelligence, weapons and life support systems and many other advances have resulted from the labor of these dedicated people. We must continue to provide these people with the adequate, modern, technical facility tools required to continue this outstanding work.

With this in mind we have provided funds in this bill for laboratory facilities at Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, for expansion of critical research and development and evaluation efforts in the area of materials technology—which includes the application of advanced technology to brush warfare situations as well as the development of new materials to withstand very high temperatures, sustained high speeds, missile reentry and the space environment.

Funds are also provided for facilities at Griffiss AFB, New York, to provide a modern laboratory for critically needed advances in the area of display technology. These advances will provide the capability for a manifold improvement in overall Air Force decision data systems and will have direct application to Air Force Strategic, Defense, Tactical and Counterinsurgency Forces.

Also included are provisions for facilities at Edwards AFB to increase the research and evaluation capability in the development of new high energy propellants—and to respond to the flight test technical evaluation requirements generated by southeast Asia commitments diversification in type of aircraft, and increased sophistication of modern military aircraft.

This bill provides funds for updating launch facilities, telemetry, communications and control capability at Vandenberg AFB, Western Test Range, and the worldwide satellite tracking and control network. These requirements respond to increased activity in these areas, including a threefold increase in number of satellites in orbit controlled by the Air Force and advanced ballistic reentry system developments.

Finally, the bill provides technical facilities at Holloman AFB; Kirtland AFB; Sacramento Peak, N. Mex.; and Brooks AFB, Tex. These facilities are the key to progress and advances in research and development in the areas of inertial guidance, weapons effects technology, solar effects on operational systems, and life support systems.

Gentlemen, each and every one of you are aware of the critical importance of an imaginative, dynamic research and development program and its impact on national security. The Soviet scientific threat—and the consequent military threat—are clear to all of us. We have had to live with it since the end of World War II, and we will probably continue to face it for many years to come. As part of the national effort to meet this threat we need to take the technological initiative. To do so we must provide our scientists and engineers with the modern facilities tools required to advance research and development—meet the challenge—and maintain our lead. This bill clearly supports this national objective. It provides the Air Force with the technical facilities that are urgently needed

today for responsive exploitation and evaluation of advanced technology for vital requirements in all phases of our military capability.

I am sure the Members of the House are fully cognizant of the importance of this part of the overall, R. & D. program which is provided in this bill. I am confident that we are going to have your strong and wholehearted support for these efforts, and all the other efforts that we are making with respect to the various programs of this meritorious bill. I urge that this bill may have unanimous approval of the House, as it had by the committee, in order to serve notice on those who are standing and working against our democratic way of life that we mean to preserve our great heritage.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Eighty-nine Members present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 135]

Andrews,	Evins, Tenn.	Landrum
George W.	Fogarty	Langen
Bolton	Ford, Gerald R.	Lindsay
Bonner	Fraser	Mailliard
Bow	Frelinghuysen	Martin, Ala.
Bray	Grider	Matsunaga
Brock	Hagan, Ga.	Miller
Brown, Ohio	Halleck	Mink
Callaway	Hanna	Pike
Chamberlain	Hansen, Idaho	Powell
Clancy	Harvey, Ind.	Reid, N.Y.
Clawson, Del	Hébert	Rivers, Alaska
Collier	Helstoski	Teague, Tex.
Cooley	Holland	Toll
Craley	Ichord	Willis
Dawson	Keogh	Wilson
Devine	King, N.Y.	Charles H.
Dyal	Kornegay	Wright

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having assumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, 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. 8439, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 381 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York, a member of the committee [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the compliment which the Members have paid me by coming out in large numbers to hear my remarks on this legislation. I want to assure them, however, that I did not make the point of no quorum.

I rise, Mr. Chairman, in support of this legislation and particularly in support of the section which has come under most attention this afternoon, section 608, the provision that would say that bases may not be closed without a report on that action first being submitted to our committee and then allowing the committee and the Congress to overrule that

action if in the judgment of either House that action were not regarded as desirable.

This, I might point out, is the same procedure which is used in the Reorganization Act. It is roughly the same procedure that, as the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina has pointed out, applies to the purchase and sale of Defense Department real estate. And it is surprising indeed that the committee and the Congress do have some authority with regard to relatively inactive real estate, but until the distinguished Chairman of our committee proposed that this working be included in the legislation, we could do nothing about the military and industrial activities that take place on the real estate.

I want to commend the distinguished Chairman for his leadership in including this section in the bill. I think that it is a very helpful and desirable section.

I hope I am not being immodest, Mr. Chairman, when I say that I offered as one of my first bills when I first came to Congress 6 years ago, a similar provision, and I think that it is even more necessary today than it was then as the extent and the economic impact of these closings have multiplied around the country.

It is perfectly clear that the committee is not proposing in this section to run the Defense Department. We recognize, as the gentleman from South Carolina has pointed out, the necessity for changes; some things have got to be closed, some things have got to be shifted, some things have got to be beefed up. But we do feel that these changes coming along to the extent that they have in the past few years, have had an effect on both our ability to defend ourselves and also on the economy of the areas affected. Therefore, this is a big enough matter so that the Congress itself should participate in these decisions.

And as the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] said a few minutes ago, this is something that ought to be made as a joint decision of the executive and legislative branches rather than by the executive branch alone.

Mr. Chairman, the House protested rather effectively earlier this year against the closing of a relatively few agricultural research stations. The House and the other body also opposed very effectively the closing of several veterans hospitals, and now even the President of the United States admitted that he was wrong and ordered some of these hospitals continued.

Certainly when it comes to important military installations, involving in some cases thousands of employees, the Congress of the United States ought to have an equal interest and concern and as much of an opportunity to be informed and to express its will.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the only complaint I would have with the wording of section 608 is that it is just a little bit ambiguous with reference to those bases which have previously been ordered closed or substantially reduced or consolidated but in which the consolidation or closing or substantial reduction has not already been completed, and where

this action is still going on, for example, the Brooklyn yard; for example, the Portsmouth Navy Yard; for example, the installation at Sands Point, Long Island; for example, the installation to which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI] referred earlier during the debate.

I think it could well be argued that since none of these closings have formally been reported to the committee, the adoption of this bill with section 608 included in the form offered by the committee probably would prevent the closing of these installations until after a report had been made to the committee, and until the House had had an opportunity to consider it.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not think we ought to take any chances about ambiguity. We ought to make it perfectly clear that if we are going to take a look at these closings, then we certainly ought to take a look at some of the significant ones that are currently in the process of being closed, particularly the Brooklyn Navy Shipyard which involves some 9,000 people and will have a tremendous economic impact on the Empire State and the great city of New York.

Further, Mr. Chairman, we ought to take a look at some of these other proposals that could have a devastating effect upon local communities like, for instance, the closing of the Portsmouth Navy Yard which will affect both New Hampshire and Maine.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I propose at the proper time under the 5-minute rule to offer an amendment to this section at page 68, line 16, to add a new sentence at the conclusion of that paragraph to read as follows:

This paragraph shall apply to any such closure, substantial reduction, or consolidation previously ordered which was still incomplete as of June 1, 1965.

Mr. Chairman, that amendment would give the committee and the Congress an opportunity to determine the economic impact and the impact on national defense of closings like the closing of the Brooklyn Navy Shipyard.

In the case of the closing of the Brooklyn Navy Yard, we have been led to believe that this decision was made on a purely automatic, scientific, computer basis. Yet I would refer members of the Committee to the hearings held by the Committee on Armed Services at which the Secretary of the Navy testified. He admitted that what he had referred to as a "comprehensive" survey of naval shipyards made in 1963 found no need to close the Brooklyn Navy Yard, although Members of the House were informed that other shipyards were to be closed. Actually, as it turned out, no shipyards were included in the 1963 list when it was finally made public. Yet 1 year later, the Secretary told us, a new survey, which he termed a survey "in depth," came up with a completely different conclusion which recommended closing down the Brooklyn Naval Shipyard yet retained the very same naval shipyards which were originally reported to be slated for closing in the 1963 "comprehensive" survey.

Under the prodding of the committee and under our direction to provide the

backup material for the difference between the 1963 and 1964 studies, the Secretary of the Navy presented to the committee nothing more substantial than the press release issued on December 12, 1963. I think this kind of failure to communicate with the Congress is a most serious matter. It certainly justifies the action of the committee in adding section 608, and I hope at the proper time the members of the Committee of the Whole will support the unambiguous assertion that it does extend to those closings pending as of the first of June this year.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I wonder if the gentleman would clarify a little more his proposed amendment and what it would cover?

Mr. STRATTON. We mean those closings which have been ordered, but where the closing, the substantial reduction or consolidation is not yet complete.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. In other words, as I understand it, if a base has been ordered closed but it has not been actually closed, this would hold up that action until the Congress had a chance to look into it?

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman is correct. In the closing of Brooklyn, for example, it was ordered closed on November 19, last year, I believe. Of the 9,000 employees who were there at that time there are 7,000 there now. Plans are going ahead to complete the closing within another year. My amendment would apply in this case, and further action would be terminated until the committee and the Congress would have an opportunity to look at it.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I represent the First District of Alabama. We have a base there called Brookley Air Force Base, not to be confused with Brooklyn, N.Y. The distinguished gentleman from South Carolina spoke about this a minute ago. We have 13,000 people to be phased out of a town with a population of 200,000. I join with the gentleman in his intention to offer this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in proposing to close Brookley Air Force Base at Mobile, Ala., the Defense Department seems to be working against its own standards.

The Secretary of Defense has said that these base closings are limited to those installations which have been inefficient and obsolete. However, during fiscal year 1964 Brookley was credited with cost savings of \$122 million in response to the Defense Department's economy drive.

The performance was 23 percent above the savings goal assigned to the base and was sufficient to earn for Brookley the so-called gold rush pennant for cost reductions, the second time that the base won the award out of only four times it was offered.

The Defense Secretary also has indicated that one of his top deputies had singled out Brookley and two other air materiel bases as "the most outstanding he has seen anywhere in the Department of Defense."

In commenting on these conclusions, Air Force Secretary Eugene M. Zuckert said:

These plaudits do not come easily and are worthy of recognition.

With regard to the matter of whether or not Brookley enjoys a strategic location, I want to remind the country that Brookley is the only Air Force installation with total supply and tactical capabilities for effective action in emergencies which is located within striking range of Latin American areas where communism is either entrenched or on the move.

Brookley is the only Air Force base with a deep water port and lies on a water transportation route that connects space installations at Cape Kennedy, New Orleans, and Houston.

Let me also mention these facts which relate to the proposal for closing the Brookley Air Force Base. It would mean automatically writing off about a quarter of a billion dollars in real estate and capital investment.

The cost of relocating families of civilian employees could be very high. It is very possible that, of the 13,000 employees involved, 10,000 would choose to relocate with their families. At an estimated cost of \$1,400 per family, the cost comes to \$14 million.

Of the present employees approximately 2,000 are either unskilled or semi-skilled and would be unable or unwilling to move even if they were qualified. They would thus be thrown on a labor market which already is rated as excess.

Brookley Field has a runway that can handle any aircraft in the Air Force—9,600 feet in length, 200 feet wide, and 2 feet thick.

The equipment and personnel at Brookley Air Force Base provides the major support for the F-105 weapons system. The F-105 is our firstline fighter-bomber, providing a nuclear strike power which will remain indispensable for several years in the future. It is the prime Air Force bomber in Vietnam today.

The Brookley team is important to the continued successful operation of the F-105 system. Breaking up that team is expected to deal a setback to the potential of the F-105 as an integral part of our defense system.

Mr. Chairman, in my view, the Congress should have an opportunity to review the decision to close Brookley Air Force Base.

Mr. STRATTON. I appreciate the gentleman's interest. That is precisely the thing it was designed to help.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from New York yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. First I should like to commend the distinguished gentleman from New York for the highly accurate statements he has made with regard to the unjustified action of Secretary McNamara in reference to the latter's order closing the New York Naval Shipyard. There is no more justification at any point in the record than was set forth here this afternoon by the dis-

tinguished gentleman from New York. Would I be in error, I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from New York, if I were to assume that section 608 at page 68 of the pending printed bill would very well cover the situation at the New York Naval Shipyard for the reason that this yard has not as yet been closed, that there has not as yet been a substantial reduction in personnel, and certainly there has been no consolidation of this shipyard with any other military facility.

Mr. STRATTON. May I say to the gentleman, he is a lawyer and I am not. Therefore I find myself at a disadvantage in interpreting some of this language. However, I think there is considerable merit to the position which the gentleman maintains. This base has been ordered closed, it has not yet been closed, there has been a reduction, but the process is still underway and there has been no official report on this action submitted to our committee.

In fact I am informed there has been no official report to our committee about this action or about any of the other actions ordered on the 19th of November. Nevertheless, I still think there is some ambiguity as to whether section 608 would apply to Brooklyn, and therefore it seems to me important that we make it crystal clear in this bill that the intention of the House is to have it apply to bases or shipyards currently in the process of being closed.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI].

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I am in agreement with most of the bill, but I strongly oppose section 608 which was added in committee at the last moment and without adequate consideration. This section would forbid the Secretary of Defense to "Close, substantially reduce, transfer, reassign, abolish or consolidate any military camp, post, station, installation, or facility," in the United States and Puerto Rico, unless and until he reports to the Armed Services Committees of both the House and the Senate, then waits 30 to 70 days unless he is prohibited from proceeding by either the House or the Senate.

What does the quoted language mean? I do not intend to take the time of the House to examine all the ambiguities, but I want to discuss two of them.

First, is section 608 talking simply about transfers of parcels of real estate and the like? Or is it addressed to something much bigger, the level of activity, the military personnel level and civilian employment, and the local economic benefits produced by the military installation? I do not think the Members of this House are greatly disturbed about how the Defense Department has been disposing of parcels of real estate—at least not to the extent of superimposing the procedural rigmarole of section 608 when there already exists a successful, simple procedure for notifying the Armed Services Committee of the intention of the Department of Defense to declare excess its surplus parcels of land. While

the language certainly is not clear and there was no significant committee discussion of it, I think we know that section 608 is directed to subsidizing the economies of communities possessing unneeded military facilities by preventing the Defense Department from reducing the number of people at those facilities. If this is not the case, and the section is intended to deal only with real estate transactions, then a baseball bat is being used to kill a fly. If it is the case, then I think it should be so stated rather than disguising the real meaning of the section by talking about returning constitutional powers to Congress.

Second, let us look at such careless language as the words "substantially reduced". I suppose that if an isolated radar station with 100 men loses 90 of them, there is a "substantial reduction" percentagewise. Are we going to ask the Secretary of Defense to come running to us every time he wants to move 90 soldiers? Or suppose the Secretary of Defense moves 10,000 troops to a forward area to meet a sudden contingency, leaving 10,000 other troops at the home installation; is this a "substantial reduction"? Are the committees not only going to review these military and administrative decisions, but also, as the occasion arises, decide what their own amendment means? I for one do not think this is sound legislation, even on this limited ground.

But, the problem of interpretation aside, I am against this section because it is out of touch with military realities. If the military is doing its job it will create obsolescence. It will continually be developing new weapon systems and getting rid of old ones. It will be shifting people to obtain a more efficient and responsive military force. And it will adjust the military base structure to reflect this constant process of change.

Section 608 would establish a congressional veto procedure for particular base closures. This can have no other effect than to prevent or slow down the necessary process of military change for the benefit of parochial, nonmilitary interests. The result will be higher cost to the taxpayer and lesser military readiness. This result can be very simply illustrated. Take for example the problem of technological change. As we all know, the hundreds upon hundreds of Minutemen with their high dependability have eliminated the need for the older, liquid fueled Atlas and Titan I missiles. When they are taken out of force, the bases they support become unnecessary and personnel must be shifted or become sheer waste. Congress through the military authorization and appropriations bills in effect approves the phase out of weapons systems by its allocation of money for Minutemen and its failure to allocate money to continue the older missiles. The only point in asking the Defense Department to come again to Congress in order to shut down the bases associated with obsolete missiles is to second-guess Congress original decision for the benefit of particular communities. That I cannot support.

The same is true of redeployments. We have a good recent example in the redeployment of B-51 squadrons to take advantage of improvement in the warning system, and in the redeployment of continental defense fighter forces to take advantage of greater aircraft capabilities and achieve more dispersal. This sort of action requires complicated, integrated planning which can be completely disrupted if one link in the chain of closures, reductions, and increases at various bases is removed to satisfy local interests. This I cannot support.

Furthermore, section 608 will seriously degrade the efficiency of our military support and logistics systems and their sound management by the Defense Department. It would interfere with complex continuing programs to integrate and reorganize logistics and supply systems, programs which necessarily involve changes in the level of activity at numerous locations. We may as well recognize that if we tamper with these programs by freezing activity at one installation at a predetermined level, we are likely to so disrupt the whole plan as to make it unworkable and lose all its benefits in money saved and military readiness gained. Even the threat of delay and disruption, which this amendment certainly establishes, may be enough to kill much needed action.

These are long-run military realities which should not be ignored. Section 608 is bad enough in these terms; it is even worse in its impact on short-run operational flexibility. To give you just one example, last March, the expanding crisis in South Vietnam required the deployment of some 6,000 personnel of the 1st Marine Brigade from Hawaii to the Western Pacific. This meant that the base population at Kaneohe Air Station, Hawaii, dropped to little more than 25 percent of its former level. I suppose this would be called a "substantial reduction"; undoubtedly, the community at Kaneohe is suffering economically. But is there any one of us who would have required the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to come to the Armed Services Committees, hat in hand, to ask permission to take this action when the Nation's commitments and the security of all of our constituents were at issue? I think not. But this is what the section requires on its face and there is nothing in the committee proceedings which would lead to a contrary conclusion.

The fact is that there is nothing of significance in the printed committee hearings at all about this section. It was included in the bill at the last moment without any meaningful hearings whatsoever, without any consideration of its impact on military readiness, and without any review of the grave constitutional problems which flow from its attempt to limit the Commander in Chief's authority to deploy or redeploy Defense Department personnel.

It was included in the bill in the face of the policy repeatedly expressed by Congress in various parts of the National Security Act that the Department of Defense shall be operated efficiently and

economically. In the past 4 years the Department announced 669 base closures and reductions with savings which will eventually run to \$1 billion annually. Almost 1½ million acres of land will be returned to civilian use. These actions have been responsive to our statutory instruction. We should expect the Department of Defense, as the greatest single employer and spender in our Nation, to set an example for the Nation—to return to the economy assets not needed for military purposes, to use its resources efficiently and to readjust its base structure with a minimum deleterious effect on the communities and their members.

Individual citizens' lives are bound to be disrupted if the Department does its job. But the answer is not to subsidize waste but to do everything possible to enable the individuals affected to find new jobs. Greatly to its credit, this is just what the Department of Defense is doing. No employing institution of substantial size has ever demonstrated greater responsibility for alleviating disruption of the lives of its employees. It has an active economic adjustment program which has in many cases helped communities to bring in new industries so that they ended up being better off. Moreover, every career employee affected by a closure is guaranteed another job opportunity; this guarantee has been met, and more than three-fourths of those so far affected have accepted the jobs offered. This is an outstanding record of achievement. And Congress now has before it the opportunity to provide additional protection and benefits in the form of proposals for severance pay and additional transportation and moving expenses for such employees. This is the way for us to perform our share of the responsibility for those who have served their country well. To encourage the pressures of conflicting parochial interests, as section 608 would do, is, I submit, not the way.

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

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

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, I would personally like to commend the gentleman from Michigan for his thoughtful addition to this discussion and to our understanding of the problem. I would like to associate myself with his remarks.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

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

Mr. NEDZI. I yield.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend my distinguished colleague from Michigan on the remarks he has made. I find the Chairman's remarks most assuring in this matter. I appreciate the courage that my colleague has shown.

Mr. NEDZI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, under permission granted I include the following editorials as a part of my remarks:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 28, 1965]

LOCAL VERSUS NATIONAL INTEREST

The House Armed Services Committee is having one more try at requiring the Defense Department to be run as a welfare society rather than as a business agency.

The Committee has voted to require either Defense Secretary McNamara or one of the armed services secretaries to give Congress advance time first to disapprove, and then block altogether, the closing down of military bases the Government finds unnecessary. Congressman Lucien Nedzi of Michigan summed up the matter completely when he declared: "If this becomes law there will never be another base closed."

There is no question that a Congressman has a right to be concerned when a military base which has brought employment and prosperity to his constituency faces extinction. The Administration's decision last November to reduce or consolidate activities at 95 military installations involved savings estimated at \$477 million. The net reduction of 63,401 jobs and the use of 376,720 acres of land was bound to affect a large number of congressional constituencies.

But this bold move by the administration was made on the judgment that the national interest comes before local interests—that when national defense no longer requires so many bases their continuance becomes an extravagant burden on all the taxpayers.

The Pentagon, in economizing on unnecessary base operations, is well aware of the dangers of abrupt economic dislocations. Efforts have been made to create new local industries, to retrain personnel and to find alternative uses for the bases themselves. In this way, both local and national interests are served. But to follow the House Armed Services Committee's lead would be both parochial and shortsighted.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 1, 1965]

CONGRESSIONAL COFFIN-NAILERS

Congress rightly complains about the near demise of its control over the armed services. In selecting issues on which to buck that trend, though, its corps of military overseers could be driving the last nails into its own coffin.

The House Armed Services Committee opened its campaign for more congressional control by snapping at Secretary McNamara's proposed merger of the Army Reserve and National Guard. As the committee itself now seems to admit, that proposal takes a considerable step in the direction of economy and efficiency.

The merger, however, was bound to be unpopular in a bread-and-butter political sense, for in numerous congressional districts it involved a cutback in Federal favors such as spending and commands for Reserve officers. In its early opposition, moreover, the House committee seemed unwilling even to look at the merits of the proposal. It seemed, in short, to align itself against efficiency and for pork-barrel politics.

House committee members may be on sounder ground in their second quarrel with Mr. McNamara—that his proposed military pay raise is overly parsimonious. Yet, especially in light of the committee's other actions, this also acquires an unsavory political taint as a possible attempt to court favor with the military rank and file at the expense of the commanders in the Defense Department.

The House committee's third foray, the recent vote to limit executive power to close military installations, is the most depressing

of all. In passing an authorization for military construction, the committee tacked on a provision that all planned closings should be subject to congressional veto within 40 days after their announcement.

Congress takes this special interest in few, if any, other military decisions. The controversy over the latest base closings provides unflattering evidence of the reason for that special interest. Since howls came nearly exclusively from Congressmen representing districts where fat was being cut, their posture on scrutiny of cutbacks hardly seems one of selfless devotion to defense efficiency.

The great pity is that the general decline in congressional power does pose a significant problem. More and more the executive department is going unchallenged and unchecked, adding to the disturbing overtones in the concentration of power it already holds. Congress could perform a sizable service by becoming a more alert watchdog, and the military is in many respects a logical place to start.

But when it appears to challenge the executive only to defend the most parochial political interests, Congress will hardly reverse the decline of its powers on really significant issues. More dangerously, it may compound the problem by convincing many citizens that the decline is fully deserved.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, June 8, 1965]

WASHINGTON CLOSE-UP: A GRAB FOR POWER ON THE HILL

(By Richard Fryklund)

The effort of Chairman RIVERS of the House Armed Services Committee to assert Congress constitutional prerogative to "raise and support armies" is now being carried to an extreme.

His committee is trying to wangle a veto power over efforts by Secretary of Defense McNamara to close surplus military facilities.

If he succeeds, political control over these valuable economy actions will be absolute. There won't be any more closings—unless of course one is announced for the home district of a Congressman who has somehow offended the czars of the Armed Services Committee.

The problem is one of personal prestige and power. RIVERS and a number of his committee members believe that the previous chairman, Carl Vinson, let the Pentagon become the dominant rather than a "co-equal" partner in defense.

McNamara encourages the frustration of the committee by doing pretty much what he pleases and, what's worse, by showing the committee members that he knows vastly more about defense problems than they do.

In his effort to regain congressional authority—as he sees it—over defense, RIVERS is challenging McNamara on each issue where he has the slightest chance of changing a major recommendation.

He may well win on his effort to get larger pay raises for military people.

But there is too much good sense on Capitol Hill to let him win on base closing.

The rider he attached to this year's military authorization bill specifies that if the Defense Department wants to close or "substantially reduce or consolidate" a base, it must notify the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate and then wait 30 days for either committee to recommend a veto.

If there is such a recommendation, the Defense Department will have to wait another 40 days for either House to approve the veto.

Obviously there will be a veto attempt every time a base is to be closed in one of the States represented on the Armed Services Committee. And obviously any Congressman with any class from one of the other States

can get to a committee member, roll a log and get a veto.

Base closing will almost come to an end. If Congressmen are interested in economy—in other districts even if not their own—they might ponder the saving of more than \$1 billion that will accrue from the 669 already closed or cut back.

Or they might think about the quick shipment of combat units from the United States to a foreign theater—shipments that often substantially reduce a base. A service could not make the shipments, under the Rivers rider, until 30 or possibly 70 days had passed.

Or they might think of necessary structural changes in the services—the phasing-out of old B-47 bombers or the shift of B-52's to less vulnerable southern bases, for instance—which require basic changes.

Or they might study the constitutional issue. It seems clear from past decisions that one committee or one House cannot force the Executive to waste money. On a substantial issue, of course, the whole Congress can enact a law which a President must obey.

Congressmen might also look at the Bolling-Anacostia Airport mess created here by the Rivers committee. It has frozen those two surplus fields despite Air Force and Navy efforts to get rid of them. The committee action did not benefit the services or the communities, which have better uses for the land.

Congressmen should ask themselves whether the Defense Department should be forced to keep bases and jobs alive when the need has died—just so a community will not suffer.

The Defense Department does offer alternative jobs to career employees affected by base closings (and 80 percent of the people so far have accepted the offer).

The Department also helps communities adjust to the economic impact of closings. In some instances the abandoned real estate has attracted new industry which has compensated for the Government jobs lost. In other instances the loss has been a local disaster. But hanging on to useless defense facilities is not the rational answer to those disasters.

Of course every Congressman really knows all of these things. Cooler heads in other House committees and in the Senate will surely kill the Rivers rider.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, June 1, 1965]

DEFENSE MANAGEMENT FROM CAPITOL HILL

Representative MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina and his House Armed Services Committee are raising serious questions about whether the Defense Department is going to be run by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara or by Chairman RIVERS and his committee.

RIVERS and Company have approved legislation which would require the Defense Department to give the House and Senate Armed Services Committees advance notice before cutting back or closing a military base. If either committee disapproved, Congress then could override the Defense Department's plans.

The obvious effect of this move, as a Michigan Congressman quickly pointed out, would be to prevent the closing of another single base, no matter how worthless to the defense effort, from now on anywhere in the United States. For every such base lies within some Congressman's district and some Senator's State, so it is virtually certain that somebody would be able to exert enough political pressure within Congress to prevent the closing.

Mr. McNamara's problem with Congress is that he has done his job too well. It has been said of him that he is the first

Defense Secretary to really fill the office. That has meant some collisions with what President Eisenhower called the military-industrial complex. It also has meant some collisions with Congressmen with an appetite for military pork in the form of unneeded bases, installations and purchases.

Representative RIVERS' predecessor, former Representative Carl Vinson of Georgia, praised Mr. McNamara, even while sometimes disagreeing with him. But Representative RIVERS seems to have a rule-or-ruin attitude.

"I just got this gavel in January," Representative RIVERS said last week, "and I intend to use it."

To a man, Congressmen are loud in their advocacy of economy in government. However, they seem to want none of it in the Defense Department.

But with the defense budget already accounting for more than half the national budget, and with U.S. military commitments expanding on several parts of the globe at once, Mr. McNamara would not be doing his job unless he were striving constantly to prevent military waste.

The question is whether or not this effort shall continue or whether Mr. McNamara will be compelled to surrender the keys of his office to Mr. RIVERS and his committee. If the Pentagon is to be operated henceforth from Capitol Hill, we can be sure that the effort to trim defense waste will be all but futile.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, May 27, 1965]

NEW "PORK BARREL" PLAN

By tacking an amendment onto a military-construction bill, the House Armed Services Committee acted this week to curb the power of Defense Secretary McNamara. The amendment is bad legislation which would strengthen "pork-barrel" practices in Congress.

McNamara's postelection announcements of military-installation closings—which caused anguish in many congressional districts across the country—provided the impetus for the committee's action.

The proposed law would give the House or the Senate a veto over any future base closings.

In our view, this would constitute a clumsy intrusion by the legislative branch into the administrative functions of the executive branch.

The issue posed is thus a great deal larger than whether McNamara is right or wrong in closing any particular base.

It is not difficult to visualize what would happen if the amendment became law. In the log-rolling, back-scratching atmosphere of Congress, the Defense Department would find it virtually impossible to close any base providing a community payroll anywhere at any time. Bases devoted to the maintenance of obsolete weapons or training programs would dot the countryside from Key West to Nome.

If such an amendment had been in effect in past decades, it is probable that coast-artillery units would still be going through their paces at Forts Worden and Casey. Goodness knows how many of the West's old cavalry posts still would be awakening daily to the sound of bugles.

If the House Armed Services Committee has its way, this absurd situation would prevail: The President could take the Nation into war without the formal approval of Congress—but could not shut down a storage depot in Wyoming or a port of embarkation on the Mississippi or Puget Sound.

The "curb-McNamara" amendment is attached to the administration-request measure for \$1.9 billion in military construction projects. The House as a whole should give it the ax.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, June 2, 1965]

DEFENSE VETO

The House Armed Services Committee, in voting to curb Defense Secretary McNamara's authority to close military bases, has openly moved that authority into the pork-barrel department.

The committee approved an administration request for \$1.9 billion for military construction projects. But it tacked on a requirement that either House or Senate must have a veto over any future base closings.

Since 1960, McNamara has shut down or reduced operations at 669 military bases. His reasons have been that savings can be effected through consolidations or through use of new techniques or designs which make older bases obsolete. Despite the logic of his decisions, few Congressmen from affected districts have taken his recommendations lying down.

Defense installations do play a large part in the economy of some districts but it is to the overall advantage of the taxpayer that the department be run as economically as possible while, at the same time, giving the Nation the best possible protection.

If a Congressman can get enough of his friends to join him in a veto every time the gravy train at home is threatened by a technological advance in the military setup, the chances of a streamlined, fairly priced defense system are remote.

The Nation's defense is too important to be a plaything for selfish interests and any veto here would infringe seriously on administrative rights and practices.

[From the Kansas City Star, May 31, 1965]

KEEP McNAMARA FREE TO SAVE ON DEFENSE

It is open season on Robert S. McNamara in the committee halls of Congress. The hard-driving Secretary of Defense is under fire in two directions. The House Armed Services Committee is out to curb drastically the authority of McNamara to close military bases. Previously the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee subjected him to intense grilling in connection with his plan to merge the Army Reserve into the National Guard.

The Reserve-Guard merger proposal is still pending. But the House group has already taken action intended to give either the House or Senate a veto over any future base shutdowns. We detect a vindictiveness in this move. McNamara has bruised some political feelings by ordering a total of 669 military facilities closed or curtailed since he took office in 1961.

These actions have resulted in saving hundreds of millions of dollars for the American taxpayer—with the promise of more thrift to come. But Members of Congress who are for economy as an abstract principle tend to cry foul when any governmental activities in their home States or districts are cut back. Their attitude suggests an unwillingness to concede that the Secretary of Defense is in a better position to judge the Nation's overall military requirements than they are. It also suggests straight politics.

We are not impressed by the contention of some Congressmen that McNamara has invaded a field of legislative authority. It seems to us that, instead, Members of Congress are seeking to restrict what is properly a responsibility of the executive branch of Government.

The House committee's restriction was written into the military construction authorization bill. If passed in the House and approved by the Senate, the President would have to choose between vetoing an essential fund measure or accepting a major infringement on the administration's power to economize. We hope that the lawmakers' collective good sense will prevail and that so difficult a choice will not become necessary. McNamara should be encouraged, not ham-

strung, in his efforts to eliminate costly waste from the defense program.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, May 30, 1965]

INDEFENSIBLE MEDDLING WITH DEFENSE BASE CLOSINGS

The decision by the House Armed Services Committee to curb the authority of the Secretary of Defense to close military bases is self-serving and indefensible.

The wonder is that the bill didn't appear a few years ago. Defense Secretary McNamara under Presidents Johnson and Kennedy has reduced or shutdown operations at 669 military bases. Invariably, the affected communities turned to their Congressmen. Mr. McNamara's arguments for greater economy in the Military Establishment were criticized as forcing unemployment and injuring local economies.

But Mr. McNamara's views have prevailed, and it is to the Nation's credit that the realities in managing the Nation's defense needs have provided the standard whether this or that military base was to close down.

These standards have held firm against pressures from some powerful constituencies, but the citizenry has been answered fairly, openly, and with patience by the Defense Department.

Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina, is attempting to impede this progressive adjustment of bases to needs by invoking article 1 of the Constitution which provides Congress with power to raise and maintain Armed Forces. Mr. RIVERS feels that his bill would return to Congress the power which the framers of the Constitution originally intended Congress to have.

This argument lacks substance and should be disclosed swiftly for what it poorly conceals—a move to transfer the decision-making from considerations of national security and economical management to the area of pork barreling.

As for interpreting this clause of the Constitution, it has been established that the congressional authority "to raise and support armies" was not inserted for the purpose of endowing the Congress with power to do these things as administrator, but rather to designate the department of Government which should exercise such powers under the executive.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 28, 1965]

VETOING A BAD VETO

Selfish, small-minded politics can be a serious handicap to American military efficiency. They can also constitute a conscienceless expense to the American taxpayer. It is for these reasons that we cast a most questioning eye on the House Armed Services Committee's decision to limit Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's authority to shut down bases.

To put our doubts bluntly: we believe that the Pentagon is both better informed and less locally influenced in its decisions than are either Congressmen or Senators. We think the Pentagon is the best judge of which bases to close down, while not forgetting the need to minimize the resulting unemployment and dislocation.

Indeed, we should have thought that Members of Congress would have preferred to have all decisions on base closings made by the Pentagon. In this way such Members would have been able to plead complete non-involvement when local merchants and chambers of commerce objected to the withdrawal of bases. Thus both political expediency and military efficiency would have been served.

The House Armed Services Committee bill would give either the House or the Senate veto power over base closings. Any plan to

shut down a base would have to be reported to Congress, with either House having up to 70 days to block the shutdown.

Secretary McNamara can be expected to protest with the utmost vigor against a move which, if enacted into law, would seriously clip his efforts to cut waste in America's gigantic military plant. Since the Secretary's steps for efficiency and economy would appear to have President Johnson's approval, we presume that the White House—despite its political sensitivities—will also oppose the measure.

Undoubtedly Secretary McNamara has made his mistakes. He has even made his share of enemies. But there is evidence that he has been an efficient businesslike and highly able Secretary of Defense. These are just the qualities required in a man responsible for the U.S. \$50 billion military budget.

With the United States facing a steady increase in the cost of its military operation in Vietnam, this is no moment for petty, local politics to enter the picture. We trust that Congress will recognize this fact and take no steps likely to decrease military efficiency and raise costs.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, June 1, 1965]

CONGRESS AND MILITARY BASES

Congress seems about to tell the Secretary of Defense to keep his hands off military bases in the United States. The House Armed Services Committee tacked onto a military construction bill a provision that either the House or Senate may veto the closing of bases.

The reason for the move is clear. Secretary Robert McNamara upset some political appeacarts when he recommended a series of base closings recently. When a base shuts down it alters the economy of the region in which it is located, and the Congressman for that district hears protests.

In all, McNamara has closed or reduced operations at 669 military bases since he became Secretary of Defense more than 4 years ago. He advanced valid reasons in each case, and the net has been a saving of billions of dollars. But when it affects the home district, Congressmen are more interested in saving their skins than saving the public money.

If the House committee's recommendation is written into law, the chances of any more streamlining of the extensive military base system, would just about vanish.

It is unfortunate that some districts have suffered economically because bases were shut down. But military needs change and bases become obsolete. The services cannot afford to expand in new directions without retracting in areas no longer needed.

Congress should let well enough alone, and be thankful the Secretary of Defense is willing to relieve them of some of the heat for doing what has to be done.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND NEXT WEEK

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the majority leader if he will kindly announce the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, may I advise the House first of all that if this matter is disposed of that we are now considering it will be our plan to go over until Monday. We will have finished the business for the week.

The business for next week is as follows:

MONDAY

District day, no bills.

House Resolution 110, to authorize travel authority to the Committee on Government Operations.

Six unanimous-consent bills of Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

H.R. 205, increasing rates of subsistence under war orphans' educational assistance program.

H.R. 206, increasing rates of subsistence for service-connected trainees under vocational rehabilitation.

H.R. 208, training of seriously disabled veterans under the vocational rehabilitation program.

H.R. 227, war orphan benefits for children of those who served prior to September 1940.

H.R. 235, repeal of chapter 33, title 38, United States Code.

H.R. 2656, size of flags furnished by Veterans' Administration.

TUESDAY AND BALANCE OF WEEK

Private Calendar.

S. 2089, providing assistance to the States of Oregon, Washington, California, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters. Open rule, 1 hour debate.

H.R. 6927, establishing a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes. Open rule, 2 hours debate, waiving points of order, making H.R. 8822 in order to be offered as a substitute.

H.R. 237, Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project. Open rule, 1 hour debate.

H.R. 485, Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California. Open rule, 1 hour debate.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Any further program will be announced later.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman, Do these necessarily come in order?

Mr. ALBERT. Not necessarily in the order in which announced but from Tuesday on, I should say substantially so.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, speaking for all the members on the minority side of this committee, that our understanding and interpretation of section 608 to which the chairman of the committee addressed himself a few moments ago in colloquy with the gentleman from Michigan is identical with his interpretation. I thought we ought to have that in the RECORD.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman. At this time I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished member of the committee, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HICKS].

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of my committee for

permitting me to speak here for a moment or two. I was advised early in my time here—I am a new member on the Committee on Armed Services—that it was ill advised to speak at all the first year around here and doubly so if you had any words in opposition to your chairman.

I rise to join the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] in opposition to section 608. I would not have done this earlier in the session, but in the course of serving on the Armed Services Committee I have come to have a great deal of respect for our chairman. I know that he is too big a man not to permit a little opposition, that he would not hold himself out as infallible.

Now, Mr. Chairman, around the country there is some opposition to this particular section.

Mr. Chairman, the Seattle Times, one of the larger newspapers in my State, editorialized against it and pointed out one of the reasons why this is a bad section.

Mr. Chairman, when we are back in the House I shall ask unanimous consent to have this particular editorial inserted at this point in my remarks:

By tacking an amendment onto a military construction bill, the House Armed Services Committee acted this week to curb the power of Defense Secretary McNamara. The amendment is bad legislation which would strengthen "pork barrel" practices in Congress.

McNamara's postelection announcements of military installation closings—which caused anguish in many congressional districts across the country—provided the impetus for the committee's action.

The proposed law would give the House or the Senate a veto over any future base closings.

In our view, this would constitute a clumsy intrusion by the legislative branch into the administrative functions of the executive branch.

The issue posed is thus a great deal larger than whether McNamara is right or wrong in closing any particular base.

It is not difficult to visualize what would happen if the amendment became law. In the logrolling, back-scratching atmosphere of Congress, the Defense Department would find it virtually impossible to close any base providing a community payroll anywhere at any time. Bases devoted to the maintenance of obsolete weapons or training programs would dot the countryside from Key West to Nome.

If such an amendment had been in effect in past decades, it is probable that coast artillery units would still be going through their paces at Forts Worden and Casey. Goodness knows how many of the West's old cavalry posts still would be awakening daily to the sound of bugles.

If the House Armed Services Committee has its way, this absurd situation would prevail: The President could take the Nation into war without the formal approval of Congress—but could not shut down a storage depot in Wyoming or a port of embarkation on the Mississippi or Puget Sound.

The curb McNamara amendment is attached to the administration request measure for \$1.9 billion in military construction projects. The House as a whole should give it the ax.

Mr. Chairman, the purport of this is that it is a bad situation for the Congress to sit in judgment on the closure of these various bases. I believe this was most adequately pointed

out right here in this Chamber this afternoon with reference to the agricultural experiment stations on which attempted closure was made. There was one of these stations located in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, the people wrote me and pressure built up. I protested and I was not in favor of the agricultural experiment stations being closed.

Then, Mr. Chairman, there was the situation with reference to the proposed closing of the Veterans' Administration hospitals. With reference to these closures the same thing occurred.

Mr. Chairman, it just gets down to who is going to make this judgment. Shall it be made by the Congress or, in this instance, shall it be made by the Department of Defense, that a particular installation should be closed?

Mr. Chairman, the point was brought up earlier this afternoon to the effect that Congress must approve any expenditure which exceeded \$25,000. That is as it should be. When the military wants more, someone should check the request. When less is required or requested, however, the same check is not necessary, for that is a different situation. The Department of Defense does not close bases when they are considered valuable to the Department of Defense at that time. They are closing the bases at the times that they do because, in the best judgment of the Department, it is in the best interest of the Nation that they be closed, not just because a particular Secretary is involved and is only going to be there for a period of 4 years. But, Mr. Chairman, the Secretary has the best judgment of the entire Defense Department at his disposal, and, in each instance, experts make such recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Seattle Times, if the Bremerton Navy Yard were being closed, probably would sing a different tune. I am certain that it would. When the Dyna-Soar program was phased out, there was an entirely different tune. But, that is self-interest.

Some feel that if section 608 is retained in the bill they would be able to come up here and veto these base-closing actions. Maybe they would and maybe they would not. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] seemed to think that the Brookley Air Force Base could be saved and some seemed to think that the Brooklyn Navy Yard could be saved if this section were adopted.

Mr. Chairman, the section says that we are supposed to take a look and make a judgment on these matters. However, I am afraid what would happen would be the same thing as happened with reference to the agricultural experiment stations and with reference to the veterans' hospitals. It would be a question of provincialism and self-interest. That is the reason I feel section 608 is a bad portion of the bill. Otherwise this is an exceptional bill and one on which the committee worked very hard.

Mr. Chairman, I do support the bill but I am concerned about this particular section.

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

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Washington on his statement and associate myself with it.

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

Mr. HICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman on his statement. It just so happens that I used to have in my congressional district the Bremerton Navy Yard which now is in the district represented by the gentleman now in the well of the House. I will say that as far as that navy yard goes and the personnel connected with it, they are absolutely sold on the idea that they have to produce and get the most for the defense dollar in order to justify their getting the work.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is very lucky to have that type of individual under his responsibility.

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

Mr. HICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Washington, and to compliment him on his first speech on the floor of the House on a very important matter. I think he has a great deal of courage. It is well stated, and I would like to associate myself with his remarks.

I also compliment the chairman of the committee for his ability and graciousness in allowing a new member of his committee to come before this body.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I, too, want to congratulate the gentleman for having done one of the most dedicated jobs of any member of our committee. We have encouraged all new Members to participate in our deliberations.

The first thing I did when I became chairman was to brief the new Members, and every single Member. The attendance has been excellent. The attendance of the new Members has been better than that of the older Members, particularly that of the gentleman who now occupies the well of the House. He has done a magnificent job, and I want to urge him to come to my office, go to the newspapers, any place he wants to. Certainly he does not agree with me all the time. I may be wrong, and I am wrong a lot of times. But any time I am right he has supported me. I do not have anything to say against what the gentleman says, and he has the right to say anything he wants to. He has done a magnificent job, and I wish we had a million like him in the Congress.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I am not one who always agrees with the chairman of our committee on all issues

and in all particulars, yet I think it is time that we put a few things in perspective.

First, I do not think the paramount issue today is whether one has the courage to stand here in the well and oppose the chairman. I admire the preceding speaker, the gentleman from Washington, very much. I know he is concerned about editorials. But I think we should point out some of the rest of us have newspapers that have written adverse editorials directed at section 608.

I happen to represent an area that has a newspaper that has printed an editorial against section 608. Bear in mind it is the only paper, the only outlet for printed publicity in the metropolitan area whose suburbs I happen to represent. The Kansas City Star is against section 608. But I want to present a few reasons why this provision should be adopted.

Let me emphasize that a false assumption has been made here, namely, that when the Armed Services Committee considers closings or consolidation of military installations it is going to oppose the closing of every single base proposed to be closed by the Department.

I think the key word in the section is "review." It simply gives the committee a chance to review the decisions. Then 30 days pass. If the committee passes a resolution there is an additional period of 40 days in which this House or the other body have an opportunity to adopt a resolution rejecting the proposed closings. That is all that is contained in section 608.

The assumption that each and every closing is going to be opposed is a false assumption and leads to unjustified conclusions. It is not a question of whether it is contemplated or advisable for a base to be closed. We are not seeking to reverse the base-consolidation announcement of Secretary McNamara of November 1964.

The point is we are trying to provide some procedural guidelines to be followed in future consolidations. I do not know whether the amendment that is going to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] will be adopted or not under the 5-minute rule, but I do submit we are seeking to avoid what happened last November, just after the election, when there was a complete factual blackout.

No Member of Congress could find out anything that was going to happen, except there had been or would be an announcement about a series of closings or consolidations. There were no further details given to Members whose districts were affected, or to any Member of the House. Information was first given to the press, then sometime afterward Members of Congress were notified. Avoidance of future information blackouts is a main purpose of section 608. That is all we are talking about.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution says "The Congress shall have Power." It does not mention Veterans' Administra-

tion, it does not mention the Agriculture Department, it says "To raise and support Armies. To provide and maintain a Navy; To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces."

Now if you cannot do this—if you cannot find out what is going on at a base and if you cannot find out what is intended beforehand, how in the name of God can you do these things? That is what I would like to know. But, my friends, this Constitution says that you fellows in Congress are supposed to look out for this military. How are you going to do it if somebody in the Pentagon says, "We are just not going to tell you what is going on in our minds and furthermore when you boys close shop and adjourn we are going to close a few bases, and furthermore we just aren't telling you where those bases are"? How would you like to run a railroad like that? That is what the framers of the Constitution said when they wrote that language here. They knew that one of these days some strong man was going to come along who might not think that we are smart as he is. They knew that. Now we have come along and tried to put you back in business. If you are not capable of running your own business, you are going to have a chance to vote on it. We think you are. We think you have sense enough to handle your own business and that is all we are trying to do in keeping with the direction of this Constitution. That is all we are doing. It did not pick out agriculture—it says "military" and it is the only branch of government that the framers of this Constitution has reposed in your keeping. You can take it or leave it. If you do not want that, you have a chance to turn it down. I want it. I know I have sense enough to run the business in my district and I believe everyone of you has that sense and at least I will believe that until somebody proves me wrong.

I tried to get some information for the distinguished gentleman from Oregon sometime ago from the DOD. I had an awful time and I do not have it yet. This should not be this way. This is a great country—this is a great country and the Constitution has given you this responsibility and you cannot delegate it—you cannot delegate it. If you do not like it, it has to be changed by an amendment to the Constitution and you cannot do anything about giving away this power. I do not want to give away mine. I believe I read the same confidence in your eyes. That is what I believe.

Mr. RANDALL. I certainly want to associate myself with the excellent, forthright, factual, and accurate statement just pronounced by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services.

I will just take a moment or two more to comment briefly on some of the statements that were made by my good friend from Michigan, Mr. NEDZI, in which he said that if the purpose of section 608 is to help some community out of economic straits then we should pass legislation for that purpose and there should be no discussion of the constitutional prerogatives of the Congress.

CXI—837

It was mentioned earlier that it would take four committees to authorize an expenditure of over \$25,000 for military construction. Let us not confuse this issue before us now with some of the comments in the Washington press this morning about a recent veto by the President on some public works measure as a warning against infringement of powers of the Executive.

Today we are considering an entirely different matter because the provision which covers raising and equipping of armies and navies is written right into article I of the Constitution. There is an easy and clear implication to be drawn that Congress has the same powers and prerogatives at the time of closing or consolidation of military bases it has when such installations are authorized. That is the constitutional question involved. If Congress has any powers to authorize the construction of military installations it also has powers to consider their closing or discontinuance. All section 608 seeks to do is call attention by emphasis to a provision already contained in our Constitution.

The issue is not whether economy in Government is desirable or feasible, as some persons would claim. Americans everywhere have applauded the President's efforts to put a realistic ceiling on the Federal budget and to pare down nonessential Federal expenditures, just as they have enthusiastically supported congressional efforts to reduce spending requests of the executive branch.

The issue is whether, as the gentleman from South Carolina has so properly asserted, our exclusive authority to raise and support armies and provide for a navy does not by implication entail the right to be consulted when such military forces are curtailed or reduced.

Mr. Chairman, your committee is not seeking to reverse the base-consolidation program of Secretary McNamara. To the contrary, this bill authorizes appropriations of construction projects essential to that consolidation program. Moreover, section 608 would not affect the closings already ordered by the Secretary.

On the other hand, your committee is trying to set more reasonable procedural guidelines to be followed in future consolidations of military installations.

We do assert it to be intolerable that supposedly irreversible and irrevocable decisions are announced to the press before they are announced to the appropriate committees of the Congress or to the individual members most concerned with these decisions.

We do insist that such decisions ought to be justified to the appropriate elected representatives of the people well in advance of the time they are permitted to take effect.

This is the purpose of section 608. It is a needed addition to the law and I am glad our committee stood unanimously for inclusion of this provision to review base consolidation proposals that come from the Pentagon. H.R. 8439 containing its important section 608 deserves our support.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the dis-

tinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding me this time, because I am not a member of his committee.

The 1966 military authorizations are now fixed, as in this bill, but I intend to direct my remarks to 1967, and I intend to make them directly to the Department of Defense and the White House. I also look to this committee, and I want the committee members to listen to what I have to say, because I need their help.

In this bill there are included 45 States and 13 foreign nations and territories, which will receive \$1,934,927,000, but there is not 1 cent for West Virginia. The five States surrounding our State will receive \$140,598,000, but there is not 1 cent for West Virginia.

We can no longer conceal the fact that we are widening the war effort. More and more of our West Virginia boys are receiving those little messages with greetings from the White House. There the ultimate responsibility lies.

West Virginia will be asked to contribute to expanding military operations, and it will respond, as it always has. We accept without complaint the necessity of sacrifice incident to war.

I heard the late President Kennedy say, some 2 years ago, on the steps of the White House, that the State of West Virginia had contributed more men to the defense of this Nation who had lost their lives, based on a population ratio, than had any other State in the Nation.

We believe we have a right to share in the financial benefits which result from the vast industrial and construction activities promoted by war. We trust the White House will be aware of this fact in 1967.

My colleague from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] said that he would rely upon the judgment and the wisdom of those in the Department of Defense. I say to him that I have been relying on that judgment and wisdom for 17 years, and that judgment and wisdom has not done one single thing for our State, though this has been drawn to their attention many, many times. Oh, yes, they will come back to say that some 7 or 8 years ago they started a military installation in West Virginia. But some of the scientists, not longer than 2 or 3 days ago, said that the Department of Defense made one of the greatest mistakes in the defense of America by stopping that military installation. If I had time I would go into why they said they did make that mistake.

In West Virginia we have everything that is favorable for military construction. We have pure water. We have the needed terrain. We have a good climate. We have men and women who want to work, and who have the ability to work. In our State we have some of the prettiest and most beautiful scenery in America.

I have been impressed by some of the arguments made against the closing of some of the installations. It is said this takes away jobs in districts and affects taxes. We would like to have some of

them, so that we could argue about closing them. We do not have them. I call that to the attention of the House today.

There will be some arguments made, and some will say, "oh, yes, you share in some of the community facilities grants, and you get some Small Business loans, and perhaps some relief appropriations." We want jobs. We want work for our people, and they want to work.

I said here some years ago that the first time there was not anything in the bill for West Virginia it could have been a mistake. At that time there were 49 States of the Union which shared in it, as I recall, and 14 foreign nations. I made the statement then that the second time we could call it a coincidence, but that the third time it happened it would get to be a habit. The habit has grown down through the years. I do not know what it will take to stop that habit, but if it takes a revolution—well.

West Virginia should share, and West Virginia should have its rightful share, if we are going to contribute our men in time of war. I do not have to tell you Members who serve on the military committees the imminence of war at this time. For that reason, we need everyone in America to join in a cooperative effort, working for a common goal—the defense of our land.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the chairman yield to me for a question?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Member from Mobile.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, in referring to section 608, I would like to ask a clarifying question. On November 19, some 95 bases were ordered closed by the Secretary of Defense, and Brookley Air Force Base was one of those to be phased out over a 4-year period. It is my understanding that the first people are to leave Brookley in June, this month 1965, and then continue for the next 4 years. Is it the chairman's interpretation of section 608 that the Congress would have a chance now, if this bill should pass, under section 608, to review the order to close Brookley Air Force Base?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I had not gone into that subject very thoroughly until it was called to my attention a few moments ago. It is my feeling that once this bill is signed by the President it would apply to any base that is open at that time. This is my curbstone opinion.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Regardless of whether an order has been issued for it?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is my opinion.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Is that your intention as well as your opinion?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Well, if I have a belief, I always follow it up with my intent.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished member of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the chairman again for presenting an innovating kind of a bill. As you will recall, we had the authorization legislation here just a few weeks ago which had some new items in it which were never before presented to this House of Representatives redefining the power of Congress. I believe in this legislation, in sections 608, 609, and 610, where we specifically set forth the authority to construct hospitals for our retirees and to have a referendum on the sale of real estate and a referendum on the closure of bases, we are redefining the power of this Congress, which I certainly think is to our advantage.

While I applauded the statement of my colleague from Washington a few minutes ago as his maiden speech before this House, I certainly did not intend to agree with the substance of his objection to this legislation, which was similar to that of my colleague from Michigan, wherein they state in section 608 power would lead to abuse by this Congress. I would like to point out we are dealing with 68 pages of legislation here and an 85-page summary explaining the bill. We have gone into such obscure items as constructing a two-car garage up at a little base near Nome, Alaska. We spent almost a full day on the issue as to whether or not we would convert from coal to oil and gas in a valley in Alaska near Elmendorf Air Force Base in Alaska. So if we can spend this amount of time on this trivial material with \$2 billion worth of expenditures on several hundred bases around the United States and in our foreign possessions and in the territory of our allies, then it would certainly appear to me as long as we vest in the Department of Defense the power ultimately to control the mission, which we certainly do by this legislation, we should certainly at least have a referendum on the matter of closing a military base. When it comes to constructing a military base, they have to come to our committee to get authorization to construct the facility. Certainly it does not mean that we are going to turn all of our bases into WPA projects. They closed one base in my district and substantially modified another. I think my district saw it was readily apparent that it should be phased out and modified and consolidated, and it did not develop into a big political harangue. I do not think we have to exercise our discretion in this section in that manner. We should exercise it with caution and discretion. We reviewed before our committee in a hearing for a full day the question of the closure of the New York Naval Shipyard. Certainly politics there played no part and we tried to decide the issue on the merits of the matter.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask support of this legislation and also 608, 609, and 610.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support H.R. 8439, this year's military construction authorization bill.

There is one aspect of the bill which I would like to discuss with you and that is the construction program for the Military Air Transport Service, and particularly that portion of the bill which re-

lates to the construction requirements necessitated by the introduction of the turboprop C-141 aircraft.

The Military Air Transport Service—MATS—program contains \$20 million for items at overseas and Zone of Interior bases. Of this amount, 29 items at a cost of \$14,703,000 support the new C-141 aircraft. A substantial portion is to expand and further modernize Travis Air Force Base, West Air Force Headquarters in my congressional district.

MATS provides worldwide support for all Department of Defense airlift missions. The dependence upon an airline of communication has permitted the Defense Department to reduce troops and supply buildup in overseas areas at a considerable savings in manpower and money without compromising our commitments. The introduction of the turboprop C-141 will greatly enhance the capability of MATS to perform the intertheater airlift mission.

This aircraft will form a major portion of the backbone of our airlift capability and provides a new future in airlift and operation throughout the free world. In conjunction with this new air transport capability, the Air Force has developed, under Defense Department direction, an integrated cargo handling system called 463L. This system is a method of handling cargo from preparation for shipment to delivery at forward area terminals with ground, terminal, and airlift equipment designed for compatibility with the special pallets on which cargo moves. A high degree of triservice coordination has been maintained to assure compatibility.

Part of the Air Force ground equipment portion of this system is airlift terminals that are automated to receive and process cargo through the terminal facilities at high speed. The operation of this system will permit a C-141 jet transport to be unloaded, refueled, and reloaded within a 1-hour period.

The manpower required for the terminal operation is considerably reduced by use of the automated system. The savings, in time and dollars, that is gained by use of this system is considerable and includes manpower, delivery time, more flying hours per aircraft, and efficiency of operation.

This new aircraft, plus the integrated cargo handling system, gives our country a definite advantage in its worldwide military commitments by providing quick reflex, nonstop, air delivery to almost any point on the globe, and provides the Department of Defense with a fast, long-range supply capability. It reduces reaction time and permits greater flexibility in decisions regarding our use of manpower and materials. Thus, denial of intermediate-stop refueling and reloading points to faraway overseas locations no longer make our actions partially dependent on favorable government-to-government agreements. The construction and conversion cost for facilities to support this new C-141 weapon system and the integrated cargo handling system, is small indeed, when compared to the overall savings made and advantages gained through their use.

This is merely one example of how relatively small construction costs enable us to realize not only dollar savings but also superior military advantage.

I urge each of you to support this bill.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. RONCALIO].

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for this time.

I rise to record my approval and support of H.R. 8439, and to congratulate the eminent and able chairman—the gentleman from South Carolina—and to compliment the members of his committee for the obvious and evident hard work that has gone into the preparation of a bill of this magnitude.

Earlier today it was my intention to strike from page 51 all of lines 18 and 19, which would have removed authority for the construction in the next 18 months of 100 units of housing at F. E. Warren Air Force Base, in Cheyenne, Wyo.

My reasons for this arise from the fact that approximately 1,200 units of housing near F. E. Warren Air Force Base and in Cheyenne are vacant at the present time. This is the result of the inevitable transition that affects all military installations when one program is completed and before additional programs are begun. If these units represent marginal or substandard housing—or were largely basement apartments unsuitable for military personnel—it would be different. But unfortunately well over 1,000 represent recently built or substantially new housing units. It is common knowledge in the Cheyenne area that mortgage foreclosures on residences have lately been on the increase.

However, to strike from this bill the authorization for these units would be to do offense to the planning of those within the Department whose vision in the long-range purposes for Warren exceeded mine.

I therefore asked that I be assured by the Department of Defense that a housing survey be made to test the need for such construction. I was given that assurance.

It is also my hope that the next round of military activity incident to the intercontinental ballistic missile program can be begun at F. E. Warren Air Force Base before or concurrent with the beginning of the construction program as contained in this bill.

As for section 608 of this legislation, I desire to associate myself with the chairman of the committee, and my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, FRANK EVANS, who is a member of that committee. I support their position fully that Members of Congress have the right to be notified before facilities are substantially reduced or closed.

I see no conflict in this position and the constitutional principle that the President of the United States shall be the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States. In my opinion, section 608 does not conflict with this principle in any way. It applies only to the structure of the Armed Services as

distinguished from its function in the national defense.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8439. I know the hours of work that have been put into it. And I believe, too, the number of amendments which were added reflect the painstaking consideration which went into the committee deliberation of this bill. It is to one such amendment that I would like to direct my remarks.

Over the years as air traffic in the Washington area increased, concern for safety grew among the executive and legislative departments and among the Department of Defense and the Federal Aviation Agency. Extensive studies were made by a special authoritative commission appointed by the President and headed by Gen. E. R. Quesada. This study included all military and civil airports in the Washington-Baltimore area and the complex air traffic patterns in the area. Action was started in 1958 and by 1962 the Air Force and the Navy had ceased fixed-wing flying operations at Bolling Air Force Base and Anacostia Naval Air Station in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission and with the authorization of the Congress. The removal of military flights adjacent to Washington National Airport assisted the Federal Aviation Agency immeasurably in minimizing aircraft operational conflicts within the highly saturated Washington airspace.

In this connection, it may be noted that the Navy, as the design agent for the Air Force and at Department of Defense direction, has developed a master plan for the development of a part of Bolling as a joint cantonment area for military personnel and for military administrative activities in the Washington area.

The Department of Defense at the moment has no present firm requirements for all of its landholdings at Bolling-Anacostia but has decided not to declare any of the land surplus on an immediate basis. Various public and private interests have applied for whatever land was not to be immediately developed to meet the needs of the Department of Defense. Some of these uses would make it unwise, or very questionable, for the Department of Defense to go forward with its plans for military housing and office space, because of an overconcentration in the area of industrial and traffic problems. In addition, a bill was introduced in the Congress, H.R. 554, which would provide for the resumption of flying operations at Bolling-Anacostia.

In view of the many and adverse and opposing interests which are at work on the Department of Defense's holdings and plans in the Bolling-Anacostia area, H.R. 8439 provides for the Congress to assume the responsibility for resolving these issues. Section 609 provides that all the land composing the Bolling-Anacostia complex will be required for military purposes in the foreseeable future and disposal will not be made unless specifically authorized by an act of Congress. This section will permit the Department of Defense to proceed in its orderly development of a cantonment area for military personnel and admin-

istrative activities in accordance with its needs. It will put the disposal of this much sought after land under the purview, responsibility, and authority of the Congress of the United States where it belongs rather than permit it to be dodged away, whittled up, and fought over by other Government agencies, outside pressure groups, and special interests. It will help preserve the use and the value of the projected defense expenditures in the land which is planned for retention by the Defense Establishment.

It would seem most imprudent to allow the precipitate disposal of this area, which has been in the possession of agencies of the Department of Defense for almost half a century, simply because a pressing need has not made immediate development mandatory. Historically, sufficient land for defense agencies which must be housed in the Washington area has been a matter of continuing concern.

Various sections of the defense agencies are now in many leased or temporary structures in this city. Their operations are fragmented and their efficiency reduced by physical separation. The new office building on Independence Avenue will relieve, but not solve, this problem.

There are both known requirements for portions of the Bolling-Anacostia complex and other requirements, which while not wholly clear at this time, undoubtedly will become much more clear as further study is made of the proper utilization of this valuable property.

Section 609 of this bill is designed to insure that no action is taken to dispose of any portion of the Bolling-Anacostia complex unless Congress has had an opportunity to indicate its will in this respect through legislative action. This was the first step taken by the committee.

The second step taken by the committee was the assignment to the Real Estate Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, to make an overall study of the proposed utilization of Bolling-Anacostia. The subcommittee has held one hearing so far and taken testimony from officials of the Department of Defense.

The subcommittee also has requested information from the General Services Administration as to the leasing and construction of office space in the metropolitan area and has also requested of the National Capital Planning Commission such information as is presently available with respect to that Commission's master planning for Bolling-Anacostia.

One thing I would like to make abundantly clear. The Armed Services Committee is not asking the House to hold this property merely because it is military property which, after all, is Federal property like any other; nor are we asking that the property be held merely for the sake of holding it for some conceivable, presently unknown, and vague use in the future. Our purpose is simply this: to make sure that a proper study has been made of the total utilization of this extremely valuable property before it is declared excess to military needs.

Frankly, I do not know what conclusions the subcommittee will ultimately arrive at. But I think I can assure the House that such conclusions as are

reached will result from a close, fair, and objective study of the Bolling-Anacostia property.

I hope that you can join with me not only in support of the language regarding the Bolling-Anacostia complex, but in the support of H.R. 8439, the military construction authorization bill.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate having this time to make a few remarks on a particular section of the military construction bill, H.R. 8439, which the House is presently considering. I am referring to the provision which authorizes the conversion of the Elmendorf Air Force Base and Fort Richardson steamplants from coal to gas.

Coal has long supplied the two installations located at Anchorage, Alaska, with a dependable source of energy from mines only 40 miles away via the Government's Alaska Railroad. The bases form the only major coal market and conversion would accordingly kill coal as an industry in Alaska's Matanuska Valley. This will mean at least 120 jobs will be immediately sacrificed affecting not only miners and their 270 dependents, but Alaska Railroad and base employees as well. The Matanuska Valley will suffer the loss of the mine's payroll, which exceeded \$1 million in 1964. In addition, the business community in the area will lose over \$1 million which the mine spends for supplies and services. The Alaska Railroad stands to lose \$700,000 to \$800,000 in annual revenues for the 250,000 tons of coal it hauls. If conversion is effected the area's economic losses would run about \$2,800,000 annually.

In reviewing these and other data presented on the proposed conversion, I must express concern over the course of action taken thus far. To my way of thinking certain contradictions in Government policy are evident. On the one hand, the Appalachia Commission has been established to administer programs of regional redevelopment and revitalization in an area plagued with chronic unemployment, particularly in the coal-mining industry. On the other hand, we are asked to approve a project which, if adopted, will kill the coal-mining industry in the Matanuska Valley, an area which already has substantial labor surplus.

To further illustrate the problems of conversion at the two bases, I am including a recent statement presented by Mr. W. A. Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers:

The United Mine Workers of America is unalterably opposed to the conversion of the Elmendorf Air Force Base and Fort Richardson power and heating plants to natural gas. These conversions are not in the public interest and would strike a damaging blow to the Alaskan coal industry and the people and communities which depend upon it.

We are certain that the decision to convert these bases was made without serious thought for the economic consequences of such an action. We are also sure that little, if any, consideration was given to what would happen to the coal miners of the State of Alaska when their jobs were eliminated and they were forced to live on unemployment compensation and even public dole.

Yet, such factors should be made a part of any decision to convert military bases from coal to other fuels. This is especially true in Alaska, a State where the military consumes 90 percent of the total coal production and where the loss of a military contract means corporate extinction.

Since these factors have not, in our opinion, been correctly evaluated, or probably not evaluated at all, we would like, for the record, to discuss them. We do this, not because of our hostility toward those who decide on fuel conversions in the Pentagon, but simply because we feel that these people cannot, or will not, take account of the human factors involved in fuel conversions.

The production of coal in the Matanuska Valley of Alaska provides a payroll of \$1 million annually to the coal miners and their families. An additional \$1 million is spent by the operators in the normal conduct of their business for services and supplies.

The decision to convert these bases under question means that this payroll and these purchases will be stopped. We have not heard any discussion on what will take their place. We have not seen any proposals as to what will fill the vacuum created by what is to us a harsh and arbitrary decision.

Nor are we aware of any plans to provide alternate sources of employment for the coal miners who will be displaced.

But there should be. All of these factors should be taken into consideration.

In a very real and immediate sense, the loss of such jobs represents a price that will have to be paid for the use of natural gas by the military at Elmendorf and Fort Richardson. Perhaps if such costs were considered, the decision which has been made would be reversed and coal would be retained.

We note with interest the Department of Defense did go so far as to ascertain the cost of unemployment compensation, which would be incurred in the event that the conversion were made. This cost has been set by the Department of Labor at \$215,000. We wonder if this has been figured into the cost of conversions and what effect it has had upon the economics of the situation.

More importantly, what happens to the people when the unemployment insurance runs out? What happens when their families and children have to endure all the rigors of poverty and all of the hopelessness of destitution because the breadwinner cannot secure a job?

We have seen situations like this all across the coalfields of this Nation. We have seen long-term unemployment and the misery that it brings. And we say to you today in the strongest possible terms that it should not be allowed to happen. We further contend that every possible resource of the Federal Government, as well as the concerted action of every person in this Nation, should be used to prevent it where possible and wipe away its stain where it exists.

It seems that we as a Nation face a question of policy with respect to the bases under question and, to a greater extent, on the whole question of military uses of coal. That decision comes, in essence, to the question of jobs. For the continuation of the use of coal in these two installations, as well as other such bases, will mean a continuation of jobs for coal miners. It will mean that men can work at their trade and provide for their families. It will return money into the economy of coal areas and allow business establishments to grow and prosper.

On the other hand, conversions throw men into idleness and place upon the taxpayers of the Nation the burden of caring for them and for their families.

There is also the question of the Alaskan Railroad. This railroad is a creature of the Government, having been built in the interest of national security and maintained in part by a Government subsidy. The economic viability of this railroad, however, is insured in large measure by the \$750,000 per year derived from the transportation of coal to the military bases in question. We understand that the loss of this coal freight revenue would force the railroad to close its line to Palmer, thus dealing a serious blow to the valley's agricultural industry, which, together with the coal industry, almost totally supports the economy of Palmer and the Matanuska Valley.

The Matanuska Valley coal deposits have provided a reliable fuel supply to the heating plants at Elmendorf Air Force Base and Fort Richardson. These bases constitute about 90 percent of the coal market. If they are converted to gas, the Matanuska Valley coal industry will be lost.

It would seem, therefore, that the Government has a special responsibility to the Alaskan coal industry and the men who work in it. But, more importantly, the Government has a responsibility to use its full resources to provide jobs for Americans who want them and to promote the stability of essential American industries. Apparently the policy of the administration is to do just that—wipe away the pockets of poverty in our land.

For these reasons, we strongly urge that the decision to convert Elmendorf Air Force Base and Fort Richardson to gas be reversed and that the use of coal be retained at these installations.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this opportunity to express my support of this legislation at the same time as I express my concern about the inclusion of section 608 in this bill. I feel certain that if this section becomes the law we will live to regret its inclusion. I voted against this section when it was offered as an amendment to this bill in committee. I feel certain that if this section becomes law we will be opening one more legislative hornet's nest to the detriment of the national interest.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state my unalterable opposition to any proposal to retain operations at the Springfield, Mass., Armyory rather than to transfer these operations to the arsenal located in Rock Island, Ill., as the Department of Defense had recommended.

After a study of the operations at the Springfield Armyory of 1½ years, it was determined that utilization of production would decline from 56 percent in fiscal year 1962 to an expected 37 percent in fiscal years 1965 and 1966. This degree of utilization could only be maintained by producing items that could have been procured from private industry. The high cost of operating the Springfield Armyory has been the subject of attention of the General Accounting Office and various congressional inquiries. Further, the aging condition of the Springfield

Armory has created a maintenance cost 50 percent higher than that of comparable facilities.

I would also like to point out that there are good and sufficient reasons for the Department of Defense's proposal to transfer the operations from the Springfield Armory to the Rock Island Arsenal. The Springfield capacity for producing small arms is duplicated by Rock Island; the Rock Island Arsenal has outstanding capabilities essential to the production of small arms including a high inventory of machine tools and a variety of manufacturing capabilities; the Rock Island Arsenal has the floor space required for the research and development mission, it has some indoor test firing facilities although some modernization is required. I would like to conclude by stating that the Department of Defense findings reveal that annual savings to be achieved by transferring operations from Springfield to Rock Island would exceed the savings which could be obtained by eliminating manufacturing operations at Springfield and continuing the research and development mission there.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly hope this amendment to section 608 of H.R. 8439, requiring the Defense Secretary to initiate a reporting procedure to the Armed Services Committee previous to any substantial reduction action or closure of a military base or facility, is accepted and approved by this House, because I believe it is a wise, a just, and a fair requirement prudently protective of the national interest.

I submit that there is no direct intention here of seriously contesting the executive discretion of the Secretary; on the contrary the substantive purpose of this amendment is to aid him in the wisest discharge of his grave responsibilities.

The real value of this amendment is that it seeks to join and coordinate the knowledge and the duty of the Congress with the power and responsibility of the Secretary in making decisions that vitally affect the welfare of a great number of American families, the security of the Nation and, indeed, the peace of the world.

In my own district, particularly at the Watertown Arsenal and at many other military installations throughout our State and region, a closure action was projected by the Defense Department against the repeatedly expressed strong convictions of a great many responsible leaders and organizations that such action was of extremely doubtful economic impact, extremely unwise, especially in the light of increased military participation throughout the world, in its impact upon our national defense posture and obviously and dangerously detrimental to the high morale of millions of loyal American workers and taxpayers. Indeed, a great many of us here in the Congress from our area, businessmen in the region and civic officials fully acquainted with the matter, remain firm in our patriotic convictions and belief that the closure action affecting the historically efficient defense production activity of the Watertown Arsenal and the faithful experienced employees of that famous

facility is not right, is not wise, is not prudent, is not economically justifiable and that it cannot be held certain by any authority that the full and essential war production effort of this arsenal will never again be needed.

Had the procedure proposed in this amendment been in existence, many of our grave questions and doubts and apprehensions, with the evidence sustaining them, could have been presented to the Armed Services Committee together with the allegations of the Defense Department on their side, and the whole problem would at least have been subject to a more thorough and impartial review through the Secretary and the committee and the Congress working together toward a better understanding for the good of the country.

As provided in the proposed amendment, if the Armed Services Committee has reason to believe that the effect of a substantial reduction or closure of a military facility would tend to impair the defense of the United States, it would report a resolution to the resolving House. The House would then have 40 days to act upon the resolution. If the resolving House fails to act upon such resolution, the Secretary would not be hindered in closing or reducing a military activity; otherwise he would be precluded from doing so.

This procedure, proposed by this amendment, appears, as I have said, to be wise and in the best national interest of all Americans and all branches of the Federal Government. I hope that it will be approved here and further hope that within its provisions the Armed Services Committee may see fit to review all the circumstances of the proposed closing of the Watertown Arsenal for the benefit of the employees that are so vitally affected and the national interest that is so gravely involved.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to submit the text of a press release which I have issued on the proposed military construction bill:

WASHINGTON.—Congressman ARCH A. MOORE, JR., said today a bill proposing the authorization of nearly \$2 billion for military construction the next fiscal year doesn't carry a single penny for West Virginia.

"My only reason for pointing this out to the people of West Virginia is that our State is always used as a prime example of the need for economic, social and educational help at the Federal level by reason of its so-called depressed condition," Moore said. "Yet, every year, literally billions of dollars in regular Federal expenditures bypass West Virginia and have been doing so for several years."

The First District Congressman emphasized that these billions of dollars represent the defense spending of the Nation and create thousands of jobs in other States.

"This is the difference between the types of Federal dollars West Virginia receives and other States get," Moore said. "I believe it is time West Virginians are made aware of this. I am sure that a vast majority of West Virginians as well as myself prefer Federal dollars that create jobs rather than those creating handouts."

The House Armed Services Committee last week reported out favorably the bill authorizing \$1,934,927,000 for military construction the next fiscal year, starting July 1.

The Congressman declared that some would say these dollars can't be spent in our

State because of the geography, climate, weather, or for any number of other reasons. "However," he continued, "millions of dollars are going to neighboring States that even today because of their conditions are also participants in the Appalachia redevelopment program." He added:

"For example, Virginia would receive upwards of \$61 million under the military construction authorization bill the next fiscal year; Maryland would receive more than \$38 million, and Kentucky would receive more than \$18.5 million—yet West Virginia would receive not a single cent."

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I shall oppose passage of this measure this afternoon.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, while I support H.R. 8439, I believe that the adoption of the amendment offered by my colleague from New York is mandatory. Congress must not abrogate its authority to provide for the defense of our Nation—we must have the final veto authority over any order closing any present existing military installation.

Mr. Chairman, we are at war—cold, peacekeeping, or otherwise—and I do not believe we should enter into a program of disarmament. And, call it what you may, budget cuts, savings, or otherwise, this program to close many of our military installations is disarmament without the consent of Congress.

The United States, our defenses, cannot afford the dismantling of a great military installation such as the New York Naval Shipyard. The justification for the continued operation of the New York Naval Shipyard needs no "fancy survey." Past and present undisputed performance is its justification. Paper figures and anticipated happenings and cost and savings must fall when matched by actual fact based on proven performance. The New York Naval Shipyard has the best and the highest performance in all wars as to construction, mobilization, and so forth.

We must retain the New York Naval Shipyard, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. Chairman, I will also support the amendment to be offered by my New York colleague [Mr. WOLFF] to prevent the transfer from Sands Point, N.Y., to Orlando, Fla., the naval experimentation station, which transfer is not justified.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, one of the basic problems of the services in general and the Army in particular is retaining qualified personnel. It costs a lot of money to train young soldiers and lieutenants, and every time one leaves the service after only 2 or 3 years, the Army not only loses that investment but also must repeat the cost in training a replacement. For example, over \$35,000 must be invested when a lieutenant hangs up his uniform—many times the cost of a bachelor officer quarters space.

One of the reasons many young men and women cite for leaving the service is poor living conditions; namely, having to live in deteriorated temporary wooden barracks and bachelor officer quarters, eat in old wooden messhalls, and use dilapidated World War II facilities. If

the young man is married, or planning to get married, family separation due to the shortage of family quarters often affects his decision to get out of the service. Consequently, when we build new barracks and bachelor officer quarters, supporting items, and family quarters, we not only take better care of our military men and women but we also make a wise investment toward reducing costly military personnel turnover.

It is interesting to note that the Army now requests barracks in the form of regimental size complexes whenever possible. These complexes, which we started in fiscal year 1963 with one at Fort Dix, are balanced packages for about 3,500 men, and include not only the barracks and messhalls but also the related support items, such as battalion and regimental headquarters, classrooms, dispensary, chapel, branch PX, and regimental gymnasium. The Army does not have to come back year after year to round out the supporting items on a piecemeal basis as is the case for the older troop housing areas, and the troops have a complete living area as soon as they move into their new barracks.

The bill last year brought the Army up to a reasonable rate for replacing barracks and bachelor officer quarters, and the bill this year essentially continues that level. We must sustain that level for a few more years if we are going to get the Army troops into modern permanent barracks and bachelor officer quarters and family housing in which they will be proud to live and reenlist for more years of service.

I believe this is not only our patriotic duty to the men and women in uniform and their families, but this is also our fiscal responsibility to invest these construction dollars where they will pay dividends in retention of skilled men and women of the services.

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join in the support of H.R. 8439. It is a balanced bill which meets the responsibilities of today. It attacks the problems of obsolescence and still provides the operational facilities for global commitments.

One element of the bill, however, as submitted by the Department of Defense, disturbed me. I refer to the area of replacement of obsolete hospital facilities. This year, as in each year since 1963, the Department has been planning hospital construction without including any beds for retired personnel and their dependents. Too, the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget have made surveys of community facilities to determine if obstetrical facilities are required in military hospitals. This policy is disturbing to the committee in that it does not take into consideration emergency mobilization requirements. Further, it is a vehicle to exclude promised hospital care to military retirees and their dependents.

Thus, the committee has deemed it necessary to place specific restrictions in this bill. If you will remember, last year a special subcommittee was appointed for the purpose of inquiring into Department of Defense policy on hospital construction. This subcommit-

tee conducted extensive hearings and published its report in September of 1964. The recommendations made concerned the provision of medical care for retired military personnel and their dependents, as well as the dependents of active duty military personnel.

The Department of Defense has also been engaged in an extensive study of the retired care problem. To date, they have not acted upon their study nor have they implemented the recommendations of the special subcommittee on hospital construction.

For this reason, interim restrictions have been placed in this bill to provide beds for retired military personnel and their dependents equal to the average experience of the last 3 years. In keeping with the recommendations of the subcommittee made last September, we have also seen fit to require that obstetrical facilities be provided for the dependents.

This bill contains several additions to existing permanent hospitals. Over the past decade there has been considerable change in the practice of medicine. Emphasis has shifted from caring for sick persons on an inpatient status when they occupy a hospital bed and are absent from duty, to caring for these same persons on an outpatient status where they can remain on duty and continue their normal family life. This clinic concept of providing medical treatment on an outpatient basis, whenever the nature of the disease or injury permits, has been a major factor in reducing the non-effective ratio. Within the Air Force alone, it amounted to a saving of 1,255,807 man-days in 1964 over what this would have been 10 years ago. While this has been a saving in manpower, it has resulted in a greater requirement for outpatient facilities in our hospitals than was envisioned at the time of their construction.

I believe the bill as it now stands corrects the objections which the committee found.

I urge the support of H.R. 8439.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to offer congratulations to my chairman [Mr. RIVERS] for his leadership with respect to H.R. 8439. It is, indeed, an honor to serve on his committee.

I am pleased to join with my fellow committee members in giving this bill unanimous approval. It is as economical and practical as can be made and will sensibly serve our military departments in fiscal year 1966.

There is one part of the bill—section 608—which has caused considerable discussion. This section calls for the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department to give prior notice to Congress of any planned closure or substantial reduction to any base. I admit that I had some initial misgivings as to the overall advisability of this provision. However, after due consideration I decided that section 608 would not prevent me from supporting the bill.

First of all, there is no question of the constitutionality of such a provision.

Article I, section 8, of the U.S. Constitution reads in part:

The Congress shall have power * * * to pay the debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy; To make rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The Founding Fathers obviously meant for Congress to hold such power over the military.

May I also add that I believe section 608 would be in the best interests of my district, living as I do in the Dayton, Ohio, area where Wright-Patterson Air Force Base is located.

In the event that an attempt is made to close, move, or substantially reduce Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, and it appears that the move is politically inspired to raid the base for parochial reasons, I would have an opportunity to be heard as a result of the process of requiring a notice to the Congress.

As a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I enthusiastically support the bill with the controversial section included.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

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 preparations, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Continental United States, Less Army Materiel Command

(First Army)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Hospital facilities and troop housing, \$11,008,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing, \$17,948,000.

Federal Office Building, Brooklyn, New York: Administrative facilities, \$636,000.

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Hospital facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$18,089,000.

(Second Army)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Training facilities, research, development and test facilities, hospital facilities, and administrative facilities, \$8,122,000.

East Coast Radio Transmitter Station, Woodbridge, Virginia: Utilities, \$211,000.

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Utilities, \$158,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, \$15,422,000.

Fort Lee, Virginia: Community facilities, \$700,000.

Fort Meade, Maryland: Ground improvements, \$550,000.

Fort Monroe, Virginia: Administrative facilities, \$4,950,000.

Vint Hill Farms, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, troop housing and utilities, \$1,029,000.

(Third Army)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, troop housing and utilities, \$5,325,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing and community facilities, \$4,106,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and utilities, \$1,992,000.

Fort Gordon, Georgia: Training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, \$18,485,000.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing facilities, \$17,281,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, \$3,720,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Hospital facilities and utilities, \$2,317,000.

(Fourth Army)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, \$1,416,000.

Brooke Army Medical Center, Texas: Training facilities, \$8,300,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$18,081,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Medical facilities, \$1,300,000.

Fort Polk, Louisiana: Training facilities, troop housing and utilities, \$1,118,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, \$2,268,000.

(Fifth Army)

Fort Carson, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, \$9,443,000.

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana: Hospital facilities, troop housing and community facilities, \$4,017,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Operational facilities and medical facilities, \$2,893,000.

Fort Riley, Kansas: Maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities and utilities, \$9,555,000.

Fort Sheridan, Illinois: Utilities, \$47,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing facilities, \$16,084,000.

(Sixth Army)

Fort Irwin, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,741,000.

Fort Lewis, Washington: Training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, \$710,000.

Presidio of Monterey, California: Training facilities and troop housing, \$3,046,000.

Fort Ord, California: Maintenance facilities, \$974,000.

Presidio of San Francisco, California: Administrative facilities, \$1,299,000.

Two Rock Ranch, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$385,000.

West Coast Receiving Station, California: Utilities, \$166,000.

Yakima Firing Range, Washington: Troop housing, \$56,000.

(Military District of Washington)

Army Map Service, Maryland: Operational facilities, \$182,000.

Cameron Station, Virginia: Medical facilities, \$168,000.

Fort Myer, Virginia: Troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$5,587,000.

Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia: Medical facilities and utilities, \$611,000.

Army Materiel Command

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Administrative facilities and utilities, \$3,419,000.

Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Texas: Maintenance facilities, \$1,941,000.

Anniston Army Depot, Alabama: Maintenance facilities, \$637,000.

Bayonne Naval Supply Center, Bayonne, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$3,658,000.

Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, \$779,000.

Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory, New Hampshire: Maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, \$1,184,000.

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Operational facilities, research, development and test facilities, and utilities, \$11,771,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Community facilities, \$137,000.

Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland: Research, development and test facilities, and utilities, \$2,736,000.

Granite City Army Depot, Illinois: Utilities, \$56,000.

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Troop housing, \$320,000.

Jefferson Proving Ground, Indiana: Operational facilities, \$52,000.

Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$2,239,000.

Lexington Army Depot, Kentucky: Administrative facilities, and utilities, \$526,000.

Fort Monmouth, New Jersey: Troop housing, \$586,000.

Natick Laboratories, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, \$1,371,000.

Navajo Army Depot, Arizona: Utilities, \$56,000.

New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities, \$815,000.

Oakland Army Terminal, California: Community facilities, \$912,000.

Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey: Administrative facilities, \$584,000.

Pueblo Army Depot, Colorado: Utilities, \$337,000.

Red River Army Depot, Texas: Maintenance facilities and utilities, \$465,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Training facilities, \$1,364,000.

Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois: Administrative facilities, and utilities, \$826,000.

Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, \$36,000.

Savanna Army Depot, Illinois: Training facilities, \$102,000.

Sharpe Army Depot, California: Maintenance facilities, \$175,000.

Sierra Army Depot, California: Utilities, \$115,000.

Tobyhanna Army Depot, Pennsylvania: Supply facilities, \$199,000.

Tooele Army Depot, Utah: Utilities, \$340,000.

Watervliet Arsenal, New York: Utilities, \$1,713,000.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico: Research, development and test facilities, and utilities, \$473,000.

United States Army, Hawaii

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities, troop housing and utilities, \$3,175,000.

Outside the United States

Okinawa, various: Community facilities and utilities, \$2,558,000.

Germany, various: Operational facilities and troop housing, \$2,046,000.

Fort Clayton, Canal Zone: Utilities, \$337,000.

Classified location: Operational facilities, \$2,400,000.

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 \$79,840,000.

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 and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) 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 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. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1966, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

Sec. 104. (a) Public Law 86-500, as amended, is amended under heading "Inside the United States" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to "Watertown Arsenal Massachusetts," strike out "\$1,849,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,952,000."

(b) Public Law 86-500, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502, "\$80,460,000" and "\$147,390,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$80,563,000" and "\$147,493,000", respectively.

Sec. 105. (a) Public Law 87-554, as amended, is amended under heading "Inside the United States" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Continental Army Command (Fifth Army)", with respect to "Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri," strike out "\$8,567,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,066,000".

(b) Public Law 87-554, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602, "\$101,816,000" and "\$150,325,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$102,315,000" and "\$150,824,000", respectively.

Sec. 106. (a) Public Law 88-174, as amended, is amended under heading "Inside the United States" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Continental Army Command (Fifth Army)", with respect to "Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri", strike out "\$8,163,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,737,000."

(2) Under the subheading "Army Component Commands (Pacific Command Area)", with respect to "Hawaii Defense Area, Hawaii", strike out "\$150,000" and insert in place thereof "\$279,000".

(b) Public Law 88-174, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602, "\$154,993,000" and "\$199,650,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$155,696,000" and "\$200,353,000", respectively.

Sec. 107 (a) Public Law 88-390 is amended under heading "Inside the United States" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Continental Army Command (Military District of Washington, District of Columbia)", with respect to "Fort Myer, Virginia" strike out "\$4,052,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,524,000".

(2) Under the subheading "United States Army Materiel Command (United States Army Weapons Command)" with respect to "Watervliet Arsenal, New York" strike out "\$77,000" and insert in place thereof "\$161,000".

(3) Under the subheading "United States Military Academy, West Point, New York" strike out "\$20,578,000" and insert in place thereof "\$27,997,000".

(4) Under the subheading "Army Security Agency" with respect to "Two Rock Ranch Station, California," strike out "\$1,014,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,210,000".

(b) Public Law 88-390 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "\$241,526,000" and "\$292,587,000", and inserting "\$249,697,000" and "\$300,758,000", respectively.

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

Bureau of Ships Facilities

(Naval shipyards)

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$5,105,000.

Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington: Maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and ground improvements, \$1,692,000.

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, \$5,917,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$2,931,000.

Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, California: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$1,129,000.

Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$2,703,000.

Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$3,591,000.

Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$3,487,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Maintenance facilities, \$998,000.

Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, California: Maintenance facilities, \$450,000.

(Fleet support stations)

Headquarters, Commander-in-Chief, Atlantic Fleet, Norfolk, Virginia: Troop housing, \$873,000.

Naval Inshore Undersea Warfare Group, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$216,000.

(Research, development, test and evaluation stations)

Navy Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Florida: Supply facilities, \$97,000.

Fleet Base Facilities

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$765,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California: Maintenance facilities, \$396,000.

Naval Command Systems Support Activity, District of Columbia: Administrative facilities, \$643,000.

Naval Station, Key West, Florida: Supply facilities, and medical facilities, \$1,293,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,319,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$2,350,000.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$2,112,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, and community facilities, \$2,133,000.

Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Administrative facilities, and troop housing, \$670,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$271,000.

Naval Station, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,508,000.

Naval Station, Treasure Island, California: Administrative facilities, medical facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,594,000.

Naval Weapons Facilities

(Naval air training stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$152,000.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas: Real estate, \$184,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Ellyson Field, Florida: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,530,000.

Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$637,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$557,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee: Training facilities, and troop housing, \$5,792,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$2,263,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Saufley Field, Florida: Training facilities, \$664,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Troop housing, and utilities, \$1,355,000.

(Field support stations)

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$5,890,000.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$1,284,000.

Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Oahu, Hawaii: Troop housing and community facilities, \$521,000.

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational facilities, \$161,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, \$1,124,000.

Naval Air Facility, El Centro, California: Operational facilities, \$500,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$441,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$11,595,000.

Pacific Fleet Tactical Range, Kauai, Hawaii: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,878,000.

Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$834,000.

Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Training facilities, \$199,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Training facilities, \$990,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida: Operational facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$892,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, \$914,000.

Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California: Operational facilities, \$476,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$2,774,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California: Troop housing, and utilities, \$853,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$5,482,000.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, and community facilities, \$509,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Ream Field, California: Troop housing, \$2,024,000.

Naval Air Station, Sanford, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$7,365,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$3,754,000.

(Marine Corps air stations)

Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$2,773,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Landing Field, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational facilities, \$264,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$4,569,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$659,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing, \$2,587,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$2,483,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$619,000.

(Fleet readiness stations)

Naval Ammunition Depot, Charleston, South Carolina: Medical facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities \$1,355,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Concord, California: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$609,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$597,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, California: Maintenance facilities, \$100,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia: Real estate, \$81,000.

(Research, development, test, and evaluation stations)

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California: Operational facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, \$495,000.

Naval Parachute Facility, El Centro, California: Research, development and test facilities, and real estate, \$2,300,000.

Naval Air Engineering Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Utilities, \$155,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities; and, on San Nicolas Island, operational facilities, and troop housing, \$2,480,000.

Supply Facilities

Naval Supply Depot, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, \$726,000.

Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California: Administrative facilities, \$590,000.

Marine Corps Facilities

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Supply facilities, \$200,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Training facilities, maintenance

facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,771,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$8,481,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Training facilities, \$2,912,000.

Service School Facilities

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Training facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$9,532,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lake, Illinois: Training facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$11,457,000.

Naval Schools Command, Mare Island, California: Troop housing, \$432,000.

Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California: Training facilities, \$2,140,000.

Officer Candidate School, Newport, Rhode Island: Training facilities, \$3,000,000.

Fleet Training Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Training facilities, \$2,221,000.

Naval Schools Command, Norfolk, Virginia: Training facilities, \$566,000.

Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare School, San Diego, California: Troop housing, \$1,212,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Training facilities, and troop housing, \$10,306,000.

Naval Schools Command, Treasure Island, California: Troop housing, \$3,302,000.

Medical Facilities

National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland: Troop housing, \$800,000.

Naval Hospital, Charleston, South Carolina: Troop housing, \$353,000.

Naval Hospital Corps School, Great Lakes, Illinois: Troop housing, \$1,696,000.

Naval Hospital, Newport, Rhode Island: Hospital and medical facilities, \$4,736,000.

Naval Hospital, Oakland, California: Troop housing, \$673,000.

Naval Dispensary and Dental Clinic, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Medical facilities, \$2,800,000.

Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Troop housing, \$315,000.

Naval Hospital, Saint Albans, New York: Troop housing \$718,000.

Naval Hospital, San Diego, California: Medical facilities, \$1,433,000.

Communication Facilities

Naval Communication Station, Adak, Alaska: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, \$303,000.

Naval Radio Station, Mount Moffett, Adak, Alaska: Operational facilities, \$1,185,000.

Naval Autodin Facility, Albany, Georgia: Operational facilities, \$313,000.

Naval Radio Station, Annapolis, Maryland: Troop housing, \$86,000.

National Naval Reserve Master Control Radio Station, Arlington, Virginia: Operational facilities, \$40,000.

Naval Communication Station, San Francisco (Stockton), California: Administrative facilities, and troop housing, \$518,000.

Naval Autodin Facility, Syracuse, New York: Operational facilities, \$45,000.

Naval Communication Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,248,000.

Various locations: Utilities, \$2,000,000.

Office of Naval Research Facilities

Naval Arctic Research Laboratory, Barrow, Alaska: Research, development and test facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$3,000,000.

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development and test facilities, and utilities, \$7,202,000.

Naval Training Device Center, Orlando, Florida: Research, development and test facilities, \$851,000.

Yards and Docks Facilities

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Davisville, Rhode Island: Training facilities, community facilities, and real estate, \$774,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Newport, Rhode Island: Utilities, \$390,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$1,863,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities, \$130,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California: Troop housing, \$893,000.

Outside the United States

Fleet Base Facilities

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Operational facilities, \$187,000.

Fleet Activities, Ryukyus, Okinawa: Troop housing, \$1,287,000.

Headquarters Support Activity, Taipei, Republic of China: Administrative facilities, \$199,000.

Naval Weapons Facilities

Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam: Maintenance facilities, and medical facilities, \$138,000.

Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan: Operational facilities, \$2,047,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Republic of the Philippines: Maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$331,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Futema, Okinawa: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,499,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Iwakuni, Japan: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$639,000.

Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Administrative facilities, and troop housing, \$497,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,986,000.

Naval Station, Rota, Spain: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities and utilities, \$5,616,000.

Supply Facilities

Naval Supply Depot, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines: Administrative facilities, \$120,000.

Marine Corps Facilities

Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$841,000.

Communication Facilities

Naval Radio Station, Barrigada, Guam: Operational facilities, \$526,000.

Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$1,701,000.

Naval Radio Station, Fort Allen, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$94,000.

Naval Radio Station, Isabela, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, and real estate, \$1,237,000.

Naval Communication Station, Londonderry, Northern Ireland: Operational facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$1,364,000.

Naval Radio Station, Sabana Seca, Puerto Rico: Community facilities, \$603,000.

Naval Communication Station, San Miguel, Republic of the Philippines: Operational facilities, \$563,000.

Naval Radio Station, Summit, Canal Zone: Operational facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$383,000.

Various locations: Utilities, \$4,500,000.

Yards and Docks Facilities

Navy Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines: Utilities, \$2,078,000.

Sec. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$41,099,000.

Sec. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) 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. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1966, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

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

Ent Air Force Base, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,767,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Operational facilities and troop housing, \$1,297,000.

Kincheloe Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$189,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, \$258,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$3,736,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities and utilities, \$950,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Maintenance facilities, \$104,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, \$117,000.

Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, New York: Operational facilities, \$414,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Operational facilities and community facilities, \$294,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$2,991,000.

Air Force Accounting and Finance Center
Air Force Accounting and Finance Center, Denver, Colorado: Administrative facilities and utilities, \$225,000.

Air Force Logistics Command

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational facilities and research, development, and test facilities, \$1,890,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$6,444,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$6,039,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$4,996,000.

Newark Air Force Station, Newark, Ohio: Utilities, \$181,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, \$8,874,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$6,983,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$7,579,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Research, development, and test facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$12,319,000.

Air Force Systems Command

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Operational facilities, \$1,861,000.

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities and troop housing, \$588,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research development, and test facilities, hospital facilities, and utilities, \$2,897,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$2,684,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$3,405,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and community facilities, \$1,517,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$431,000.

Various locations, Eastern Test Range: Troop housing and utilities, \$415,000.

Air Training Command

Buckley Air Force Base, Aurora, Colorado: Operational facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, \$106,000.

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$6,242,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$1,781,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Training facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$3,567,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$5,510,000.

Laredo Air Force Base, Laredo, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$1,852,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Troop housing and community facilities, \$866,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Community facilities, \$352,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$2,933,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$1,782,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Maintenance facilities and troop housing, \$651,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$1,533,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$4,319,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$1,653,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Training facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$1,342,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$2,920,000.

Air University

Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Troop housing and utilities, \$741,000.
Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Troop housing, \$770,000.

Alaskan Air Command

Eielson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska: Operational facilities and supply facilities, \$601,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska: Operational facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,540,000.

Galena Airport, Galena, Alaska: Supply facilities, \$374,000.

King Salmon Airport, Naknek, Alaska: Community facilities, \$288,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$7,837,000.

Headquarters Command

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$3,187,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and real estate, \$3,359,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Training facilities and maintenance facilities \$1,180,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities and utilities, \$2,094,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,240,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and community facilities, \$3,319,000.

Pacific Air Force

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$3,315,000.

Wheeler Air Force Base, Wahiawa, Hawaii: Community facilities, \$396,000.

Strategic Air Command

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, \$46,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$3,015,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Hospital facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$1,839,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$1,792,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities, hospital facilities, and community facilities, \$1,785,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational facilities and troop housing, \$662,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Troop housing and community facilities, \$389,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational facilities and community facilities, \$306,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, \$4,235,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Community facilities, \$426,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Community facilities, \$187,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Community facilities, \$263,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$4,453,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$1,908,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Operational facilities and supply facilities, \$148,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities and troop housing, \$1,169,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Community facilities, \$565,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Troop housing and utilities, \$577,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$3,051,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Maintenance facilities and troop housing, \$239,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, \$109,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Maintenance facilities and troop housing, \$171,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Training facilities and utilities, \$389,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Maintenance facilities, \$126,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$4,643,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$691,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Community facilities, \$796,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts: Supply facilities, \$298,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri: Community facilities, \$218,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, \$45,000.

Tactical Air Command

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, \$1,823,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$2,085,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$2,775,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$3,948,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$774,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$9,679,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational facilities, medical facilities, and community facilities, \$755,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, ground improvements and real estate, \$1,639,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Operational facilities and supply facilities, \$1,636,000.

Pope Air Force Base, Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$2,560,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$1,189,000.

United States Air Force Academy

United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Training facilities, \$8,872,000.

United States Air Force Security Service Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Texas: Community facilities and utilities, \$768,000.

Aircraft Control and Warning System

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,377,000.

Outside the United States

Air Defense Command

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$970,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Wake Island Air Force Station, Wake Island: Supply facilities, troop housing and utilities, \$1,391,000.

Various locations: Maintenance facilities and medical facilities, \$953,000.

Pacific Air Force

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$21,935,000.

Strategic Air Command

Various locations: Utilities, \$335,000.

United States Air Forces in Europe

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hos-

pital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$25,255,000.

United States Air Force Southern Command

Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities and community facilities, \$1,686,000.

United States Air Force Security Service

Various locations: Operational facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$3,411,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force 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 \$93,463,000.

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 and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons development, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) 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 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. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1966, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 88-174, as amended, is amended in section 301 under the heading "Inside the United States" as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Air Force Systems Command", with respect to Sacramento Peak Upper Air Research Site, Alamogordo, New Mexico, by striking out "\$2,889,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$3,167,000".

(2) Under the subheading "Strategic Air Command", with respect to March Air Force Base, Riverside, California, by striking out "\$186,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$255,000".

(b) Public Law 88-174, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 the amounts of "\$161,940,000" and "\$491,622,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$162,287,000" and "\$491,969,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense 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 defense agencies for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Defense Atomic Support Agency

Sandia Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Utilities, \$188,000.

Clarksville Base, Clarksville, Tennessee: Troop housing, \$36,000.

Killeen Base, Killeen, Texas: Troop housing, \$45,000.

Defense Intelligence Agency

Arlington Hall Station, Arlington, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$17,900,000.

Defense Supply Agency

Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio: Maintenance facilities and supply facilities, \$301,000.

Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee: Supply facilities, \$266,000.

Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah: Supply facilities, \$329,000.

Defense Clothing and Textile Supply Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, \$950,000.

Defense Industrial Supply Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, \$255,000.

National Security Agency

Fort Meade, Maryland: Operational facilities and production facilities, \$6,075,000.

Office of Secretary of Defense

Armed Forces Radio and Television Service, Los Angeles, California: Operational facilities, \$18,000.

Outside the United States

Defense Atomic Support Agency

Johnston Island Air Force Base: Research, development and test facilities, \$3,688,000.

SEC. 402. 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 \$20,000,000.

SEC. 403. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities which he determines to be vital to the security of the United States, 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 \$50,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense, 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.

TITLE V

Military family housing

SEC. 501. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units and trailer court facilities, in the numbers hereinafter listed, but no family housing construction shall be commenced at any such locations in the United States, until the Secretary shall have consulted with the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. If the Secretary and the Administrator are unable to reach agreement with respect to the availability of adequate private housing at any location, the Secretary shall immediately notify the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in writing, of such difference of opinion, and no contract for construction at such location shall be entered into for a period of thirty days after such notification has been given. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

(a) Family housing units for—

(1) The Department of the Army, two thousand four hundred and seventy units, \$47,064,000.

Presidio of San Francisco, California, one hundred and fifty units.

Fort Benning, Georgia, three hundred units.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, fifty units.

Fort Meade, Maryland, three hundred and forty units.

Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, one hundred units.

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, two hundred units.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina, one hundred and eighty units.

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, three hundred units.

Fort Monroe, Virginia, fifty units.

Fort Myer, Virginia, one hundred and twenty units.

Atlantic side, Canal Zone, one hundred units.

Pacific side, Canal Zone, three hundred units.

Fort Buckner, Okinawa, two hundred and eighty units.

(2) The Department of the Navy, four thousand eight hundred and forty units, \$85,200,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California, fifty-two units.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, two hundred and fifty units.

Naval complex, Long Beach, California, two hundred units.

Naval Post Graduate School, Monterey, California, two hundred and eight units.

Naval complex, East Bay, San Francisco, California, four hundred units.

Naval complex, South Bay, San Francisco, California, three hundred units.

Naval complex, West Bay, San Francisco, California, three hundred units.

Naval complex, Washington, District of Columbia, three hundred units.

Naval Base, Key West, Florida, four hundred units.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, two hundred and fifty units.

United States Navy installations, Oahu, Hawaii, three hundred units.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, two hundred units.

Naval Base, Newport, Rhode Island, two hundred units.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island, two hundred units.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas, three hundred and fifty units.

Naval Complex, Norfolk, Virginia, five hundred units.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia, one hundred units.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, one hundred and fifty units.

Naval Complex, Naha, Okinawa, forty units.

Naval Station, Sangley Point, Republic of Philippines, one hundred and forty units.

(3) The Department of the Air Force, four thousand nine hundred and ninety units, \$92,670,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, two hundred units.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, two hundred units.

Beale Air Force Base, California, three hundred units.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, three hundred units.

Ent Air Force Base, Colorado, forty-nine units.

Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia, three hundred units.

Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, three hundred units.

United States Air Force installations, Oahu, Hawaii, two hundred and fifty units.

Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, one hundred and fifty units.

England Air Force Base, Louisiana, three hundred and fifty units.

Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, two hundred and fifty units.

Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, two hundred units.

Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, one unit.

Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico, one hundred and fifty units.

Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, one hundred units.

F. E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, one hundred units.

Pacific side, Canal Zone, two hundred and fifty units.

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, two hundred units.

Goose Airbase, Newfoundland, Canada, one hundred units.

Kadena Airbase, Okinawa, two hundred units.

Naha Airbase, Okinawa, one hundred and seventy units.

Clark Airbase, Republic of Philippines, four hundred units.

Site 4-S, seventy units.

Site 6-S, two hundred units.

Site QC, two hundred units.

(b) Traller court facilities for:

(1) The Department of the Navy, two hundred spaces, \$360,000.

(2) The Department of the Air Force, four hundred spaces, \$720,000.

Sec. 502. Authorizations for the construction of family housing provided in this Act shall be subject to the following limitations on cost, which shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and all other installed equipment and fixtures:

(a) The cost per unit of family housing constructed in the United States (other than Hawaii and Alaska) and Puerto Rico shall not exceed—

\$26,000 for general officers or equivalent;

\$19,800 for colonels or equivalent;

\$17,600 for majors and/or lieutenant colonels or equivalent;

\$15,400 for all other commissioned or warrant officer personnel or equivalent except the four-bedroom housing units authorized by sections 4774(g), 7574(e), and 9774(g) of title 10, United States Code, may be constructed at a cost not to exceed \$17,000.

\$13,200 for enlisted personnel, except that four-bedroom housing units authorized by sections 4774(f), 7574(d), and 9774(f) of title 10, United States Code, may be constructed at a cost not to exceed \$15,000.

(b) When family housing units are constructed in areas other than those listed in subsection (a), the average cost of all such units, in any project of fifty units or more, shall not exceed \$32,000, and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$40,000.

(c) The cost limitations provided in subsections (a) and (b) shall be applied to the five-foot line.

(d) For all units constructed in the areas listed in subsection (a), exclusive of the project for the United States Military Academy at West Point, the average unit cost for each military department shall not exceed \$17,500, including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate cost of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(e) No family housing unit in the areas listed in subsection (a) shall be constructed at a total cost exceeding \$32,000, including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(f) Units constructed at the United States Military Academy, West Point, shall not be subject to the limitations of subsections (a) through (e) of this section, but the average cost of such units shall not exceed \$36,000, including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

Sec. 503. (a) Notwithstanding the limitations on net floor area and cost contained in section 502 of this Act and in sections 4774(b), 7574(b), and 9774(b) of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense, or his

designee, is authorized to construct or acquire family quarters for general officers assigned to the following positions which involve exceptional representational responsibilities for the benefit of the United States:

Commander in Chief, North American Air Defense Command, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Commander in Chief, Strike Command, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.

(b) For any set of quarters constructed under the authority of this section the net floor area shall not exceed three thousand six hundred square feet, the cost to the five-foot line shall not exceed \$80,000 and the total costs, including those for construction, land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities, shall not exceed \$100,000.

(c) For any set of quarters acquired by purchase under the authority of this section the total costs of acquisition shall not exceed \$100,000.

Sec. 504. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions not otherwise authorized by law, to existing public quarters at a cost not to exceed—

(a) For the Department of the Army, \$8,000,000.

(b) For the Department of the Navy, \$5,000,000.

(c) For the Department of the Air Force, \$4,800,000.

(d) For the Defense Agencies, \$396,000.

Sec. 505. Section 515 of Public Law 84-161 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 515. During fiscal years 1966 through and including 1967, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military installations in the United States and Puerto Rico 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 installations. Such housing facilities may be leased on an individual or multiple unit basis and not more than seven thousand five hundred of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may not exceed an average of \$160 a month for each military department, including the cost of utilities and maintenance and operation."

Sec. 506. Section 507 of Public Law 88-174 (77 Stat. 307, 326) is amended by deleting the figures "1964" and "1965," and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "1966" and "1967."

Sec. 507. The Secretary of Defense or his designee is authorized to relocate two hundred units of relocatable housing from Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, to other military installations where there are housing shortages: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the proposed new locations and estimated costs, and no contract shall be awarded within thirty days of such notification.

Sec. 508. There is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of Defense or his designee for military family housing as authorized by law for the following purposes:

(a) for construction and acquisition of family housing, including improvements to adequate quarters, improvements to inadequate quarters, minor construction, rental guarantee payments, construction and acquisition of trailer court facilities, and planning, an amount not to exceed \$242,400,000 and

(b) for support of military family housing, including operating expenses, leasing, main-

tenance of real property, payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred, payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715m), an amount not to exceed \$489,700,000.

Sec. 509. Family housing constructed under authority of this Act shall all be detached single family units or semi-detached two-family units unless, prior to seeking bids from contractors, the military service concerned shall have justified to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives on an individual project basis, proposed other types of units which will not become substandard or cause excessive population density.

Sec. 510. Under regulations to be promulgated by the Secretary of Defense, military personnel who are assigned quarters in former Wherry housing units, whether or not such units have been rehabilitated, are eligible to occupy such units on the basis of a fair rental determination, rather than on the full forfeiture of basic allowance for quarters.

TITLE VI

General provisions

Sec. 601. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), 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. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, and V shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$267,795,000; outside the United States, \$7,391,000; section 102, \$79,840,000; section 103, \$10,000,000; or a total of \$365,026,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$234,187,000; outside the United States, \$34,436,000; section 202, \$41,099,000; section 203, \$10,000,000; or a total of \$319,722,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$227,516,000; outside the United States, \$55,936,000; section 302, \$93,463,000; section 303, \$10,000,000; or a total of \$386,915,000.

(4) for title IV: A total of \$100,051,000.

(5) for title V: Military family housing, a total of \$732,100,000.

Sec. 603. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska, if he determines in the case of any particular project that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost arising in connection with that project, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such project was submitted to the Congress. However, the total costs 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. 604. 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. 605. Contracts for construction made by the United States under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, on an equal basis when practicable, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another department or Government agency, and 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. 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. 606. (a) As of October 1, 1966, all authorizations for military public works (other than family housing) 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 2, 1964, 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 acquisitions in whole or in part before October 1, 1966, and authorization for appropriations therefor;

(3) notwithstanding the provisions of section 606 of the Act of August 1, 1964 (78 Stat. 341, 363), the authorization for the following items, which shall remain in effect until October 1, 1967:

(a) operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements in the amount of \$611,000 at Fort Benning, Georgia, that is contained in title I, section 101, under heading "Inside the United States" and subheading "Continental Army Command (Third Army)" of the Act of July 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 223).

(b) operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities and utilities in the amount of \$833,000 at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, that is contained in title I, section 101, under heading "Inside the United States" and subheading "Continental Army Command (Third Army)" of the Act of July 7, 1962 (76 Stat. 223).

(c) operational and training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities in the amount of \$4,241,000 at Fort Dix, New Jersey, that is contained in title I, section 101, under heading "Inside the United States" and subheading "Continental Army Command (First Army)" of the Act of November 7, 1963 (77 Stat. 307).

(d) training facilities in the amount of \$290,000 at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, that is contained in title I, section 101, under heading "Inside the United States" and subheading "Continental Army Command (Second Army)" of the Act of November 7, 1963 (77 Stat. 307).

(e) operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities in the amount of \$236,000 at Fort Knox, Kentucky, that is contained in title I, section 101, under heading "Inside the United States" and subheading "Continental Army Command (Second Army)" of the Act of November 7, 1963 (77 Stat. 307).

(f) maintenance facilities in the amount of \$449,000 at Fort Story, Virginia, that is contained in title I, section 101, under heading "Inside the United States" and subheading "Continental Army Command (Second Army)" of the Act of November 7, 1963 (77 Stat. 307).

(g) maintenance facilities, medical facilities, community facilities, and utilities in the amount of \$512,000 at Fort Benning, Georgia, that is contained in title I, section 101, under heading "Inside the United States" and subheading "Continental Army Command (Third Army)" of the Act of November 7, 1963 (77 Stat. 307).

(h) training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing and utilities in the amount of \$1,836,000 at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, that is contained in title I, section 101, under heading "Inside the United States" and subheading "Continental Army Command (Third Army)" of the Act of November 7, 1963 (77 Stat. 307).

(i) operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and administrative facilities in the amount of \$553,000 at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, that is contained in title I, section 101, under heading "Inside the United States" and subheading "Continental Army Common (Third Army)" of the Act of November 7, 1963 (77 Stat. 307).

(j) training facilities, troop housing and community facilities in the amount of \$919,000 at Fort Irwin, California, that is contained in title I, section 101, under heading "Inside the United States" and subheading "Continental Army Command (Sixth Army)" of the Act of November 7, 1963 (77 Stat. 308).

(k) operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and utilities in the amount of \$719,000 at various locations that is contained in title I, section 101, under heading "Inside the United States" and subheading "Army Component Commands (United States Army Air Defense Command)" of the Act of November 7, 1963 (77 Stat. 309).

(l) maintenance facilities in the amount of \$1,498,000 at Fort Richardson, Alaska, that is contained in title I, under the heading "Inside the United States" and subheading "Army Component Commands (Alaska Command Area)" of the Act of November 7, 1963 (77 Stat. 309).

(m) maintenance facilities in the amount of \$721,000 at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, that is contained in title I, under the heading "Inside the United States" and subheading "Army Component Commands (Pacific Command Area)" of the Act of November 7, 1963 (77 Stat. 309).

(n) operational facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities and utilities in the amount of \$968,000 at various locations that is contained in title I, section 101, under heading "Outside the United States" and subheading "Army Security Agency" of the Act of November 7, 1963 (77 Stat. 310).

(o) operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and utilities in the amount of \$5,995,000 in Germany that is contained in title I, section 101,

under the heading "Outside the United States" and subheading "Army Component Commands (European Command Area)" of the Act of November 7, 1963 (77 Stat. 310).

(p) operational facilities in the amount of \$6,900,000 at various locations that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of November 7, 1963 (77 Stat. 310).

(q) training facilities in the amount of \$7,600,000 for the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "Service School Facilities" of the Act of November 7, 1963 (77 Stat. 314).

(r) administrative facilities in the amount of \$3,484,000 for the Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia, that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "Office of Naval Research Facilities" of the Act of November 7, 1963 (77 Stat. 315).

(s) community facilities in the amount of \$550,000 for Camp Smedley B. Butler, Okinawa, that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "Outside the United States" and subheading "Marine Corps Facilities" of the Act of November 7, 1963 (77 Stat. 315).

(b) Effective fifteen months from the date of enactment of this Act, all authorizations for construction of family housing which are contained in this Act or any Act approved prior to August 2, 1964, are repealed except (1) the authorization for family housing projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions or manufactured structural component contracts in whole or in part before such date, (2) the authorization for two hundred family housing units at a classified location contained in the Act of August 1, 1964 (78 Stat. 341, 359), and the authorization for one hundred and eighty units at site 4-S contained in the Act of August 1, 1964 (78 Stat. 341, 360).

Sec. 607. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project inside the United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) \$32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

(2) \$8 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) \$1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) \$8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

Sec. 608. (a) The Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department, or the designee of either, may not close, substantially reduce, or consolidate any military camp, post, or station, installation or facility until the expiration of thirty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department reports the pertinent details of the action to be taken to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

(b) If during such period a resolution is reported by either of the said committees stating that the proposed action with respect to the closure, substantial reduction, or consolidation should be rejected by the resolving House because if carried out it would in the judgment of the said resolving House tend to impair the defense of the United States, such closure, substantial reduction, or consolidation shall take effect after the expiration of the first period of forty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which such resolution is reported; but only if, between the date of such reporting in either House and the ex-

piration of such forty-day period such resolution has not been passed by such House.

(c) For the purposes of subparagraph (a) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but in the computation of the thirty-day period or the forty-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain.

(d) This section applies only to military camps, posts, stations, installations and facilities in the United States and Puerto Rico. It does not apply to any facility used primarily for river and harbor projects or flood control projects.

Sec. 609. (a) It is the sense of Congress that all the land comprising the Bolling-Anacostia complex will be required for military purposes within the foreseeable future and should be retained by the Department of Defense for such use.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.), the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1441 et seq.), the Act of June 8, 1960 (10 U.S.C. 2662), or any other law, no portion of the Bolling Air Force Base or the Anacostia Naval Air Station shall be determined excess to the needs of the holding agency or transferred, reassigned, or otherwise disposed of by such agency unless hereafter specifically authorized by an Act of Congress.

Sec. 610. No authority provided in this Act for hospital construction within the United States shall be exercised unless plans and provisions are made in advance of the initiation of construction for the treatment of retired military personnel and their dependents to the average extent of such treatment in existing hospital facilities at the installation concerned for the period of three years preceding the date of this Act; nor shall such hospital construction authority be exercised unless plans for the hospital include facilities for obstetrical care.

Sec. 611. (a) All construction under this Act shall be designed using techniques developed by the Office of Civil Defense to maximize fallout protection, where such can be done without impairing the purpose for which the construction is authorized or the effectiveness of the structure, unless exempted from this requirement under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense or his designee.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall make appropriate provision for the utilization of technical design and construction methods in the preparation of design and construction plans and in construction under this Act, to assure carrying out the purposes of this section; and for such purposes expenditures on individual projects shall not exceed one per centum of the amount authorized for that project.

Sec. 612. The last sentence of section 2674(a) of title 10, United States Code, as amended, is amended by changing the figure "10,000" to "\$25,000".

Sec. 613. Every contract between the Secretary of the Air Force and the Aerospace Corporation shall prohibit the construction of any facility or the acquisition of any real property by the Aerospace Corporation unless such construction or acquisition has first been authorized to the Air Force by the Congress.

Sec. 614. Titles I, II, III, IV, V, and VI of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1966."

TITLE VII

Reserve Forces Facilities

Sec. 701. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop additional facilities for the Reserve Forces, including

the acquisition of land therefor, but the cost of such facilities shall not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$8,890,000.

(2) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air National Guard of the United States, \$9,000,000.

(b) Air Force Reserve, \$3,400,000.

Sec. 702. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to convey to the city of Little Rock, Arkansas, without consideration, all right, title, and interest in so much of the land and improvements comprising the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Little Rock, Arkansas, as is agreed to be required for a right-of-way for construction of a public highway, at such time as that portion of the land and improvements may no longer be required as a part of said training center.

Sec. 703. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), 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. 704. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Authorization Act, 1966".

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the bill and that it be open at any point to any and all germane amendments.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 17, delete the figures "\$8,122,200" and insert "\$8,122,000" in lieu thereof.

On page 56, line 2, delete the words "or multiple-unit".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time because I feel that there is still one item relating to section 608 which needs further clarification. I should like to address a question to the distinguished chairman of the committee in the spirit of further clarification.

I am concerned with the constitutionality of this section, and the possibility of a Presidential veto. I would like to read, if I may, two or three short paragraphs from this morning's Washington Post as a preface to my question. The article reads as follows:

A little-noticed Presidential veto earlier this week appears to have been intended as a quiet warning of what is in store if bills sponsored by two House committees ever reach the White House.

The bill the President vetoed Monday authorized the administration to repair some

of the damage done by floods on the west coast last winter.

The President vetoed the bill although the administration supported it. The veto came because of a proviso the House inserted that would give the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate the power to block any project they disapproved.

The President said he would not sign the bill with such a clause in it, terming the clause an infringement on the traditional division of powers between the executive and legislative branches.

My question is, of course, Does the distinguished chairman feel that the position which the President of the United States has taken with regard to the bill just referred to indicates the possibility of his vetoing the bill now before us, because of the provisions of section 608?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Utah. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I just finished a moment ago referring to that section of the Constitution where the military was placed in the hands of the Congress. It did not say that about agriculture.

So, I do not think there is any conflict with the constitutional powers of the President or the mandates of the Constitution to the Congress. I do not see any conflict.

Of course, I did not read the article to which the gentleman has referred, but if it is the same author of another article where they took a whack at our committee a few days ago, I have a 17-year-old boy at home who knows as much about the Constitution as the man who wrote that article.

I think it is designed to intimidate the Congress. I know our powers are clear and this is one of them upon which we are going to insist.

Mr. Chairman, I see no conflict between us and the President and I am going to insist on our right to legislate in this field. I do not care what the Washington Post has to say about it.

Mr. KING of Utah. Let me pursue this just a step further, if I may.

Does the gentleman know whether the position of the President is based upon a published opinion of the Attorney General?

I am asking for information, for I do not know the answer to that myself.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. If the gentleman will yield further, I am not familiar with it.

Mr. KING of Utah. Has the gentleman from South Carolina made contact with the Office of the Attorney General to determine what its position would be on this question? I think it is rather serious if there is even a remote possibility that this bill might be vetoed by the Chief Executive.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Of course, the Office of the Attorney General does not concern me. I happen to know as much about the Constitution as does the Attorney General, and this I can assure the gentleman—I have a great regard for the Constitution, a great regard for it, and I believe the record is clear on that point.

Mr. KING of Utah. I think the record is abundantly clear that the gentle-

man from South Carolina does have a great regard for the Constitution, as does the gentleman in the well. I do feel, however, that this legislative history is necessary because I am sure there will be people in good faith who will be asking questions about this. At this time, I should like to express grave reservations about section 608, because of the possibility of a Presidential veto.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am sure that is correct and I hope I did not leave with the gentleman from Utah the wrong impression. I know of the dedication of the gentleman. He has been one of the great Members of the Congress and I appreciate the gentleman's interest in this legislation and his asking the question.

Mr. KING of Utah. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STRATTON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STRATTON: On page 68, line 16, at the end of the line insert a new sentence to read as follows:

"This paragraph shall apply to any such closure, substantial reduction or consolidation previously ordered which was still incomplete as of June 1, 1965."

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment, of course, to which I referred earlier, the amendment that would make it perfectly clear, so that there can be no possibility of ambiguity, that the wording of section 608 applies to those closings or reductions that have previously been ordered but which are still in the process of being carried out.

Mr. Chairman, I ought to make it clear as I did not make it clear, I am afraid, when I spoke on this matter earlier, that actually this amendment was offered in the committee by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. PIKE]. However, he is in transit at the present time, at the request of our distinguished chairman, as a member of a group of our committee that is going out for an on-the-spot investigation of the military situation in Vietnam. Therefore, he asked me to offer his amendment in his behalf.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment lost in the committee by a narrow margin. I think there was some misunderstanding as to its full implications. I have altered the wording somewhat so that it would be perfectly clear, and I think it should be clear that it applies to any installation such as the Brooklyn Navy Yard, the Portsmouth Navy Yard, the facility at Sands Point, Long Island, the air base at Mobile, Ala., whose closing or reduction may have been ordered earlier but whose closing or reduction has not been fully carried out as of the first of June.

Mr. Chairman, the only point at issue seems to be whether the present wording of section 608 already covers closings in process at this time. Of course, the distinguished chairman of our committee said in response to an inquiry just a moment ago that it was his horseback opinion that it did apply. I hope it does.

However, I believe we ought not to leave the point hanging, particularly because on page 13 of the committee re-

port, at the top of the page, in connection specifically with shipyard closures, the committee report says:

No language was included to stop the closures at this time.

So let us make sure that the language is placed in the bill, let us make sure that the same prerogative of constitutional review—and I could not agree with my chairman more strongly that we do have this right—is extended to those closings which are in process, so the gentleman's committee may have a chance to look at them and work its will. Then we will be doing the fair thing.

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

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

Mr. CAREY. I join with the gentleman now in the well in expressing praise on behalf of our entire delegation to him and to the other members of the committee, particularly to the chairman, for the careful, comprehensive and responsible treatment in the hearings which they accorded us, and those we brought with us, on behalf of the contemplated closing in the New York area. They have been most considerate. As I pointed out, this committee is living up to its constitutional responsibility, and I hail the gentleman in the well for pointing out that the language in the bill in section 608 clearly makes it possible for this committee to continue its inspection into the closing down of these very vital defense installations. As the report points out, this is not a closed chapter, this is not a final matter, there is no irrevocability here. We are disposing of some \$300 million of assets in the New York Naval Shipyard, and it is high time for this Congress under the chairmanship of the great gentleman from South Carolina to continue to look at this matter.

I would remind the House that some 80 Congresses contributed to the building of this great shipyard, and the other installations, and certainly this Congress has a right to look at the closing of these installations. I assure the membership there would be a great loss on our hands if this installation is closed down without a complete review by this able committee. I therefore hail the chairman of the committee and the gentleman in the well for the work they have done. We are not talking about surplus or obsolete bases to be held open. We are seeking the truth for the closing so that we will know fully about the matter.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman for his very generous remarks and join him in the views he has so eloquently expressed.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to comment on the remarks

made by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York. I remember last October when I made the statement outlining some of the military base closure decisions that had already been made but were not being announced until after the November election. One of the base closures I announced in a speech in Lima, Ohio, was the Brooklyn Navy Yard. At that time New York Representatives in the Congress disputed my statement and said that they had talked with the Department of Defense and that there was no plan to close the Brooklyn Navy Yard. I announced at that time these closings would take place immediately following the November election.

Now, as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Defense, I have disagreed with Secretary McNamara on many items, as far as the research and development program, as far as the long-range defense planning for the 1970-75 time period, and as far as the adequacy of the 1966 defense budget to meet the costs of our involvement in southeast Asia and throughout the world.

I support the Secretary of Defense on his base-closing program thus far announced. This Congress should support the administration in this announced program. The gentleman from New York should now admit and I am sure he must that the decision to close these bases had been made before the November elections. It was deliberately withheld merely for partisan political reasons. It seems to me if the Secretary of Defense was right before November when this decision was made, he is just as right today. I would have admired his courage just a little more, however, if he would not have denied they were programmed before the election. These decisions were of long standing and their announcement long overdue from the standpoint of proper management of our Defense Department. Politics should have no place in the running of this most important Department. The national security of our country should have top priority.

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

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of the regular order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time merely to announce that NASA now has the pictures of the astronaut walking in space. They will be shown starting Monday morning at 11 o'clock in the Committee on Science and Astronautics, room 2318, Rayburn Building. We will continue to show them through the day, but the first showing will be reserved for Members of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I hope I will not take the 4 minutes, but I was a little bit concerned lest this debate go by on the assumption that there were those in the House who did not take

serious objection to what the Committee on Armed Services is suggesting be done in this area in section 608. I was very pleased that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LARSEN] made the points he did. I think that this form of section 608 is unconstitutional. I have respect for the gentleman from South Carolina's judgment in constitutional areas, but there are those who feel that it is unconstitutional.

Let me point out another thing. This does not give the power to the Congress. The Committee on Way and Means constantly has these problems. I have been insisting over a period of years that when something is written in about a retention of power in the Congress, affecting matters of concern to the Ways and Means Committee it says the Congress and not the Committee on Ways and Means, even though it might be a tax matter or a tariff matter. If it is to accomplish what the gentleman says, it should be the Congress and not the Committee on Armed Services. Of course, the matter would be rather automatically referred to the Committees on Armed Services when it comes to the House and the Senate in compliance with the words, to the Congress.

Then, second, this is not the Congress that acts. This is one House of the Congress or either House acting upon what the respective Committee on Armed Services might do.

I believe somebody had better look at the books on constitutional law. If we were to have something in this bill to reserve some power in the Congress, for which I can see some merit, although in this area I am not so sure, I do question the propriety and constitutionality to proceed in this fashion.

I believe we are all aware of what is going on here. I merely wish to say for the Record that there are many in the House who have been looking forward to some real reform in expenditures areas in the executive department, not the least of which is in respect to the military establishment. The McCormack-Curtis amendment, which I co-authored with our Speaker in 1958, was designed to try to bring about some of these efficiencies, not merely in the Military Establishment, but in respect to the whole process of Government procurement.

I wish that this issue over the propriety and constitutionality of section 608 had been fought out by the leadership on the Democratic side of the aisle, but I notice that the sponge has been tossed in. That is why I have been rather quiet on the thing. However, I did not want the day to go by without having a record made to demonstrate that many of us have serious reservations about it. I regret that the Democratic leadership did not make a fight for its own executive administration. I stood ready to assist.

This matter was not cleared with the leadership by the members of the Armed Services Committee on either side of the aisle and yet they profess to speak in the name of the Congress. Where are the House leaders today on an issue which affects basically the structure of

the Congress and the relationship of the Congress with the executive? The administration is strongly opposed to this, and on sound grounds, in my judgment.

Mr. RUMFELD. Mr. Speaker, 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Missouri and associate myself with his remarks and particularly to his statement in opposition to section 608.

Whether or not the constitutionality of this section can be questioned as has been suggested today by several knowledgeable Members, it appears to me that the section is unwise. I consider it a proper delegation of legislative authority to permit the Secretary of Defense to effect economy in the conduct of the Department of Defense through the closing and/or consolidation of U.S. military facilities across the globe where he can demonstrate that it is in the best interests of the country from both a military as well as an economy standpoint.

Further, a reading of this section raises questions in my mind as to whether or not the words "substantially reduce" might inhibit the Secretary of Defense in the conduct of U.S. military affairs. I have great respect for the chairman and his Committee on Armed Services, but in this case, I must say that I am hopeful that section 608 is removed from the bill.

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of this amendment. I feel it is fair. It is reasonable. It is certainly justifiable. I do not see how anyone in this House can oppose it.

In answer to the able gentleman from Wisconsin, I may not be a member of this committee, but I am fully aware of the great efforts made by the gentleman from New York who offered this amendment, and the other members of the committee in the New York area, to thwart the arbitrary, unfair action of the Defense Department.

Mr. Chairman, all of us in the New York metropolitan area have been fighting this arbitrary action ever since it was even in the rumor stage. No one ever said that we agreed with the Department of Defense. No one remained silent. To the contrary, the gentleman from New York and all of us have been fighting the action of the Defense Department and the Secretary of that Department in relation to the unfair, unjustifiable and callous action regarding the New York Naval Shipyard. Hence, I feel that the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin was uncalled for.

I commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] for his concern and for his efforts to win this objective. Likewise, I wish to compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. PRICE] who unfortunately cannot be here today

due to his official mission, for his relentless fight for this amendment. I trust that it will win overwhelmingly today.

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. It seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] which would apply to section 608, is eminently fair and justified. Certainly if the closing or reduction or consolidation of a military installation should be reported back to the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate, then this same provision should apply to those installations where the closing or reduction or consolidation has not been completed. This would give the Armed Services Committee an opportunity to examine thoroughly the basis upon which the decision has been made.

It is important that there be full justification laid before the appropriate committees of the House and the other body on the question of closing not only the naval shipyard but also other installations. The economic impact on the city of New York is tremendous in this case. I am sure this applies elsewhere in the country. It also shows the imperative need for Congress to face the whole question of conversion of the economy. We should adopt legislation to deal with economic conversion. I have introduced legislation to do this—H.R. 1728.

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

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I should like to compliment the Committee on Armed Services on the splendid bill they have brought forth and also compliment the chairman of that committee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of section 608. I believe it would be strengthened by the addition of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable SAMUEL STRATTON. Therefore, I rise in support both of the section and of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], for 4 minutes to close debate.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree that the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], is needed. An amendment slightly varying from this was offered by our distinguished colleague [Mr. Pikel], who is unfortunately not here today. After discussion, the amendment was defeated in committee. I hasten to say that the vote was not very close. As I said awhile ago, I do not believe this is necessary. If anything ever gave the President the right to veto a bill, I think the attaching of this amendment would do it, because it might be ex post facto in its application. What we ought to do, I think, is to leave the bill as it is now written and try to see what we can do, if it is needed

to be clarified, during the conference. We, in the committee, do not feel it is needed.

So far as 608 is concerned, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], was talking about the Curtis-McCormack amendment. We do not agree that the Curtis-McCormack amendment applies to things of this nature. When that amendment was offered, if my memory serves me right—and I did not agree with it then—it was really to apply to procurement. However, since then the Curtis amendment has been applied to everything one can conceive of in the Department of Defense—transportation, intelligence. You name it—and it applies. If there was ever a delegation of constitutional powers to the Department of Defense, it was in the Curtis amendment. The Constitution puts under the Congress the military. For your information, we cannot delegate it.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is accurately stating that there has been a different interpretation. I would say there are three. I do not quite agree with the Department of Defense interpretation, either, but there was a colloquy, and a rather lengthy one, between the Congressman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and the Congressman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] and myself about a year or so ago in which we explored this area. I thought we came out with a pretty fair report of our understanding. Nonetheless, I was simply referring to my interest in this area when I was referring to it.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I have the highest affection for the gentleman from Missouri, but it seems to me that we did not give any such powers as this to the Secretary of Defense and, if we did, we should positively take them back, because he has no business with them. That is my position. We cannot give away these constitutional powers. I do not care what anybody says. We just cannot do it. And I am not willing to make the effort. I am going to cling to the rugged old cross that happens to be the Constitution. So far as the amendment of the gentleman from New York is concerned, I do not think it is needed. This bill has enough in it for those people to try to fight it. We have taken a giant step forward in getting back our constitutional powers, and I would like to see us retain what we have. That was the reasoning of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on this amendment has expired.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STRATTON) there were—ayes 32, noes 104.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLFF

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLFF: On page 23, strike out lines 3 and 4.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, the proposed move of the Sands Point Naval Training Devices Center represents a direct challenge and affront to legislative prerogative. Bipartisan attempts to question the Navy regarding the move have been met by evasive tactics composed of misstatements, omissions, and absence of knowledge requested. For the past 5 months I have directed my staff to examine the ramifications of this move, and I can confidently predict that today's request is but the surface portion of a huge iceberg. This transfer involves not only the rehabilitation of buildings we are being asked to act on today; but, in addition, the attendant costs of disruption of service, training of new personnel, moving expenses, and forced early retirement of employees.

In evaluating such a transfer, the answers to two questions must be carefully weighed: First, is the move necessary and in the best interests of national security; and, second, what is the cost of this transfer?

None of us wishes to see the military establishment turned into a WPA by retaining obsolete or inefficient bases; and, by the same reasoning, none of us wishes to spend the taxpayer's money when we do not have to. Yet studies have proven that the move of the Sands Point Center will ultimately cost us \$9 million more than it would cost to expand present facilities. Hidden costs have been studiously obscured in an effort to find something to do with the 1,400-acre Orlando Air Force Base.

National security must be the only criterion in defense determination, and national security demands a continuous flow of trained men and the training devices to teach them. The Navy has defined the mission of the center as "contributing to the Navy's operational readiness." With naval forces deployed across the globe and the importance and vitality of the U.S. Navy in evidence each day in Vietnam, "operational readiness" takes on a more important aspect of our defensive network.

In fact, the Navy Department has blandly disregarded its own advice. The last time it was suggested that the center be transferred, the commander of the center said:

The loss of any significant number of experienced personnel would certainly reduce the activity's ability to maintain adequate progress in the training device program.

I have here a petition signed by men who have determined to resign; 127 out of a total of 150 of the center's professional personnel.

"The center's leadership and strength in the training device R. & D. field has always been people." Yet 70 percent of those employees will require replacements if the move is effected. Thirty-two engineers have already resigned. I have the signatures of 92 other engineers

exhibiting their reluctance to participate in this forced march. This is 124 out of an engineering force of 167. If the men are the program, as the Navy asserts, this program will collapse.

It will cost an added \$2,187,000 for the training of inexperienced engineers and technicians who will require at least 6 months training to assume new projects plus \$700,000 more as the result of the forced retirement of employees.

If the move is effected, this trained element is lost forever, and I concur with the Navy analysis, "the training devices program is too important to allow any disruption."

This facility now utilizes 10 out of 160 acres available at the present site leaving ample opportunity for expansion and development without the attendant costs of moving. Now they want to move it to a 1,400 acre site.

Authenticated figures evidence this move will cost \$10.5 million. Expansion of the present facilities would run to only \$1.7 million. A relocation that causes an unnecessary disruption of a vital service that costs more money than it would, to expand present facilities, that is done in total disregard of congressional wishes, that flaunts the information gathering prerogative of Congress, is pernicious.

The ultimate effect on national security colors all my decisions. However, fiscal responsibility must be a full and equal partner. In this move it is merely a poor relation.

The President has asked us to engage in a war against waste. We readily enlisted. Executive agencies have been queried countless times—"Is this trip really necessary?" It is time we in Congress did the asking—"Is this move really necessary?" Those of us who are interested in eliminating waste in Government are always looking for superfluous items to cut from the budget. Gentlemen, we have found one.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] has a personal and a valid interest in this matter. I would expect him to make the effort he is making for his own people. It is a commendable effort.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I happen to have gone into this matter with some care. I heard the testimony on it in the Committee on Appropriations where we also must pass on the proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I want to give to the members of the committee some of the facts which were related to that committee by Navy witnesses. First of all, Mr. Chairman, the proposal to move the naval training device center is not new. A year ago the Navy asked to move the center because they found the facilities now available are not proper nor adequate for the requirements and that it would simply cost too much money to provide adequate facilities at the present site.

At that time the Navy sought to move to Mitchell Field, N.Y. The move was not carried out. Now a year later they are back again and they specifically say again the facilities are not adequate for the proper operation of the naval train-

ing device center. It is a question of rebuilding them at a high cost or of moving.

Mr. Chairman, the only places that are available and suitable for their purposes are Orlando, Fla., where an air base has been vacated, or Mitchell Field, N.Y. They propose to move the center to Orlando because it will cost only \$851,000 in military construction to go there. It will cost much more to go to Mitchell Field.

Future requirements for expansion can be accommodated at Orlando by modifications rather than new construction. So the total anticipated cost will be less at Orlando than anywhere else.

In addition it is estimated that the sale of the property now occupied by this station will net the Federal Government a return of \$1,295,000. The cost of the transfer will very largely be compensated by the sale of property no longer required.

I would like to point out that while a number of employees are involved, 700, the Navy has already polled them, and the Navy has testified that approximately 500 of the 700 have already signified their intention of moving. Apparently there is no problem of getting qualified personnel to accompany this move to Orlando. Everybody wants to go to Florida anyway. This is basic.

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

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

Mr. WOLFF. Of those 500 employees, what character are they? Are the employees these professional people who are the guts of this base?

Mr. SIKES. I have the Navy testimony before me. It signifies that 500 of the 700 expressed their desire to accompany the base to Orlando. Of the remaining 200, only 60 are professional and engineering types. The testimony further states "of the top-graded professionals currently at the center, a very high percentage of them have indicated their intention to move to Orlando."

This is the testimony of Navy witnesses on this same subject. I have no reason to question that testimony.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman stated everybody likes to go to Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I trust the gentleman agrees.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I agree with him on that. But would the fact that there is an 18-hole golf course on this property at the Orlando Airbase be of any significance in the Navy's decision for this move?

Mr. SIKES. It is a very nice thing to have golf courses available for service personnel and civilian employees at military bases. It helps to make everybody happier in their work. If there already is one available, it is better still. In Florida you can play golf year around.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any question about the necessity for the move. Let me reiterate the fact that the Navy has testified 2 years hand running that they have to get out of the present facilities or spend millions of dollars to build them up. Two sites are available. Orlando is less costly, and more desirable

otherwise, and for that reason the Navy would like to go to Orlando.

I trust the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Florida has put his finger right on the situation. A lot of admirals would like to be in Florida in the winter so they can play golf—not 7 months, like we can in New York—but 12 months a year. This seems to be the nub of the entire argument. During general debate the gentleman from Florida took about 10 minutes, and he pointed out very carefully, point by point, all the reasons why section 608 should remain in the bill, and why these base closing and consolidations should not be permitted to take place.

Now he stands here and says to us—but that does not mean we should not move a base from New York State to Florida—so that some admirals can play golf all winter long.

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

Mr. RESNICK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. I am sure the gentleman will, if he refers back to my previous testimony, he will find that I said Congress should be made a partner. I did not say there should not be base closings or changes. I said Congress should be made a partner. That is why I support section 608. That has nothing to do with what we are talking about now. I am sure the gentleman wants the record to read correctly.

Mr. RESNICK. That is correct, sir. I also would like to point out, we do want Congress to be a partner. We would like to be a partner in this decision to keep a base where it has been for 20 years and where it has prospered and where there have been no complaints of the service there. As my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, pointed out, the guts and the heart and the brains of this organization is not the facilities. The facilities are just bricks and mortar.

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

Mr. RESNICK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOLFF. Does the gentleman know that the maintenance costs of the base as substantiated by the Society of Professional Engineers would be \$2,566,700 per year as compared to this base where it is now of \$500,000 a year?

Mr. RESNICK. Yes, I am aware of that and the gentleman has done an excellent job in making the House aware of this. I have personally lived near the base for a number of years. I know in what high regard it is held in the area and the high opinion in which the base is held by the professional services.

I will ask permission when the Committee rises and we are back in the House to put into the RECORD a letter from the steering committee of a New York bipartisan group, and I would just like to read what the committee said about the Navy's responses.

First, that the responses were not responsive throughout all of Mr. WOLFF'S questions or requests for information.

The information even in this inadequate fashion is contradictory.

Mr. Chairman, I would like also to point out that this appropriation bill is the small part of the iceberg. We just see this small part—\$817,000. We do not see what it is going to cost to move that equipment. We do not see what it is going to cost to move the people. We do not see what it is going to cost to retrain the people.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I realize the hour is getting late and that we are all anxious to get back to our offices and attend to our many other duties. Yet, I am sure you realize since I represent the area to which this naval training unit is going to move, I have a vital interest in this matter.

Let me say that I have followed this very carefully. I have checked with the Navy and also I have checked out the figures that the gentleman from New York has sent around to the Members of the House recently. I can tell you that the figures are misleading. As a matter of fact, the Navy has found that this move will be an economical move. It will provide better facilities. It will take care of an expansion that they decided on 5 years ago and decided also at that time that they must move. They have been looking for a place ever since.

I would like to point out this further point because I think it is a part of this whole business. In November the Secretary of Defense made a decision to close somewhere between 80 and 90 bases. Those bases are located in 33 States. As a matter of fact, there are 64 congressional districts involved in these base closures. At the Orlando Air Force Base where this unit is going we now have four Air Force units that they are moving to four Air Force bases throughout the country. Orlando in the 11th District of Florida stands to lose about 3,000 men with a payroll of about \$20 million. I think this is part and parcel of this whole decision and it was made in the interest of economy by the Secretary of Defense and actually supported his move. With the Orlando Air Force Base empty and its modern facility there, the Navy ascertained this was a good place to transfer their operation. I think it makes a lot of sense. Actually the nub of this matter is this, if we approve this amendment what we are really doing here is specially treating 1 Member of the House when there are about 64 of us who are suffering from the same base closure and change problems. This is not a sound thing for the House to do.

I would hope this amendment is defeated. The financial figures so far as the economy involved here show that the move is a wise one. It will be an economy for the Government and it makes good sense. The Navy figures show that the move to Orlando will cost the Government only \$2.2 million while re-

maining in Long Island will cost \$3.8 million, a saving of \$1.6 million.

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask if we can reach some agreement on time on the amendment. Many Members wish to leave. I certainly should like to complete action on the bill as quickly as possible.

I ask unanimous consent to terminate debate on this amendment in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by our distinguished colleague from New York. The Defense Department's proposed transfer of the function now being so ably carried out at the Sands Point facility is just another example of false economy.

I commend the gentleman from New York for the efforts he has given to this issue. I believe it has been clearly demonstrated at the hearings, that this move, if permitted to take place, would represent not a savings but a waste of \$9 million.

As Members of this House, we should consider it our responsibility to oppose this kind of wasteful spending and such a foolhardy proposal as the one to relocate a vital facility which has proved itself to be eminently efficient and successful. The Naval Defense Training Center at Sands Point is doing an outstanding job. I do not believe it should be moved just to promote the illusion of savings.

I am happy to join my colleague in this effort to retain this facility. I trust his amendment to delete the amount for the Orlando site, where the Sands Point facility is to be relocated, will be approved overwhelmingly.

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

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I observe that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services declared that 12,000 line items were handled in the course of the stupendous work which was done on this bill. All we are concerned with now are two lines out of the 12,000.

Naturally, we in our area are concerned about the loss of this facility, coming as it may come, on top of the closing of the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

If there were incontrovertible evidence to support the transfer of the Sands Point facility, we could yield. But reasons and purposes for the transfer are clouded in the data that appear before us.

When it is revealed through a study of the engineers at the training center that \$9 million, not \$851,000, will be spent for the new site, for construction, maintenance, and training at the new location, then a second look at the proposal is essential. If we appropriate this \$851,000, we will automatically generate the expenditure of an additional \$8 million.

And that amount is not in the appropriation.

Because of this automatic extra expense, because of the lack of agreement on the merits of the transfer of the Sands Point Naval Devices Training Center, I urge that the specific appropriation be eliminated by amendment to the bill H.R. 8439.

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

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York. I believe that under the cloak of economy we have in many ways handed to the Secretary of Defense a carte blanche enabling him to close down or move any facilities.

As I understand it, this is not an economy move. It is a move which will be very costly to the Government. I should like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] if he has overall figures indicating what this will actually cost, rather than save the Government if the move is made.

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

Mr. OTTINGER. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. I have those figures. The rehabilitation of buildings at Sands Point will cost nothing. At Orlando, that will cost \$850,000.

The construction of new buildings at the present site would cost \$1.2 million. At Orlando it would cost \$2 million. These are figures of the Engineers and Scientists Association of the U.S. Naval Training Device Center. Annual maintenance would cost \$530,000 at the present base, but the maintenance cost in the move to Orlando would be \$3 million a year. The moving cost would be \$1.5 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER].

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, the proposed move of the U.S. Naval Training Devices Center from Port Washington, N.Y., to Orlando, Fla., is highly questionable from the point of view of the taxpayers.

We are not engaged in a chess game. The distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY], represents the district to which the Center is to be moved. I am deeply concerned with the economic well-being of my constituents. Many of the employees of the Center reside in my district. I am equally concerned about our national defense. I feel that ill-advised, poorly conceived transfers and base closings can defeat the economy goals they are designed to serve.

In the case of the Naval Training Devices Center move from Port Washington, N.Y., to Orlando, the Navy has consistently avoided a candid statement of what this move would cost. All we have to go on in this bill is a request for authorization of \$851,000 for rehabilitation of buildings. Commonsense tells us that the costs of moving a multimillion-dollar installation 1,200 miles involves costs other than the repairing of some buildings.

Why does the Navy not provide us with the total costs involved in this move?

The failure to provide the information should preclude further consideration of this authorization by the Congress of the United States.

Other items attest to the shortsightedness of the proposed transfer. A \$100,000 laboratory at the Port Washington site, presently in process of construction, would be completely lost to the taxpayers.

Relocation of Center personnel and their families would occasion substantial costs which would return nothing on the defense dollar spent.

The proposed move of this base 1,200 miles is not in line with the President's and Mr. McNamara's economy goals. The Center requires less than 10 acres; Orlando has 1,400. Does an operation of this size justify keeping open a huge base? Why should an installation requiring only 10 acres be moved to 1,400 acres?

Renovation of existing housing at Port Washington would cost far less than making such housing available at the Florida location. The buildings at the present site, I am told, are durable structures that can be modified and improved.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about this matter, much evidence has been brought out to indicate the folly of such a move. I do not want to belabor the point, but such a move under the guise of economy, appears to me to be a matter of false economy.

The Naval Training Devices Center has had a long and successful history at its present location. There is ample room for expansion and consolidation of the scattered elements of the center at the Port Washington site and in the surrounding area. By remaining where it is, the waste occasioned by the cost of moving would be saved. Interruption of the vital function of the center would be avoided.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in the name of the American taxpayer and in support of the President's economy program. I urge that the amendment to strike the \$851,000 authorization in connection with the move of the Naval Training Devices Center be carried in the interests of economy and national defense.

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment and to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] for his leadership in bringing this matter to the attention of the House. Here we have an opportunity to strike a blow for economy. Rather than it being, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] suggested, special treatment for one Member, this is a special opportunity for the taxpayers of this country to save \$9 million. I certainly want to say that the gentleman from New York has ably analyzed the costs involved and presented them to the House. This is a chance to strike this blow for economy. At the same time let us remember there is more involved than

just one facility. It is the whole question of the engineers and scientists and contractors who are doing this very important work.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I should simply like to state that the committee has gone into this thoroughly; the Subcommittee on Appropriations has gone into it thoroughly; the Navy Department has gone into it thoroughly; and they have all arrived at the conclusion that this would save money, and I am willing to take their word for it.

I commend the gentleman from New York for the fight he is making to keep this installation in his district. It is a fine thing that he is doing, and if the shoe were on the other foot, I would probably be doing the same thing. But I must say, to coin a phrase, "In my heart I would know I was wrong."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

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

A little while ago, during the process of the discussion of section 608 it was contended if that section ever became law, all we would do would be restrict our help to one Member after another without making any firm or hard decisions with respect to the merits of the suggestion on base closures. I am sure it is not the intent of this committee and it is not what we will do. Here is another point. The information has come to us that this school eliminates the need for three items. One major repair project costing over \$1 million would be needed if the site remained where it is. However, if you moved it to Orlando, it can be done at a much cheaper rate. One other thing in respect to section 608. If this section 608 had been in the law, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] would come before our committee and we would have given him his day in court. We would have heard the facts and exercised our judgment on those facts. As it is we have had the information supplied by the Navy. We were satisfied with that information. If the gentleman from New York had made a presentation perhaps we could have given his side of it a little bit more time than we have been able to do in these few moments today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] to close the debate.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. According to the records of the Armed Services Committee, it will cost \$851,000 to move to Florida. It will cost \$2,600,000 to move to Mitchell, plus \$1.2 million if you add a Polaris facility, making a total of \$3.8 million. If you move the employees to Florida it would cost \$1.2 million. It would cost \$100,000 instead of \$1.2 for the Polaris, making a total cost in Florida of \$2.2 million as against \$3.8 million to remain where it is, plus the growth potential of this base in Florida which is, incidentally, a very good base.

Mr. Chairman, I have no ax to grind. These are just the facts as presented to our committee. So the committee felt constrained not to oppose it. These are the facts. This is the reason why I oppose the amendment.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLFF) there were—ayes 61, noes 113.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the Committee on Armed Services for its great diligence and efforts in connection with this important bill. I am certainly heartily in accord with most of its provisions.

I have serious concern about section 608. I just wanted to make some reservation in regard to the matter at this time. I do not know what eventually may be the outcome of this proposal, but I do think there is cause for concern about the language in the bill as it is now written.

S. 327, PACIFIC NORTHWEST DISASTER RELIEF ACT OF 1965

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the statements of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services with whom I generally agree. I certainly agree with the strong statement he made to the effect that "this is a giant step in regaining our constitutional powers," meaning the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I would only hope that on next Tuesday when we have an opportunity, which we likely will have, to vote on the question of the Northwest disaster bill which was vetoed by the President, that those who are in support of that position of the gentleman from South Carolina will strongly support the effort that probably will be made to reinstate the language which the President asked be stricken and which the Public Works Committee in fact did strike and which unquestionably is a Presidential attempt to prevent the Congress of the United States, meaning the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate, from exercising the powers that they unquestionably have of authorizing public works projects.

Mr. Chairman, the President said that he thought there should be stricken from section 5(a) of that bill the clause that reads as follows:

But no appropriation shall be made for any such work that has not been approved before June 30, 1966, by resolution adopted by the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively.

So I say to all those who are supporting the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina on this matter, they should particularly support the effort to reinstate that language come next Tuesday.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], chair-

man of the Committee on Appropriations, as to his statement as it relates to the question of economy. Those people who want to economize, likewise want to preserve the proper powers of the Congress, should also support the amendment preserving the power of the Public Works Committee to properly authorize such projects. The very purpose of putting this into the language of the legislation was to make certain that any proposal made by the President and the Office of Emergency Planning, the objective of it, would be to make certain that when the decision was made as to the nature of the project, the project would have to come back for proper authorization which unquestionably is the authority of the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate and is exactly the same language that was written into the Public Building Act of 1959 and was signed by the then President Eisenhower and is precisely the same language that was contained in the Water Resources Act of 1964, signed by President Johnson, although he said he had reservations about it at the time.

So I say to all on both sides of this issue, you should support on Tuesday next the effort to reinstate the powers of Congress relating to the Northwest disaster relief bill which will be pending before you at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS) having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, 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. 8439) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 408, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WYDLER. I am in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WYDLER moves to recommit the bill H.R. 8439 to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 68, line 16, at the end of the line a new sentence as follows:

"This paragraph shall apply to any such closure, substantial reduction, or consolidation, previously ordered, which was still incomplete as of June 1, 1965."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and fifty-two Members are present, a quorum.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM—ADDRESS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks I include a well-considered address, that should be widely read, delivered by Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY on June 1, 1965, at Michigan State University:

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

It is a pleasure to accept the invitation of the Michigan State People-to-People Committee to discuss U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Coming here today from Washington—once aptly described as "a city of southern efficiency and northern charm"—it is refreshing to return to the atmosphere of excitement, of expectation and love of learning that is characteristic of a great university.

Action is to the politician what reflection is to the scholar—and as a political leader, it is a rewarding experience to confront the enthusiastic questioning of the student and the careful scrutiny of the professor.

It is a welcomed—if risky experience.

It is welcome, because nowhere are solid arguments and perceptive judgments more appreciated.

It is risky because nothing chills nonsense like exposure to the brisk air of a university. The subject which I am about to discuss with you is appropriate for this audience because it pertains to war and peace.

No group should be more interested in war and peace than those who will be expected to bear the brunt of the fighting if war should come.

It is therefore a natural and healthy phenomenon that war and peace in southeast Asia should have become the subject of lively debate and vigorous discussion on university campuses across the country.

As the debate on U.S. policy in Vietnam has flourished during the past 6 months, the United States has continued to be challenged to match deeds with words in opposing aggression and defending the freedom of a friendly nation.

We have met that challenge.

Our firm and decisive response to naked aggression against South Vietnam has demonstrated to our friends that our power remains preeminent and our devotion to freedom firm—and to our foes that the United States is no paper tiger.

The measured application of American power proves that we are prepared to meet aggression in whatever form—that we shall not be forced to choose between humiliation and holocaust—that the firmness of our response in no way diminishes our devotion to peace.

Our action in Vietnam is a part of the continuing struggle which the American people must be prepared to wage if we are to preserve free civilization as we know it and resist the expansion of Communist power.

It is a further indication that the breakup of the bipolar world, which has characterized the international relations of the past two decades, and the easing of tensions between East and West following the nuclear test ban, may have changed the pattern of U.S. involvement in world affairs, but it has not diminished it.

We retain the role of leader of the free world that we inherited at the end of World War II, and in that role our responsibilities remain worldwide. In that role our responsibility extends to distant Asia as well as to countries on our doorstep.

President Johnson has made it unmistakably clear that we intend to meet those responsibilities.

It was in the role of defender of the free world that we originally made a commitment to Vietnam in 1954.

It was in this role that three administrations maintained that commitment.

Although as students of history you may debate the wisdom of the original decision to take up the responsibilities which the French relinquished in 1954, this question has little relevance for the policymaker today.

President Johnson in his Baltimore speech of April 7 and his Washington speech of May 13 spelled out those alternatives and which we have chosen as the basis of our policy.

They are three:

First. In the face of armed conflict, in the face of continued aggressions, we will not withdraw, we will not abandon the people of Vietnam. We shall keep our word.

Our refusal to withdraw is based on our recognition that sudden withdrawal from Vietnam would only weaken the position of free societies in Asia—which could only regard withdrawal as a loss of interest by the United States in the area and enticement to accommodate themselves to Communist China.

In refusing to withdraw we reject the belief that by some Hegelian law of inevitability, China is destined to swallow up all of Asia. And I find it curious that proponents of the inevitability theory so often combine it with advocacy of the Titoist doctrine that Vietnam would become an independent neutral nation if we would withdraw our military forces. The arguments are absolutely incompatible.

We refuse to withdraw in the certain knowledge that withdrawal would mean the betrayal of those who have opposed the spread of communism in southeast Asia, would mean certain death or exile.

Finally, in relation to the Sino-Soviet contest, a withdrawal by us would vindicate, the Chinese thesis that militancy pays—and discredit the Soviet thesis of peaceful coexistence.

Second. Recognizing that a political solution of the conflict is essential, we stand ready to engage in "unconditional discussions." We have no desire for further military escalation of the war. We stand ready to consider any solution which would bring peace and justice to all of Vietnam, North and South.

I would like to make crystal clear who is in favor of a political settlement and who is opposed, who has offered the olive branch and who has rejected it. President Johnson has affirmed not only our willingness to hold unconditional discussions to end the war, but our ardent desire to do so.

What has been the response of the Communist governments in Hanoi and Peking?

They have rejected every peace offer from any source. They have spurned the efforts of the U.N. to mediate. They have scorned the offer of the British. They have brushed aside the efforts of the Indian Government. In short, the Communist governments in Hanoi and Peking have rejected all efforts to restore peace and justice to the people of Vietnam.

Third. We recognize that the people of Vietnam must have a cause for which to fight, they must have hope of a better day. We have made it clear to the people of Vietnam that to improve their lives and fulfill their hopes we stand ready to support a massive cooperative development effort—not only for Vietnam but for all of southeast Asia. It is our hope, as President Johnson has said, that "the works of peace can bring men together in a common effort to abandon forever the works of war."

These three principles—honoring our military commitment, a continuing willingness to seek a political solution, and a massive economic development program—remain the bases of our policy.

The struggle in Vietnam has a special significance for the United States as the defender of the free world because it confronts us with a bold new form of aggression which could rank in military importance with the discovery of gunpowder. I refer to the "war of national liberation."

Vietnam offers a classic example of what can be accomplished by militant Communist forces intent on deliberate subversion of a country from within.

There we have seen a Communist state refuse to leave its neighbors in peace. We have seen the infiltration of Communist cadres to strengthen and direct guerrilla warfare in violation of international accords. We have seen the Communists who control and direct the war from Hanoi insist that the war in South Vietnam is internal because many of the Vietcong are South Vietnamese. We have seen them portray the struggle as a civil war, in which the "popular forces" are arrayed against "American imperialism."

It is this new sophisticated form of warfare that is becoming the major challenge to our security, to the security of all free nations. This new warfare is often more dangerous than the old—a war in which the leaders cannot be located, in which the sources of supply cannot be easily cut off, in which the enemy forces are not outsiders but indigenous troops—in which signed truces do not halt the struggle.

The supreme challenge today is to prove to our Communist foes and our freedom-loving friends that the new face of war is no less pernicious than the old, that it can be defeated by those of strong mind, stout heart and a will of steel. We know now that most Communist regimes do not desire to blow the world to pieces. They prefer to pick it up piece by piece.

How do we successfully meet the challenge posed by wars of national liberation? We need a balanced military force comprising air, sea, and land power. We need maximum flexibility in our forces—making it possible to respond rapidly to any situation. We

need men experienced in guerrilla and psychological warfare, in all the paramilitary arts that are practiced in wars of national liberation. We must adapt our aircraft and ships to the conditions we find. We must relearn the tactics of ground warfare in a guerrilla setting and adapt our equipment and our weapons accordingly.

Overwhelming military power alone is not an adequate response to wars of national liberation. Since these wars feed on seething social discontent, success in countering them requires a subtle blending of economic aid, political expertise, educational efforts, information and propaganda programs, combined with military power.

Where wars of national liberation flourish, the military struggle is but one part of a larger social and political struggle. And these struggles will continue and revolutionary ferment will increase until governments come to power capable of implementing systematic social and economic programs designed to abolish shocking social and economic inequality between the privileged few and the impoverished masses, between glittering capitals and festering slums, between favored urban enclaves and primitive rural areas.

For the masses of the people in the developing countries of Asia who have never known the benefits of modern civilization, the status quo is no longer a burden to be patiently borne, but an oppressor to be cast off.

The primary responsibility for preserving the independence and security of a country remains with the people and the government of that country. If the people and their leaders have no will to preserve their independence, no outside force can save them. If the government can provide the people with a cause for which to fight, with a program inspiring sacrifice and effort, that government can be capable of defending itself against Communist infiltration and subversion from within. Where subversion from within is supported from outside, as in the case in Vietnam, outside assistance is needed if such a government is to achieve this capability. In many areas of the world, the United States has inherited the role of protector and defender of non-Communist nations which are under Communist assault. It is a role we have not sought. It is often a painful and expensive one. But it is an essential one, both to the security of the non-Communist world and to our own.

As I have noted, in overcoming wars of national liberation no one mode of response is adequate. At this point I would like to call attention to the nonmilitary side of the struggle that is required in this complex situation. My example again is Vietnam. I refer to the little noticed side of the struggle—the struggle for a better life. It is the battle of the Vietnamese people not merely to survive, but to build, to make progress, to move forward.

In the past decade, rice production has been doubled. Corn output is expected to be four times as large next year as it was in 1962. Pig production has more than doubled since 1955.

The average Vietnamese can expect to live only 35 years. Yet there are only 200 civilian doctors. A new medical school we are helping to build will graduate that number of new doctors each year.

Meanwhile, we have helped vaccinate more than 7 million people against cholera and millions more against other diseases. More than 12,000 hamlet health stations have been built and stocked with medical supplies.

In Vietnam, as everywhere, civilization is a race between education and catastrophe. Education is the foundation of any country's future. For it is impossible to run a government, local or national, to man factories or to enrich the national life without trained

and educated people. Elementary school enrollment was 300,000 in 1955—it is five times that number today. Vocational school enrollment has quadrupled. The university population is increasing steadily.

This progress has been achieved against the most appalling odds. It has been made despite the carefully planned and executed program of terror and harassment carried out by the Vietcong.

There is a curious misconception abroad that the Vietcong is a great idealistic movement, a sort of "Indo-Chinese wing of the American Populist Party"—to use Arthur Schlesinger's phrase. In reality, they are, he continues, "a collection of very tough terrorists whose gains have come in the main not from the hopes they have inspired but from the fear they have created."

In the countryside, agricultural stations have regularly been destroyed and medical clinics raided. Malaria control team members have been killed or kidnaped. Village chiefs, schoolteachers and others who represent order and social service have been made special targets by the terrorists.

All told, it is estimated that 10,000 civilian officials have been killed or kidnaped since 1954. If one were to use comparable figures for the United States in relation to population, this would amount to 130,000 officials.

Yet the effort goes on despite these attacks and dangers. Brave and tireless Vietnamese continue to take seeds and fertilizer and farming know-how to the villagers; teachers continue to man the schools; medical teams go into the country despite the clear and always present danger. And at their side—I am proud to say—go American civilian workers. And they, too, have been killed and kidnaped. These men and women, Vietnamese and American—and increasingly of other nationalities—are the unsung, unpublicized heroes of this phase of the struggle. So long as they persevere wars of national liberation can be defeated.

As I understand it, you have decided to participate in this struggle by adopting the hamlet of Long Yen in Tay Ninh Province. This hamlet, 60 miles from Saigon, has vigorously resisted absorption into Vietcong hands. I am told you plan to raise funds to build a new two-room school, to construct an open-air market, and to pay for both a schoolteacher and a health officer. These are things the people of the hamlet themselves have decided they most need and want.

I have heard that word of Michigan State's program has struck sparks in other campuses as well. This is most encouraging, most inspiring. For the need is so great—not just the physical need, but the need for people to know that other people stand with them. In this fashion you will be helping the Vietnamese people build a future for themselves. You will be working to defeat a new and pernicious form of aggression against mankind.

In assisting independent nations—whether in southeast Asia or in our own hemisphere—there will be required on our part patience as well as courage, the will to endure as well as the will to resist.

But our willingness to meet our obligation to assist free nations should not be confused with a desire to extend American power or impose American ways.

We do not aspire to any Pax Americana. We have no desire to play the role of global gendarme. Where multilateral organizations are ready and capable of assuming the burden of defending independent nations from Communist assault, of preventing internal rebellions from leading to chaos and anarchy, we welcome their intervention. As we know from recent history, international organizations like the UN are not always capable of stepping in quickly. When they are capable we welcome their presence.

Our stakes in southeast Asia are too high for the recklessness either of withdrawal or

of general conflagration. We need not choose between inglorious retreat or unlimited retaliation. The stakes can be secured through a wise multiple strategy if we but sustain our national determination to see the job through to success.

Our Vietnamese friends look forward to the day when national independence and security will be achieved, permitting the withdrawal of foreign forces. We share that hope and that expectation.

But we know that that hope cannot be achieved if the United States shirks its obligations, if it attempts to withdraw from the world, to retreat from its responsibilities as a world leader. If we refuse to share the burden of preserving the peace—who will take it on? If we refuse to share the burden of defending free societies, who can guarantee their survival? If we will not join in the defense of democracy, what are its future prospects?

I fail to see the logic of those who recommend that we withdraw from the world. If we are concerned about our national security in all its aspects, we cannot ignore Asia because Europe has been made secure. We learned by hard experience in Europe that involvement is the price of resisting aggression, that appeasement is not only morally wrong, but a threat to national security.

In a complex world, we must practice patience and perseverance—patience to defend free nations in distant Asia as well as those close to home. We must not be lured by quick and easy solutions. We must not abandon our goals because of frustration. We must continue to pursue the goal of peace and freedom—acknowledging both the prospects of success and the consequences of failure. If we act with vision and wisdom, we shall not fail.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, we have been witnessing some interesting but in some respects distressing conflicts in the presentation of our national assessment of our national economy. The policy and position of the President and his administration has been that our economic output can be steadily increased with balance and stability. Indeed such expansion is an absolute necessity in the light of increased technology and the press of unemployment. The posture of the Federal Reserve Board seems to lean against this position and seems convinced that progress can only be bought by dangerous inflation. Let it be understood that we all appreciate and highly respect the distinct role that the Federal Reserve plays in our monetary and fiscal policy. That this role calls for a cautious approach is not questioned, but it should also be responsible and ought to be responsive to the avowed policy of the country's leadership so long as that leadership is not demonstrably irresponsible.

We have as the Chairman of the Federal Reserve a very highly qualified individual. A man of great ability, high intellect and long experience and, incidentally, one of the most astute politicians outside of political office, using

that term in its elective sense. Mr. Martin does very little, if anything, by accident and misadventure. Characteristically, he speaks and acts upon careful and thoughtful consideration. He would, I am sure, be the first to admit, however, to being subject to error. He still puts his pants on one leg at a time like the rest of us and he can be wrong. If my memory serves me correctly, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board was wrong in his expectations about the tax cut which we passed last session.

It is not for being subject to error that the Chairman should be faulted, however. It is in exercising less than the highest level of restraint in his public statements. His is one of the most sensitive positions in the United States. To the degree that the heavy responsibility of that office is not reflected in responsibility ringing in every public utterance, he can do great disservice.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I entertain not only a high respect for Mr. Martin, I am also deeply impressed by the complexity and difficulty of the subject matter over which he exercises with his Board awesome jurisdiction. Running tandem with this respectful regard nonetheless is a commonsense understanding of the inexactitude of the economic art which all economists interested in monetary matters practice. There are no absolutes in the field and the truth is as elusive as in any intellectual pursuit. No amount of systematizing or invention of vocabulary can obscure that fact. It behooves the actors in the monetary role then not to play the "heavy."

It is for just these reasons that I am disappointed with the recent speech by Mr. Martin in which he undermined the confidence of those elements in our society most needed to be encouraged to maintain the balance effort to achieve continuing stable progress. Cautionary criticism and advice on constructive restraint should and have been welcomed, but an unrestrained lowering of the monetary boom with the tone of impending doom is not in keeping with the appropriate role of the Federal Reserve System. That we are not alone in being disturbed by the conflicting positions between the Federal Reserve Board and the administration is obvious.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of May 31 carried a very disturbing article by Frank Porter, apparently prompted by very definite signs that the Federal Reserve Board is going it alone in monetary and credit policy, regardless of administration views.

Columnist Porter could not have put the question any more bluntly than when he asked:

Are William McChesney Martin, Jr., and the Federal Reserve Board he heads in open rebellion against administration policy?

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is my own opinion that it is about time a few blunt questions were asked and some straight answers given on the vital question of money and credit. Just what is going on?

The United States is the only advanced industrial nation I know of where credit may be manipulated by small groups without any political re-

sponsibility. Former Secretary of the Treasury Dillon was fond of saying, even in testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee, what a friendly, old time was had over lunch when the Treasury and Fed officials exchanged views on these issues so vital to all Americans. But Mr. Dillon never failed to admit, albeit reluctantly, that the Federal Reserve could always tell the Treasury where to get off. In plain words, the Fed might listen politely and then make independent decisions on money and credit even though Treasury would vigorously disagree. Now, what kind of government is this where the voters do not have even an indirect voice in these matters?

President Johnson has pledged us adequate credit at low interest rates while wisely dealing with the gold outflow by selective measures. And our price stability over recent years has been a marvel for all to behold—prosperity without inflation. So when the Fed plunges bank reserves down close to \$200 million in the red, then maybe Eliot Janeway is right when he suggests that "right under L.B.J.'s long and inquisitive nose, Chairman Martin has crossed the President up in this most sensitive area of governmental operations."

Mr. Speaker, if it is Martin who is in charge here and not the administration or other elected officials, I think it is high time the folks back home knew about it.

The complete article by Mr. Porter follows and after it is a more recent article reflecting Mr. Fowler's reaction to Mr. Martin's recent speech:

[From the Washington Post, May 31, 1965]
FEDERAL RESERVE RESTRICTIONS RAISE SOME ISSUES

(By Frank C. Porter)

Are William McChesney Martin, Jr., and the Federal Reserve Board he heads in open rebellion against administration policy?

Or is the White House in tacit agreement with the Fed's shift toward a tighter monetary policy?

Will the trend toward tighter money and credit help choke off present prosperity, as it was accused of doing in 1957 and 1960?

Or will it reduce the threat of an overheated American economy and help bring the balance of international payments into equilibrium?

These are questions being asked about Washington with increasing frequency these days. And hard answers are hard to come by. Administration spokesmen are mum on the subject.

The Federal Reserve System exercises substantial control over the Nation's stock of money and interest rates by fixing the level of reserves commercial banks must set aside against their deposits, by raising and lowering the interest rate on loans the Fed makes to its member banks and—most importantly—through its purchase and sale of Government securities in the open market.

READING THE WIND

In the words of Chairman Martin, it "leans against the wind" by easing money and credit when business conditions are depressed and tightening up when surging prosperity threatens an inflationary blowoff.

But its critics charge that its timing is frequently off—that instead of leaning against the wind the Fed sometimes leans with it and falls on its face.

In its 1964 annual report, the President's Council of Economic Advisers singled out

restrictive monetary policy as a chief factor in the downturns of 1957 and 1960.

For most of the current 51-month economic expansion, the Fed has gone along with frequent White House admonishments to keep money relatively easy. As recently as in his January economic message, President Johnson warned that monetary policy should not be permitted to cancel the expansionary effects of last year's tax cut.

When Mr. Johnson put forth his 10-point program to reduce the Nation's international payments deficit, it was widely interpreted as in lieu of tightening money and raising interest rates to halt the dollar outflow.

SWITCH IN POLICY

But since then the Fed has switched from relative ease to a moderately tight policy—a move that possibly was foreshadowed when Martin told Congress in late February that if the President's program failed to produce results "we must be prepared to take whatever measures are needed, including of course, a less expensive overall credit policy."

The President's program appears tentatively to have reversed the outflow. But free reserves—a measure of commercial banks' unused lending powers—have been allowed to drop from an average \$103 million in January to \$32 million in February, to minus \$76 million in March and to minus \$113 million in April. The figure is now averaging nearly minus \$150 million.

This has led Eliot Janeway, New York economic consultant, to suggest that "right under L.B.J.'s long and inquisitive nose, Chairman Martin has crossed the President up in this most sensitive area of governmental operations."

AGREEMENT ASSUMED

Janeway's thesis is that the administration had assumed an agreement with the Fed on a target of zero or neutral reserves, that it assured bankers there would be no money squeeze when the bankers agreed to limit oversea loans to help the payments situation, that the swing toward tighter money is already reflected in a skittish stock market and bodes ill for the economy in general.

A Capitol Hill economist complains that the Fed "hasn't allowed a damn nickel for commercial expansion" and is putting a severe strain on business ability to finance inventories and receivables.

On the other hand, a prominent Wall Street investment banker, who is no friend of tight money, sees no danger in the present policy unless it is pursued further. He feels it is a normal reflection of the abnormal pace of economic expansion in the first quarter.

And an administration economist also leery of restrictive monetary policy is inclined to discount the negative reserve position. He notes long-term interest rates have remained stable and sees no dearth of liquidity in the economy.

[From the Washington Post, June 9, 1965]
SECRETARY FOWLER DISCOUNTS BOOM-BUST TALK

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler, predicted yesterday that the United States will enjoy noninflationary growth and prosperity "as far ahead as one can see."

He told the Senate Finance Committee that he is "not at all fearful" of another 1929 crash and stressed that the American economy is expanding in a healthy, balanced way.

The Cabinet officer's statements came as a firm rejection of a week-old warning by Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin, Jr., that there are "disturbing similarities between our present prosperity and the fabulous twenties." Mar-

tin's statement touched off a sharp stock market break.

"The dissimilarities between the two situations so far outweigh the similarities that I'm not at all fearful," Fowler declared.

The Treasury head made his comments in reply to committee questions as the finance group opened hearings on a \$4.8 billion excise tax cut bill that the House passed last week.

Fowler asked the committee to reject the House measure in favor of a more modest \$3.6 billion excise reduction that President Johnson recommended in mid-May.

"The administration's distinct preference * * * is that the bill we would like to see emerge is the bill in line with the President's program rather than the bill approved by the House," Fowler said.

In giving the committee his confident prediction of a steady growth in economic activity, Fowler said the administration has raised its sights since it made its yearly economic forecast in January and now expects that the gross national product will be higher than its original \$660 billion estimate.

The Secretary ruled out an inflationary boom along with a 1929 bust. He said it is important to be aware of potential dangers but he declared that the economic barometers "give grounds for solid confidence that our expansion will continue without undue strain on the economy or on manpower."

"The economy is catching its breath following the very large sales and production increases of the first quarter," Fowler said. "We see and expect a continued orderly growth as far ahead as one can see."

SLOGAN IN WASHINGTON NOT "POLITICS AS USUAL," BUT "POLITICS AT THE FLICK OF A FINGER"

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, late Tuesday the House approved an expenditure of public funds for the hiring of operators to man some of the ultramodern, fully automatic elevators in the Rayburn Office Building.

Bright and early yesterday morning, even before the bill could be messaged to the Senate, the political pap had begun to flow. The powers-that-be had started to install the operators. Apparently the political patronage machinery was greased and rolling even before the House gave approval.

Apparently the old slogan in Washington of "politics as usual" is out. It is now "politics at the flick of a finger."

INTENSIFICATION OF NATIONAL EFFORT TO BEAUTIFY AMERICA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, during the recent past months, under President

Johnson's urging, there has been an intensification in national effort to beautify America. I sense that on the State and municipal level there has begun a local participation that can only have the most favorable effect insofar as cleaning up junkyards and effectively curtailing the littering of waste throughout the land.

This Nation not only owes an obligation to the President for his efforts in this field, but Mrs. Johnson is to be equally commended for her leadership.

I am pleased to draw the attention of the House to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial of Sunday, May 23, 1965, which points out that the basis of "America the Beautiful" today lies as much with Americans as with Government.

The editorial of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch is as follows:

CHALLENGE TO THE SPOILERS

The skeletons of discarded cars, old junkyards, litter our countryside—and are driving my wife mad.

The husband who said that is President Johnson. The words are more simple observation than political oratory, yet they indicate that the President, or his wife, started something.

They have started the White House Conference on Natural Beauty in Washington this week. That in turn is intended to start Americans thinking about the beauty, the dignity and good taste of their every-day life.

An American in London will note that Englishmen do not throw paper on the streets. An American in Paris will observe that Frenchmen do not break mementoes off the Notre Dame Cathedral. An American almost anywhere in the European countryside will see few billboards, auto graveyards and other scars against nature. Yet at home he is used to these things.

Peter Blake, who wrote "God's Own Junkyard" (not in anger but in fury), found a signboard on a giant California sequoia, a junkyard in a Rocky Mountain valley in California, and other forms of avicious squalor destroying scenery from Miami Beach to Waikiki. More statistically, the Keep America Beautiful organization estimates that if the litter along the Nation's highways were dumped along one highway from New York to San Francisco, the road would be buried a foot deep in waste paper, beer cans and whatnot.

Such is America the Beautiful today. It is a land where many central cities, including St. Louis, are trying to beautify their downtown areas while suburban sprawl spreads across fields and meadows. It is a land where some devoted souls attempt to preserve worthwhile or historic buildings and sites while others try to exploit them commercially or tear them down for parking lots and cubed architecture.

It is a land where the finest superhighways in the world are being built, to be lined in most States (including Missouri, apparently) with billboards. It is a land where more and more people clamor for water for recreation while other people and industries pollute it, along with the air above.

It is a land where a recent Congress passed farsighted legislation to preserve a vestige of American wilderness, and to create new areas for outdoor use and enjoyment, while outside these few conserved areas spoliation seems to grow with the affluent but not yet great society.

What is it about Americans that leads them to toss a tin can here and a wrapping paper there, to cut down unique trees, to dump waste in lakes and rivers, on an ascending scale of disregard for beauty and for fellow Americans? Is it a legacy from pioneer

days when the land was vast and the people few, and rugged disregard for either was free?

The land is no longer vast and the people are no longer few. Littering, polluting, bulldozing, billboard and other forms of senseless misuse and destruction of resources and beauty must be stopped. So it is that President Johnson talks of measures with force behind them to landscape highways and restrict signboards.

Yet does it not seem strange that the Federal Government has had to take the lead almost everywhere in conservation and anti-pollution measures? Why should the Federal power have to lead and push States and local communities to protect the grass at their grass roots?

Indeed, the basis of an America the Beautiful today lies as much with Americans as with government. It is time for civilized maturity, for a social and individual conscience of a heritage that needs creation as well as preservation. We would expect the White House Conference to tell Americans that beauty is in the eye of the beholder. By the end of this century there may well be 380 million Americans to behold what is left to them.

SUPREME COURT INVALIDATES STATUTE TO PREVENT AVOWED COMMUNISTS FROM BECOMING OFFICERS IN UNION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court Monday invalidated that part of the Landrum-Griffin Act which attempted by statute to prevent avowed Communists from becoming officers in unions.

With irresponsible unionism now holding this new and astonishing sanction, the individual more than ever needs his only real protection—the right not to join and the right to withdraw from a union.

The great labor federation, the AFL-CIO, expelled many unions from that association for Communist domination and for racketeering. But these same expelled unions enjoy compulsory membership in most States, and some of them appeared before your Education and Labor Committee demanding compulsory membership in all the rest of the States. The McClellan investigations of racketeering in unions support the need of workers in 31 other States for relief from compulsory irresponsible unionism.

I am today introducing an amendment to the present national labor laws which will give this relief. The near 100-percent membership in thousands of unions in those States having right-to-work laws shows that voluntary unionism will not damage responsible unions.

WYOMING—WOMAN SUFFRAGE AND THE LADIES OF THE CONGRESS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Washington Post there appears a picture of an even dozen most attractive ladies with the comment that none could remember it ever having happened before—the 12 women Members of Congress under a noncongressional roof.

My State of Wyoming, Mr. Speaker, gave America a first lady Governor, the beloved Nellie Tayloe Ross, and is the first State to give women suffrage in America. Since Wyoming is celebrating its 75th year of statehood this summer, I think this is an appropriate time, in behalf of my State of Wyoming, to congratulate the 10 ladies of this House and their counterparts in the other body.

Voting rights for women were won in America by a lady justice of the peace at South Pass City, Wyoming Territory, whose name was Esther Morris and whose likeness is in Statuary Hall. It is said at the time of her victory in Cheyenne, Wyo., nearly three-fourths of a century ago, that the members of the Wyoming Territorial Legislature drank to her success with the toast: "God bless our women, until now our superiors, from this day forward our equals."

The outlines follow:

It's unanimous—They couldn't remember its ever happening before: the 12 women Members of Congress together under the same noncongressional roof. Aware that it may be a while before it happens again, they sit for a rare picture at a dinner the Women's National Press Club gave in their honor Tuesday night. They are: Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon; Representative FRANCES BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio; Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican, of Maine; Representatives FLORENCE DWYER, Republican, of New Jersey; MARTHA GRIFFITHS, Democrat, of Michigan; EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon; PATSY MINK, Democrat, of Hawaii; LEONOR SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri; JULIA HANSEN, Democrat, of Washington; CATHERINE MAY, Republican, of Washington; EDNA KELLY, Democrat, of New York; and CHARLOTTE REID, Republican, of Illinois.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL STUDENT COUNCIL WEEK

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentle-

man from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution requesting that the President proclaim the last week of October as National Student Council Week.

The student councils in secondary schools are actually proving grounds for citizenship. They provide a forum for the expression of student opinion and a training ground for students who will be the leaders of the Nation. The councils also provide a level of communication between the student body and the adult community through which joint problems may be resolved.

The student council is a student self-government organization, elected by students, to represent the student body on matters of concern to the entire school. Through participation in these groups, students gain an understanding of the problems involved in the operation of a community at an early stage in their lives.

I am pleased to note that my own State of New Jersey was the first to proclaim a statewide Student Council Week and has done so annually for 14 years. I have been contacted on several occasions by a constituent of mine, Miss Jo Anne Chernev, who served this past year as president of the New Jersey Association of High School Councils. The New Jersey association was given the responsibility of promoting the National Student Council Week project by the annual national convention. Miss Chernev and her group have done extensive research on the statewide programs and have made their information available to Members of Congress. I am happy to support Miss Chernev and the association in their work on this project.

Statewide student council weeks have been established in 14 States and 9 others have indicated that they may do so in the near future. The activities conducted during these periods may include conventions, poster campaigns, elections, inaugurations, leadership training, and conferences, all of which are patterned on those on the national level. In this manner, student councils provide an opportunity for young people to learn the fundamentals of government and democracy through actual practice. Since Congress serves as a model for these student organizations, the promotion of a National Student Council Week would be a means of expressing confidence in the ability and sense of responsibility of our young people.

EXPLANATION FOR LACK OF ACTION ON ARM TWISTING?

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the listless approach the Civil Service Commission has taken in resolving the cases of Rural Electrification Administration officials charged with violating Federal laws in soliciting civil service workers for political campaign funds may be explained by charges that Civil Service Commission Chairman John Macy is trying to wear two or three job hats.

The Washington Sunday Star Columnist Joe Young quotes the director of a private research organization as saying that Civil Service Commission Chairman John Macy has become so occupied with White House duties, he is not even available to return telephone calls from other key officials in Government.

Perhaps this is one of the reasons the Civil Service Commission has not seen fit to take firm and forthright action on these cases of political arm twisting which I brought to the Commission's attention long ago.

I want to make it unmistakably plain that I do not necessarily agree with some of the judgments made by this private research organization, the Committee for Economic Development, nor do I subscribe to all its recommendations involving Federal service careerists. But in this instance, it would seem to me there is validity to the criticism that Mr. Macy is trying to wear two or three hats.

Looking after the welfare of the vast number of civil service employees, and protecting their integrity from political pressure is the paramount responsibility of the Civil Service Commission. I do not believe any other tasks should take precedence over this clear obligation on the part of all members of the Commission.

We have been treated to 9 months of delay since the Commission investigation ended without bringing the REA arm-twisting cases to a conclusion. That is far too long a period for a reasonable investigation, assessment of the facts, and sound corrective action.

With consent I place the Washington Star article at this point in my remarks: [From the Washington (D.C.) Star, June 6, 1965]

MACY'S WHITE HOUSE DUTIES CITED AS HARMFUL TO CIVIL SERVICE ROLE
(By Joe Young)

NEW YORK, N.Y.—John Macy's dual role as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and Special Adviser to President Lyndon Johnson on Government personnel matters was criticized yesterday by the director of the Committee for Economic Development's committee on improvement of management in Government.

Robert Steadman said that the Commission's operations and direction of Government personnel affairs and policies are suffering as a result of Macy's "wearing two hats."

Macy also has a third function—that of chief talent scout for the President in recruiting top Government executives.

EXPANDED ACTIVITIES

The CED is an influential group composed mainly of top financiers and industrialists which concerns itself with monetary and fiscal policy matters. Recently, it expanded

its activities to include Government personnel and management problems.

Its Government committee is headed by Marion Folsom, Eastman Kodak executive and former Secretary of Welfare.

Steadman charged that top Government officials under the rank of Cabinet officers, such as Under Secretaries, "can't even get Macy to return their telephone calls because he's so busy with his White House duties."

"Who's running the Civil Service Commission?" Steadman asked. "Are the Commission's duties and responsibilities so light that it can afford to operate without full-time leadership?"

Steadman predicted that the situation will continue to deteriorate as long as Macy devotes so much time to his White House duties.

The CED official quoted Philip Young, who also served in a dual capacity under President Eisenhower while CSC Chairman, as declaring after his experience that such an arrangement won't work.

PERSONNEL OFFICE URGED

Steadman spoke at the Eastern regional conference of the Public Personnel Association in behalf of CED's recent report on the Federal career service. The report in part urged that Federal career jobs in grades 15 or 16 and above be removed from the Civil Service Commission's jurisdiction and be placed under the control of a proposed new office of executive personnel in the White House.

These supergrade jobs under such a plan would be under the control of the President and the occupants would not have the job tenure rights as at present.

The objective is to permit greater flexibility in selecting and promoting such officials and in assigning them to different Federal jobs as needs arise.

There also are reports that a special Presidential task force recently recommended something along the same line.

REJECTED BY JOHNSON

Civil Service Commission officials at the conference here, however, disclosed that the Johnson administration has rejected such a proposal and the Federal supergrade careerists will remain under the commission's jurisdiction.

The administration also was disclosed to have rejected another CED proposal that two new supergrades—grades 19 and 20—be created at higher salaries for key careerists assigned to special and highly important duties.

CSC officials said there was not need for the proposed extra grades.

Many of CED's other proposals, however—such as improved executive training, higher salaries, more mobility in assigning career people to other Government duties—either have been adopted or are under serious consideration with a good chance of being adopted, CSC officials said.

On the issue of removing top Federal careerists from civil service coverage, the CSC apparently convinced the President that it would be an unwise move.

Herald Leich, Chief of the CSC's Program Planning Division, who appeared on the panel with Steadman, said removing top Government careerists from the Civil Service Commission's authority would be "decapitating the career service."

Leich also said it would be a deteriorating effect on the morale of middle-grade Federal civil servants aspiring some day to top jobs as well as being impractical in planning programs for the entire career service.

Leich differed with the CED official on Macy's dual functions, declaring that his White House duties make unnecessary any divorce of CSC's authority and responsibilities because of the close links between the Commission and the White House.

CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS OBJECTS TO WITHDRAWAL OF MAIL FROM PASSENGER TRAINS

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a resolution from the city of Minneapolis, Minn., requesting me and my congressional colleagues to exert our "utmost influence to encourage the U.S. Postal Department to continue the transportation of mail by passenger train."

As the city council resolution indicates, withdrawal of post office mailings results in revenue losses to the railroads, resulting in cutbacks in passenger train service and economic and transportation distress to the entire State.

Certainly, I hope that the Post Office Department will give this sound resolution its careful attention and will act upon its wisdom. Under unanimous consent I insert the letter of transmittal and the resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks:

CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS,
June 7, 1965.

HON. ANCHER NELSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Attached you will find copy of a resolution passed by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., at a regular meeting thereof held May 28, 1965, requesting the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota in the Congress of the United States to exert their utmost influence to encourage the U.S. Postal Department to continue the transportation of mail by passenger train.

Very truly yours,
LEONARD A. JOHNSON,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION

(By Alderman Martens)

Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota in the Congress of the United States to exert their utmost influence to encourage the U.S. Postal Department to continue the transportation of mail by passenger train

Whereas it appears that there has been a policy established by the U.S. Postal Department of discontinuing mail service being transported via passenger trains; and

Whereas withdrawal by the Post Office Department of the use of passenger trains for carrying the mails and the attendant loss of revenue to the railroads where passenger traffic is not heavy results in making some railroad line operations marginal or submarginal; and

Whereas the discontinuance of passenger train service throughout the State of Minnesota acts generally to the disadvantage of the citizens of the city of Minneapolis and the State; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That it hereby requests all Minnesota Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States to exert their utmost influence to encourage the U.S. Postal Department to continue the transportation of mail on passenger trains; be it further

Resolved, That this council desires to reconfirm and reiterate its position of encouraging our Federal and State agencies to take a very close look at any proposed or suggested reduction of service given to and needed by city of Minneapolis and State of Minnesota residents and businesses before granting a discontinuance of passenger train service; be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be and is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota in the U.S. Congress.

Passed May 28, 1965.

GEO. W. MARTENS,
President of the Council.

Approved June 4, 1965.

ARTHUR NAFTALIN,
Mayor.

Attest:

LEONARD A. JOHNSON,
City Clerk.

FACTFINDING MISSION LEAVES TONIGHT FOR PARIS

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Republican factfinding mission will leave tonight for NATO headquarters in Paris after a weeklong series of briefings and conferences here.

Sponsored by the House Republican conference, the mission consists of Representatives ALEXANDER FIRNIE, of New York, HASTINGS KEITH, of Massachusetts, JAMES D. MARTIN, of Alabama, and myself. The Republican conference is headed by Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, of Wisconsin, and includes the full GOP membership in the House of Representatives. The NATO mission was selected from the House Republican task force on NATO and the Atlantic community.

No Government funds are involved and the group is taking Pan American flight No. 114 from Kennedy International in New York departing at 8:30 p.m. The group will board a National Airline flight No. 289 at Washington National Airport at 5:55 p.m. to connect with plane in New York.

The schedule of conferences in Paris is not complete but it already includes the following: Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Supreme Allied Commander of Europe; NATO Secretary General Manlio Brosio; Ambassador Thomas K. Finletter, U.S. Representative on the NATO Council; French Minister of Defense Pierre Messmer, and officials of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Final briefing in preparation for the trip was early today with Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupé, director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania, who serves as consultant to the mission and has been in Paris for the past week arranging appointments.

Yesterday we met with Assistant Defense Secretary John T. McNaughton and Admiral Alfred G. Ward, U.S. member of the NATO military council known

as the Standing Group, which is located in Washington.

The previous day we met with NATO's first Commander, former President Eisenhower at Gettysburg and later with Assistant Secretary of State Douglas MacArthur II.

On Monday we were in New York where we conferred with former Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

Our pretrip conferences and consultations have convinced us that our concern over the sharp decline in the influence of NATO is widely shared.

We leave with the benefit of counsel from high officials, past and present. The encouragement and advice of public officials on both sides of the political aisle, scientists, military experts, and economists have been most gratifying and helpful.

This will be a factfinding, not a fault-finding mission. Our group seeks to understand the attitude of French and other officials toward NATO and our role in the alliance.

Through this mission, we hope to alert the American people to the deepening crisis in NATO and to contribute to a better understanding of its gravity; learn firsthand the nature of Franco-American disagreement as viewed by the French; and, hopefully to aid our Government in moving swiftly and wisely to meet these problems.

INDUSTRIAL WHEAT AMENDMENT WOULD PENALIZE CORN FARMERS

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the Agriculture Committee and Members of the House will take a most thorough look at a provision in H.R. 8629 which would substitute the use of wheat for industrial purposes at the expense of feed grain farmers. This bill will more than likely soon be part of the omnibus farm bill.

The Wheat Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee recently reported H.R. 8629 to the full Committee. I am a member of the subcommittee. I opposed the provision in it which would change the definition of "food product" in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. I am still opposed to the provision and for reasons which I shall state.

The existing definition of "food product" includes flour. The new definition in H.R. 8629 would amend section 379(d) of the act to read as follows:

As used in this subtitle, the term "food product" means flour, excluding flour clears not used for human consumption as determined by the Secretary, semolina, farina, bulgur, beverage and any other product composed wholly or partly of wheat which the Secretary may determine to be a food product.

The exclusion of flour clears from the definition of "food product"—flour

clears being a byproduct of wheat milling—represents a very important change in the act. Approximately 73 percent of a bushel of wheat is classified as flour. In 100 pounds of flour clears, there is about 15 pounds of protein, which is marketed as vital wheat gluten, a food, and about 55 pounds of starch. Some of this 55 pounds goes into food products, but a substantial portion of it is available, if the price is right, for industrial uses. Under the new definition in H.R. 8629, a processor of flour clears which are used for glue would not have to pay for a wheat certificate. At present, all flour processed must have paid for it the 75 cents a bushel certificate, which would rise to \$1.25 if the pending legislation is enacted.

The processors of flour clears, if the new definition of "food product" becomes law, will get their raw material at a price which probably would be close to the support price for wheat of \$1.25 a bushel. This would not be far from the price which the processors of corn have to pay for their raw material.

In other words, industrial wheat processors would be excused from paying the extra \$1.25 "bread tax" that will apply to wheat used for domestic food consumption, and they could purchase wheat for prices about one-half below that in effect for other wheat processors and therefore be very competitive indeed with the corn industry. The new definition of wheat then would really be a subsidy for wheat at the expense of corn and grain sorghums and to some extent, potatoes, since starch from potatoes is used for certain industrial purposes. This would also be a subsidy at the expense of the taxpayer, because for every bushel of wheat exempted from certificates under this proposal, Uncle Sam would no longer collect his \$1.25. Remember that under the present program, Uncle Sam now collects 75 cents a bushel on the wheat clears used for these industrial purposes.

This whole question has been complicated by the introduction of what I consider extraneous and irrelevant issues. The Department of Agriculture supports the amendment on the grounds that it will enable the wheat processors to recover markets lost to imports of wheat byproducts which go into industry. I submit that, if imports are injuring the wheat processors, the best remedy does not lie in a domestic subsidy which hits other domestic industries.

We are also told that the proposed amendment simply would enable both wheat and corn processors to buy their raw material at world prices and that, consequently, it is equitable.

I do not see where the world-price question has any bearing whatever on this controversy. Both corn and wheat processors must obtain their raw material here and not abroad. The world price for corn is the domestic price and our wheat processors cannot buy wheat at the world price. An import quota shuts almost all of it out. I am surprised then that the Department of Agriculture uses the world-price argument in defense of the amendment when it has no

application to the situation which the amendment would create.

Since the corn and wheat processors both must obtain their raw material here, we must look to the price relationship between the two products to determine whether a subsidy is involved. What do we find? In the domestic market, wheat, over a long period of years, has sold at prices substantially higher than corn. This was true before the Federal programs and has been true since. The cost of producing wheat is quite a bit higher than the cost of producing corn. And the parity price of wheat today is around \$1 a bushel higher than the parity price of corn.

The habitual price differential, the difference in production costs and the wide spread between wheat and corn parity are the pertinent factors. The parity differential alone should dispose of the contention that the proposed new definition of "food product" represents only an equitable adjustment. The new definition, in my opinion, is intended to provide a subsidy for wheat which goes into industrial uses and this wheat would be in direct competition with corn and grain sorghums which are diverted to the industrial market.

I am sympathetic with the problems of wheat farmers and with the problems of the entire wheat industry. Yet, I cannot find justification for a subsidy which helps one agricultural commodity at the expense of other agricultural commodities. It establishes a most dangerous precedent and it hurts corn farmers in my State and throughout the corn belt. If we subsidize wheat today at the expense of corn and grain sorghums, tomorrow we will be asked to subsidize other agricultural commodities at the expense of other segments of agriculture.

Only last year the agriculture committee turned down a similar proposal to subsidize directly wheat for industrial uses. Now, we are asked to do the same thing indirectly. We have already set a precedent in this matter and a most constructive one. I see no reason to penalize corn farmers now.

AID FOR NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in support of my bill, H.R. 8654, relating to shipments of supplies to North Vietnam and Cuba, I want to call attention to the following newspaper column by Don Maclean:

WASHINGTON.—Even the most simple-minded armchair strategist can figure out that instead of wasting million-dollar airplanes trying to bomb tiny bridges and jungle trails, we should be bombing the main port in North Vietnam. That's where the enemy's supplies are delivered in the first place.

But, as with everything else about the Vietnam situation, it isn't as simple as that.

For one thing, if we bombed the main port, we accidentally might unload a few bombs on ships belonging to our great and good allies, England, Japan, and West Germany. That's a little something that the pacifist professors failed to mention during their teach-in, the crash course in nonfighting.

When I talked to State Department officials about bombing Hanoi's port, they said that the State Department was preparing a study of the matter. The question is not whether to bomb the port, apparently, but whether it's worth all the hell that'll be raised if we do. The State Department told me that in 1964, 402 free world ships landed supplies there. State says our allies assure us that these supplies are nonstrategic.

This, of course, is nonsense. When a nation is at war, it can use a boatload of almost anything. It all helps, one way or the other. Also, the United States, even at this late hour in the Vietnam war, hesitates even to blacklist the free world ships that call at Hanoi. In other words, they can drop stuff off there and make their next stop San Francisco. Then, if they feel like it, they might get a consignment of supplies for our troops. Then, on to Saigon.

A breakdown on our allies' ships calling at North Vietnam in 1964 shows: England, 177; Japan, 74; Norway, 43; Greece, 35; West Germany, 8; France, 1. The State Department says that in 1965, the figures have escalated. That's funny. I guess North Vietnam, despite the war, is getting more prosperous and is importing more consumer goods. If you believe that, then you probably believe that all Chinese are laundrymen.

The lack of a blacklist against this shipping is harder to understand than the lack of bombing raids against the port. Such a list exists against free world ships trading with Cuba. The Maritime Administration publishes it every 3 weeks. Ships landing supplies in Havana can land at American ports, too, but they can't take on any cargo that our Government has an interest in, owns, or controls. That's an awful lot of cargo.

About 800 ships, or roughly 5 percent of the world's fleet, have now made our blacklist. I asked the maritime people how we found out whose ships and what ships landed supplies in Havana. An executive said: "Sometimes from shipping reports published in other countries and sometimes in various other ways which I'm not at liberty to tell you about."

By the way, our old buddy, England, is leading the way there, too. You've got to hand it to those British businessmen, they can seek out business faster than rats can find a healthy ship.

It's little things such as this that drive our military men crazy. Every time we lose an expensive plane, and sometimes its pilot, trying to bomb supplies being hauled south in Vietnam, the Joint Chiefs know that these losses could be avoided. Hanoi's supplies would disappear if we bombed that port. Like Korea, this is another war our troops aren't being allowed to win.

The professors at the teach-in gave us little credit for what we're not doing. We're not using atomic weapons, poison gas, germs, or any of our awful weapons. We are not seeking the main, most vital targets. We're not even trying to stop our friends from helping the enemy. But, you see, the mealy-mouthed professors and the weak-chinned students came to criticize, not to praise.

A LONG, HARD SUMMER

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, evidence continues to accumulate substantiating the critical need for substantial numbers of competent farmworkers in my district and elsewhere in California, and in other sections of the country, including Florida and even Ohio.

For some time, it has been evident that the administration is attempting to solve the farm-labor problem by recruiting students and other nonprofessional farmworkers, such as delinquents and dropouts, to work in the fields. The administration seems to believe that it can solve some of the social and racial problems of the big cities in the process. Thus, our area is to become a laboratory for administration experiments in social planning—when our immediate need is for thousands of competent professional farmworkers to forestall continuing disastrous crop losses with the accompanying depressing effects on our entire economy.

Mr. Speaker, the Council of California Growers is a fine organization composed of about 20,000 operators of both large and small farms in our State. The council has followed a reasonable and dispassionate course throughout the controversy regarding the farm labor problem during recent months. The current issue of the council newsletter, dated June 7, 1965, is a particularly cogent commentary on administration efforts to recruit students for farmwork.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point the full text of the council newsletter for the benefit of my colleagues and other interested persons:

A-TEAMS: AGRICULTURAL LABOR OR A SOCIAL EXPERIMENT?

There is mounting evidence that planners in Washington are intensifying efforts to impose their ideas of socioeconomic programs upon agriculture; that they are out to remove any vestige of independence; that they seek to convert agriculture into a dependent, easily managed creature—a docile cow which can be milked at will for the benefit of the Great Society.

The most recent indication of this relentless drive to create a subservient agriculture is the action upon recent requests for supplemental labor; action by Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz' farm labor panel; action designed to bend agriculture further to the will of Government by edict regardless of cost, regardless of the possible danger of catastrophic losses, and wholesale bankruptcies.

Faced with a request to live up to the Secretary's promise that "no crops would be lost due to a shortage of labor," the panel heard evidence which indicated genuine labor shortages—claims which are substantiated by State figures. Instead of granting the request for relief, the panel ordered the growers to participate in a new social experiment.

Growers were told there are 5,000 students—members of the administration A-teams in Colorado, Kansas, Texas, and New Mexico—all eager to come to California and all of whom must be employed before consideration can be given to further requests for foreign supplemental workers.

These A-teams—according to the plan—are high school athletes between the ages of

16 and 18 years, organized into groups of 20 to 30, under the supervision of an adult, hopefully a coach.

Not only must growers employ these young people, but they must guarantee \$1.40 per hour, give them written contracts, pay transportation both ways, pay the salary of the supervisor, guarantee a minimum number of work hours, and provide adequate housing and food. Transportation alone for some of the Texas crews will run \$45 to \$50 per person—one way.

Texas, at the present time, appears to have more of the teams ready than any other State and when Texas Congressman HENRY GONZALEZ wrote Secretary Wirtz to protest against (1) the use of the teams at all in farm labor and (2) the transportation of youngsters "hundreds and even thousands of miles," Wirtz replied that the youth recruitment programs "will be used merely as supplements if the adult recruitment program does not fulfill all the needs," and added, "I am certain you will agree that this plan is infinitely preferable to resorting to the importation of farmworkers to fill unmet needs."

It doesn't take much interpretation to read into the Secretary's response that he is going to insist upon the use of these teams regardless of their ability or of the cost to the growers or inconvenience to the youngster and his family.

The seeming disregard for facts is nowhere more apparent than in the California panel's report to Secretary Wirtz. The panel praised the growers in the Blythe area for their outstanding effort at recruiting, for the pioneering efforts at training foremen, for housing, recreational facilities, and other efforts, and then the panel recommended that the grower request for 494 supplemental workers be denied.

Why? The panel said the growers should conduct more aggressive recruiting and, that to grant them the supplemental workers requested, would retard efforts at recruiting additional domestic workers.

The panel spoke righteously of the Department of Employment estimate that domestic farm employment was up 19,000 in May over the same month last year, but conveniently overlooked the fact that the total number of workers was down 12,000. It ignored the fact that these 12,000 jobs are the ones which may mean survival or disaster for many growers.

Despite their concern over the costs and the feasibility of using the youth teams, grower groups in California are participating in the program. Twenty teams have been offered jobs by growers in Blythe, Stockton, Salinas, and the citrus industry. The first of these teams arrived last week.

Growers expressed the hope that these young people will be a valuable source of labor, and pointed out that local youth always have been employed. Growers hope, though, the Secretary will permit quick action on supplementary workers if the youth groups are inadequate and avoid repeating the serious losses that have occurred in strawberries and asparagus because of Government procrastination.

The very existence of this unique farm panel—the departure from normal, and proven, channels—leads to some interesting speculation.

Under Public Law 78, there was an established method of determining farm labor shortages. The State department of employment—with trained personnel, and statewide offices—was the agency designated to certify to needs. During the first few months of this year, this procedure was maintained—there was close cooperation between State and Federal agencies in determining need and recruiting workers.

Suddenly the Secretary switched. Without explanation, he abandoned the services of the established factfinders—and named three college professors, none of whom have

any extensive experience in farm labor, to a factfinding panel.

By inference, the Secretary indicated he believes three professors know more about farm labor problems than experts in the State agency * * * experts with knowledge and impartiality established over a period of years.

The panel appears still to use carefully selected facts from the department of employment when convenient—such as the reference to the 19,000 increase in employed domestics—ignoring shortages indicated in the same set of statistics.

It seems that the panel was appointed—not to improve the efficiency of determining grower needs—but, instead, to extend the long arm of Washington directly onto the farm. The State government appears to have been bypassed in favor of strong central control.

In an effort to clarify the situation, Newsletter asked a series of questions of one of the panel members—Daniel G. Aldrich, chancellor of the University of California at Irvine.

Here are the questions and the answers.

What, in your opinion, is the responsibility of the panel which was set up by Secretary Wirtz?

Answer: "The responsibility of the panel is to advise the Secretary of Labor on the appropriateness of the requests for foreign supplemental workers that are submitted to him, that is the appropriateness of the number that are requested. Secondly, for the panel to continue to review the agricultural labor situation in California to determine whether the criteria which the Secretary of Labor established for requesting supplemental labor is being met."

In the light of the panel's recommendations to Secretary Wirtz last week, after review of the supplemental labor requests from Blythe and Salinas, is it the opinion of the panel that the so-called A-teams can fulfill all the needs of California agriculture in the foreseeable future?

Answer: "It is the view of the panel that the A-teams should be utilized in California. There are 5,000 A-team workers ready to come to California, and, since requests before us for braceros was a very small portion of the number of A-team workers available, this source of labor should be explored first."

With a shortage of 12,000 workers in California at the moment, it is hard to understand how a request for fewer than 2,000 could be considered inappropriate—yet apparently the panel did.

If this is the pattern to be followed, it will be a long, hard summer.

H.R. 8496

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a bill (H.R. 8496) was introduced last week to extend a provision of the Atomic Energy Act that exceeds all bounds of rightful and reasonable authority on the part of the Federal Government. Under that provision the Atomic Energy Commission may "indemnify and hold harmless the licensee and other persons indemnified, as their interest may appear, from public liability arising from nuclear incidents which is in excess of the level of

financial protection required of the licensee."

Therein is a shocking violation of the inherent rights of the individual, the community, the State, and the general public, and I ask my colleagues to study every word of this legislation before the House comes to decide upon whether to prolong the injustice here constituted.

In drawing a line against the amount of damages that can be claimed by a victim of a nuclear incident, it sets a dangerous precedent that Congress should never tolerate, for the potential victims of a nuclear incident may never have consented to expose themselves to the proximity of a reactor. In other words, as the present act is interpreted the AEC may arrogate to itself the decision as to where an atomic electric plant is to be located regardless of protests by the neighborhood, community, or State. Thus ensconced, operators of the nuclear device are protected by a no-recourse provision from claiming damages over and above those arbitrarily set by the Commission.

I cannot in conscience accept this kind of unfair legislation. When its implications are properly interpreted by my colleagues, I cannot believe that you will say, in effect, to your constituencies:

"I believe that the Atomic Energy Commission should be empowered to permit an electric company to construct and operate an atomic powerplant wherever it chooses whether or not you are willing to live in the vicinity of that facility. Furthermore, I feel that the AEC should have authority to limit the liability of the company, thus leaving residents of the community involved to collect damages only in the amount that is set by the AEC. For these reasons I am supporting H.R. 8496 and whatever other provisions of the act that are necessary to vest this power in AEC."

If, on the other hand, Congress rejects H.R. 8496 and thereby removes the no-recourse provision of the act, we are not going to subject our citizenry to any more of the hysteria that prevailed in Long Island and the Bodega Bay area of California when AEC announced that licenses for atomic reactors at those sites had been applied for. Mass protests by residents of the respective locations finally prevailed and plans were withdrawn, but the threat never should have been permitted from the start. I for one do not want residents of Pennsylvania's 22d Congressional District to be forced to march in opposition to a situation made possible through the unwise acquiescence by Congress to an illogical, irresponsible, and inequitable proposition set forth by the Atomic Energy Commission.

There is yet another unjust feature in H.R. 8496. In providing for a portion of the insurance coverage on atomic plants, the Federal Government would continue to subsidize premiums by assuming the obligation for a good part of the cost. As a Representative of a State whose economy depends to an important extent upon a vibrant coal industry, I protest the subsidization of a competitor. I have never objected to the use of Treasury

funds for research into civilian and commercial use of the atom, but America and the world have long since passed the laboratory and pilot plant stages. Full-size reactors have for a long time been providing the heat to turn turbines that turn generators and produce electric power.

Western and central Pennsylvania have for too long experienced exceedingly high percentages of surplus labor, and we do not relish the idea of using Federal appropriations to dim the encouraging prospects now developing. Our new Keystone and Conemaugh generating stations, which will provide electricity for markets as far away as Philadelphia and New York, are being constructed without financial assistance from the Federal Government, and I see no reason for setting up a subsidized competitor. Those powerplants will use a lot of coal, thus opening new jobs for miners, equipment manufacturers, and suppliers.

There is another giant generating plant planned for Pennsylvania that will have an important impact on the economy of our area. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. recently announced that a third new 750,000 generating unit would be constructed at the Brunner Island steam-electric station below Harrisburg. To carry the coal from mines in Cambria and Centre Counties, 136 hopper cars are being built at the Johnstown Plant of Bethlehem Steel Corp.

These projects mean jobs that can result in the economic resurgence we have been awaiting for years. Congress must not appropriate funds or continue an unreasonable and unrealistic law supporting and protecting a rival business.

OFFICE OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I called the attention of the House to the fact that the Committee on Rules had, in granting a rule for H.R. 6927, the administration bill to create a Department of Housing and Urban Development, made it in order to consider as a substitute bill, H.R. 8822, which would establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development.

In an effort to familiarize our colleagues with the substance and objectives of our alternative proposal, I included as a part of my remarks the text of the bill and the text of my testimony before the Rules Committee.

As the House has been informed, H.R. 6927, the Department bill, has been scheduled for consideration by the House next week. We shall have the opportunity, therefore, for the first time, to

vote for a measure which will do more than change the name and elevate the status of an existing agency, a measure which will provide the means of bringing direction, coordination, efficiency, and consistent administration to the jungle of Federal programs intended to help with the problems of our urban areas.

At a time when the confusion and contradiction and duplication which have resulted from the lack of any overall policy and coordination in the field of urban affairs threaten to undermine the objectives of Congress in approving urban area programs, I suggest that we should not content ourselves with a bill which promises only prestige while it avoids action on the real issue.

Twenty-four of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, have joined in sponsoring bills virtually identical to H.R. 8822. They include, in addition to my earlier bill, H.R. 5173, the following:

H.R. 6082, introduced by Hon. FRANK J. HORTON, of New York.

H.R. 6098, introduced by Hon. GARNER E. SHRIVER, of Kansas.

H.R. 6144, introduced by Hon. CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., of Maryland.

H.R. 6151, introduced by Hon. ED REINECKE, of California.

H.R. 6203, introduced by Hon. JOHN B. ANDERSON, of Illinois.

H.R. 6204, introduced by Hon. ALPHONZO BELL, of California.

H.R. 6205, introduced by Hon. LAURENCE J. BURTON, of Utah.

H.R. 6206, introduced by Hon. JAMES C. CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire.

H.R. 6207, introduced by Hon. SILVIO O. CONTE, of Massachusetts.

H.R. 6208, introduced by Hon. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, of Kansas.

H.R. 6209, introduced by Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey.

H.R. 6210, introduced by Hon. CHARLES E. GOODELL, of New York.

H.R. 6211, introduced by Hon. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, of Michigan.

H.R. 6212, introduced by Hon. JAMES HARVEY, of Michigan.

H.R. 6213, introduced by Hon. ROBERT McCLORY, of Illinois.

H.R. 6214, introduced by Hon. CLARK MACGREGOR, of Minnesota.

H.R. 6215, introduced by Hon. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, of California.

H.R. 6216, introduced by Hon. F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts.

H.R. 6217, introduced by Hon. CHARLES A. MOSHER, of Ohio.

H.R. 6218, introduced by Hon. ALBERT H. QUIG, of Minnesota.

H.R. 6219, introduced by Hon. DONALD RUMSFELD, of Illinois.

H.R. 6220, introduced by Hon. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 6221, introduced by Hon. HENRY P. SMITH III, of New York.

H.R. 6261, introduced by Hon. STANLEY R. TUPPER, of Maine.

Our bill to establish an Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development has a long and honorable history. Born in the minds of scholars and administrators who have understood the urgent need to bring together all the disparate parts of the Government's vast effort in the field of urban affairs, the need for a top-level

coordinating office has become almost universally recognized.

In their authoritative study of "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas," published in 1960, Professors Connery and Leach stated:

There is reason to believe that Federal programs are piling up on each other faster than metropolitan areas can digest them. Each is planned separately, and there is no correlation among them. Programs are launched in isolation, without reference to their impact on the areas to which they are directed. As a consequence, Federal programs are badly coordinated so far as metropolitan areas are concerned, both among themselves and in terms of State and local programs in the same areas. Federal programs having a bearing on metropolitan problems should be re-examined in order to assure better coordination and to provide the maximum flexibility and a minimum of standardization as to detail and procedure.

Earlier, in 1957, the Bureau of the Budget identified 21 major programs which affected metropolitan areas, and the Eisenhower administration, through Presidential Assistant Robert Merriam, undertook an informal effort to provide needed coordination and policy direction.

Today, those 21 programs have grown to anywhere from 45 to more than 60, depending on how one defines an urban program, and the problem has magnified in scope, complexity, and significance.

In 1960-61, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations at my request conducted a detailed study of governmental structure, organization, and planning in metropolitan areas at all levels of Government. It urged, among other things "that steps be taken within both the executive and legislative branches of the National Government to bring together in better coordination and interrelationship the various Federal programs which impact upon orderly planning and development within the large urban areas."

The Commission, which includes representatives of all levels of government—Federal, State, county, and municipal—among its members, unanimously emphasized that intergovernmental relations with respect to urban affairs are being unnecessarily impaired because of inadequate coordination of Federal programs.

Mr. Speaker, hundreds of individual examples could be cited to demonstrate how the failure of coordination has produced waste, duplication, and inefficiency in the operation of many Federal programs. The same inefficiency has tended to obstruct the efforts of State and local governments to solve their urban problems. All levels of government, therefore, have a deep and immediate interest in devising mechanisms which will assure proper coordination.

The issue, I believe, is clear. Our bill, H.R. 8822, will do this. The committee bill, H.R. 6927, cannot do it.

AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, there is an issue of considerable import that should be considered—an issue of conscience that touches the lives of many of our citizens who must work to support themselves and their families in an age of greater concentration of power in both labor and management.

If and when section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is repealed—and, in my judgment, the sooner it is the better—the rights of workers to organize will be enhanced. For many, however, as sympathetic as they might be toward the goals for which many of our finest labor organizations have worked for years, their religious beliefs do not permit them to join labor unions or any secret organizations.

We should take special note of their problem and I wish, today, to introduce a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act that persons who have religious convictions against joining or participating in a labor organization under a union security collective bargaining agreement should not be required to join or pay dues.

In this Nation, among the Seventh-day Adventists, the Amish, the Mennonites, the Plymouth Brethren, and the National Association of Evangelicals and other groups there are those who cannot in good conscience belong to any sort of labor organization because of basic religious convictions and the teachings of their churches. My bill is designed to protect these individuals in their employment and to save them from having to violate their faith for economic reasons.

These are not persons trying to escape the honorable obligations of unionism—they are not free riders or freeloaders. Sums equal to the dues and initiation fees would be paid to the Treasurer of the United States or perhaps to charitable enterprises.

As an alternative, the bill permits a voluntary agreement between the individual and the union as to conditions of employment, but these in no way would infringe upon the religious convictions of the employee.

Now is the time to meet this issue. It in no way infringes on the rights of union organization. What it does do is enhance the personal rights and liberties of all of us as we recognize in law that minority rights and beliefs have a sacred meaning, too, as we try to build a new age in America.

The bill reads as follows:

H.R. 8962

A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide that individuals with religious convictions against joining or participating in a labor organization under a union security collective bargaining agreement shall not be required to join or contribute to the support of that labor organization

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C.) is

amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

“INDIVIDUALS WITH RELIGIOUS CONVICTIONS

“SEC. 19. No individual who has religious convictions against joining or financially supporting a labor organization may be required to join or financially support any labor organization as a condition of employment if such individual pays to the Treasurer of the United States a sum equal to the initiation fees and periodic dues uniformly required as a condition of acquiring and retaining membership in a labor organization which is representative of the employee unless said individual and said labor organization mutually agree upon some other condition of employment.”

JUSTICE FOR TRANSYLVANIA

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on June 1 it was 408 years ago that the Diet of Torda in Transylvania, became the first European legislative body to pass an act granting religious tolerance to its citizens. This was a Diet dominated by Protestants, but the Queen who had signed this act into law was a Roman Catholic, Queen Isabella.

Each person—

The act said—

may hold whatever religious faith he wishes, with old or new rituals, while we at the same time leave it to their judgment to do as they please in the matter of their faith, just so long, however, as they bring no harm to bear on anyone at all, lest the followers of a new faith be a source of irritation to the old profession of faith or become in some way injurious to its followers.

By today's standards, this was yet a modest statement. But even this statement represented a revolution in men's thinking. I must be remembered that at the time it was enacted, religious intolerance was ripe in most European countries, and that the concepts of human dignity and personal freedom which are supported by the Bible were frequently honored in their abuse. The date is also preceding the outbreak of the Thirty Years War by 61 years, the peace of Westphalia by 91 years.

It must be also remembered that at that time Transylvania and Hungary were the battlegrounds between the West and the Mohammedan East. The peoples of Transylvania have seen what slavery meant, as they were harassed, both by the Turkish armies and the Habsburg mercenaries in turn. The fear of slavery was mixed with the bitter pill of humiliation as the Kingdom of Hungary, of which Transylvania was a part, had been a dominant power in the area until 30 years before the Diet of Torda.

In the words of the former head of the Unitarian Church in Hungary, Bishop Alexander St. Ivanyi, now a distinguished, beloved divine in Lancaster, Mass.:

Freedom was the most designed summum bonum in Hungary, no matter what the “dominant ideas” of the age were elsewhere.

This freedom they sought to establish in Transylvania, the only free part of war-torn Hungary. * * * These Transylvanians were wise enough to discover that freedom begins with the freedom of conscience, the “better part” of which is religious freedom.

The act of 1957 became the foundation for the more comprehensive Act of Religious Liberty and Freedom of Conscience, which was evolved by subsequent sessions of the Diet between 1557 and 1571, and which remained the basic law of the Constitution of Hungary until the Communists took over the country in the recent postwar period.

In the four centuries that have intervened, it has become universally recognized that freedom and religious tolerance are inseparable. It is not surprising, therefore, that whenever Hungarians in Transylvania or elsewhere have been confronted with the need of fighting for their political and economic freedom, one of their first actions has been to reassert the Acts of the Diet of Torda between 1557 and 1571.

Today Transylvania is part of Rumania and is under Communist domination. Religious freedom is a thing of the past, ministers of several faiths are still in prison despite the amnesty of 1963-64, and there is only one Roman Catholic bishop instead of three, and he is not even completely free to exercise his ecclesiastical functions.

Political freedom of elections and parties are nonexistent for any of the nationalities in the province. But the Hungarian minority which, together with the German Saxons were the implementers of the Acts of Torda, is particularly harassed and persecuted. Their schools are increasingly merged with Rumanian schools, the use of Hungarian in public is dangerous at best, forbidden in many areas, the Hungarians who succeed in receiving diplomas are involuntarily transferred to areas outside of Transylvania, or into overwhelmingly Rumanian districts of Transylvania, while local autonomy has been a sad joke, even in the so-called Mures-Magyar autonomous region, ever since 1961. Street brawls about the use of Hungarian in public resulted in large-scale arrests of Hungarians last summer after the amnesty, and the psychological situation of the persecuted 1.75 million Hungarians in Transylvania may be best summed up as being that of one fact and one opinion.

The fact is that 133,000 Transylvanian Hungarians signed up for emigration to equally Communist Hungary. Thus even Kadar's regime is preferable to them than the Rumanian Communist order. The second is the letter of a Hungarian professor of languages, at the merged Babes-Bolyai—Rumanian-Hungarian—university at the capital of Transylvania Kolozsvár—Cluj:

I would rather be a simple member of a collective farm in Hungary, than a professor at this university. The psychological burden of seeing the persecution of my fellow Hungarians proves to be too much for my nerves.

Mr. Speaker, on March 24 and 25, nine of my colleagues, led by my distinguished friends, Congressman MICHAEL FEIGHAN

and SEYMOUR HALPERN, introduced resolutions calling for the condemnation by this House of the discriminatory practices of the Rumanian Communist Government against its Hungarian minority in Transylvania. I think it is only fitting to call the attention of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and its European Subcommittee to these resolutions which in my opinion are called for and proper. I am happy to hear that hearings on this matter are being scheduled and hope that the resolution will soon come before the House.

I must say that this Nation cannot move too speedily or too vigorously to repudiate and act to check the outrages and abuses against the basic rights, freedoms, and privileges of an ancient and honored people like the Transylvanians.

Deprived of their birthright by force, brutality, and a cynically ruthless dictatorship, they still have the spirit and the courage bravely and gallantly to resist the calloused mistreatment and persecution of their tormentors and persecutors, fearlessly standing for and working for their own liberation, and for that of the millions of other helpless people behind the Iron Curtain in all parts of the world, who are being denied their God-given right of freedom and self-determination.

I think that this House can no longer delay in holding out the hand of help and support to these afflicted people, and others like them throughout the world.

It is up to this great Nation, born in freedom, and dedicated to its preservation at all costs, to do something to encourage and help these oppressed peoples.

It is fitting that we should pause in this great deliberative body to evidence our deep interest in and close fellowship with the aims and aspirations of these helpless, defenseless, persecuted peoples, and to reaffirm our unswerving purpose and determination to do everything we can to uphold their spirit and extend them succor and assistance in their hour of trial, tribulation, and dire need.

It is clear that the Transylvania people are being visited with a wide range of discriminatory and repressive actions by their Soviet masters, and that these relate not only to their human rights, but to their heartfelt spiritual beliefs, their rich culture and their proud way of life.

I am dismayed, Mr. Speaker, to think that this great Nation, by silently acquiescing throughout the years to the many instances of persecution like those to which Transylvanians today are being subjected, by inertia and inaction is appearing to condone and tolerate the perpetration of these unspeakable outrages that shock the conscience of just men the world over and cry to heaven itself for redemption.

For our own sake, as well as for the sake of these oppressed gallant peoples, in the name of our own heritage, yes, in the name of the living God who binds us together in human brotherhood, let us move to come to the defense, the relief, and the liberation of these worthy human beings, whose only offense is that

they worship God and love freedom so much that they are willing to suffer, sacrifice, and die for it.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have checked this with the minority and it is satisfactory. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the bill H.R. 8926, the coinage bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WILLIAM McCHESNEY MARTIN, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD, CANNOT STAND PROSPERITY—HE SHOULD RESIGN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is the story of a man who cannot stand prosperity. Let me modify that statement—this is the story of a man who cannot stand prosperity for the many—it is A-OK for the few. This is the story of the Federal Reserve Board's Chairman, William McChesney Martin, who believes that it is more important to restrict the money stock and credit of the Nation, and increase interest rates, than it is to keep America prosperous. This is the story of a man who is defying the President of the United States by singing a siren song of pending disaster unless we take measures that run counter to the President's, which will in fact insure the reality of that disaster.

An important part of this story has to do with the remarkable advances of the economy under President Kennedy, and continued under Lyndon Baines Johnson. No apology is needed for 52 months of uninterrupted prosperity.

Despite this 52-month record of unprecedented prosperity, the longest peacetime period of well-being in the Nation's history, with 75,100,000 employed in this country, with our gross national product for the first quarter of 1965 running at an annual rate of \$648 billion a year, compared to \$622 billion for all of 1964—with all of this magnificent achievement rolling along, from out of the woodwork comes the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board to "cry havoc."

AMERICA'S INCREDIBLE ECONOMIC RECORD UNDER PRESIDENT JOHNSON

In the first 50 months of our record-breaking prosperity, our output of goods and services rose by more than \$147 billion, an increase of almost 30 percent.

Our growth in the last 4 years was greater than that of the entire 9 years previously. Unemployment fell from 6.8 percent in the first 3 months of 1961 to 4.8 percent in the first 3 months of 1965. Last week, President Johnson was able to announce that it went down to 4.6 percent in May, the lowest level since October of 1957.

But, William McChesney Martin of the Federal Reserve Board, in his powerful position, cries havoc—he cannot stand prosperity.

Let us look further at the economic state of affairs under Lyndon Baines Johnson. Inventories remain remarkably low in relation to sales. Price stability is as firm as a weight lifter's muscle. There are no signs of excessive demand or inflationary prices. We are still using only about 89 percent of our productive capacity and while wages have gone up slightly, unit labor costs are lower today than a year ago, according to the President's chief economic adviser, Gardner Ackley.

The tax cut of 1964 provided a major fiscal stimulus for the economy, and in the offing is the excise tax cut which can only help our economy. Thanks to President Johnson's strong campaign to reduce waste in Government, and the increased revenues which continued business expansion has brought, the administration's budget deficit for this fiscal year will be only about half of last year's deficit. The deficit in our national income budget for the first 3 months of this year is only \$100 million.

For Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board, all this has been too good. He is the man who cannot stand prosperity.

Mr. Martin said earlier today that he advocated safe driving and has been accused of causing all the accidents.

It appears to me that he ought to have his driver's license revoked. He got us in a ditch three times under Ike, and now he is trying to do it under Lyndon Baines Johnson. He is too dangerous a driver to be on America's financial and economic highway.

CHAIRMAN MARTIN'S OPEN MOUTH POLICY

In a speech delivered at Columbia University in New York recently, where Chairman Martin noted some similarities between the economic situation now and during the period preceding the great depression, he may have unwittingly brought about the beginning of the end of his public career. He frightened the daylights out of not only the stock market community, but business and some important financial circles around the country as well.

I am inclined to go along with Leon Keyserling, who says that in many respects, Mr. Martin is an "estimable man" and "is not wrong in all respects." Then Mr. Keyserling calls attention to an expansion in consumer debts, which is probably too rapid, that Mr. Martin complains about. But Keyserling notes that Mr. Martin does not tell how the consumer debt situation came about. Mr. Martin carefully avoids mentioning that it is due to a decade under the impact of Federal Reserve Board policies approved

by Mr. Martin, which took a heavy toll in unconscionable interest rate rises that are paid by homeowners, farmers, small businessmen, and American families generally.

While Martin noted a few points of vulnerability that need correction in the American economy, he ignored, as economist Leon Keyserling said, the "manifold points of strength that tower above these—points of vulnerability—like Pike's Peak above the plains."

What Martin did was to give some sensation-generating comparisons between the economic situation now and during the late 1920's. He likened some current conditions to those pertaining to the late 1920's, and he played up the idea that now, as just prior to the 1929 crash, the clear dangers to our domestic well-being lie chiefly, though not altogether, in our balance-of-payments difficulties, the monetary policies of France, and our longstanding deficit in international balance of payments.

This is the theory of those who look upon Herbert Hoover as primarily a victim of wicked European forces that brought upon him the great depression. This theory is totally discounted by such eminent economic scholars as Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, who wrote a study called "Controlling Depressions," and the first John Galbraith work, "The Great Crash." These economic realists saw clearly that the crash was due primarily to domestic maladjustments, "which caused our productive powers to get more and more out of line with distribution and consumption at home," and which, as I will point out later, were accentuated by the Fed's tight-money policies in the late 1920's.

Speaking of maladjustments, during the Hoover depression, things got so bad down in east Texas that the folks were forced to go out and catch cottontail rabbits, something we never ate before. They were called "Hoover hogs." If William McChesney Martin keeps up his drive toward disaster, we may call them "Martin hogs."

That the real danger to our economic progress lies in implementing policies that have been discredited because they have time and again brought about man-made depressions and recessions never seems to enter William McChesney Martin's mind. That the very monetary policies which he espouses and puts into practice are what causes national economic distress is totally imperceptible to the thinking mechanism of a man who is so completely Hoover oriented, and who is a believer in the trickle-down money theory. A prominent Washington writer, who knows him well, told me that he believes that Martin would buy a Hoover collar if the haberdasheries still stocked them. The cogs in his head click one way—tight, tight, tight money, high, high, high interest rates; ignore increasing the money stock even when economic activity demands it.

A further note on the Hoover trickle-down policy, which funneled money to the top and mighty little of it to the bottom. There were supposed to be two cars in every garage and two chickens in

every pot, according to Hoover. But what the policy really trickled down to was that the car or cars were repossessed by the finance company and there were no chickens, and not even a pot to cook them in. But there were at least two mortgages on all homes that had not been foreclosed.

To return to the matter of money supply, so vital to the economy of every country, let's see how Mr. Martin and the Fed have blundered. In mid-May, our money supply was \$159.2 billion. Believe it or not, last December it was a little higher, \$159.4 billion. But in the same period, our gross national product increased to where it is now almost \$650 billion, and between the fourth quarter of 1964 and the first quarter of 1965, it went up almost \$14 billion. I repeat, our money stock remained the same.

The man who cannot stand prosperity has not been able to grasp that money supply, credit, and interest rate policies right here at home bring on depressions and recessions. Every single depression and recession that we have had, which put the country through a wringer each time—three under Eisenhower—was preceded by a curtailment of the money supply—a failure to keep the money supply abreast of the expanding economy—a tightening of credit and an increase in interest rates. This is precisely Martin's policy today—it was the same yesterday, and the day before, and the day before.

Martin's policy could bring us trouble, but not a depression or a re-do of the horrible Hoover days, because of the great things that have happened under Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, John Kennedy, and Lyndon Johnson. I shall only mention a few facts that will show how dissimilar 1929 is from 1965. To those who still get nerve tremors thinking of the Hoover days, let them take courage from the following.

SOME REASONS WHY 1965 IS NOT 1929

In 1929, the Government did not have a budget of \$100 billion a year. This in itself is a cushion against any major collapse of the total American economy.

During the Hoover depression, the old folks had lost their life savings and had nothing to fall back on. Today, we have the social security system which provides some income to 19.9 million of our citizens.

During the Hoover depression, and for the 5 years preceding it, the farmer had been not a second-class citizen but a fifth-class citizen economically. His income had been shrinking since the midtwenties. Prices of things he had to buy were going up, up, up. Interest rates were also going up, up, up, so that when he went to the bank to borrow money to produce crops or to raise cattle and hogs—when he wanted to borrow money for any of these things, he was looked upon as a very bad risk and paid through the nose, if he could get any money at all out of his banker.

Today, most farmers are protected by farm programs, and while the farmer's income might not be as high as the farmer would like, he cannot conceivably

be as bad off as he was when he had nothing but Hoover's famous crack about "prosperity" being "just around the corner" to lean upon.

Mr. Martin, with his Hoover depression mentality, ignores the fact that we have insurance for our unemployed workers. Besides, we have programs that President Johnson is implementing designed to curtail poverty and bring improvement to the worst areas of distress in America, to aid the bottom layer of our wage earners so that the whole economy will not have a continuing drain upon it.

President Johnson is trying to help people to help themselves. Herbert Hoover, best known for his great depression, spurred people all along the road to misery. Chairman Martin, the man who cannot stand prosperity, appears to want to pick up where Herbert Hoover left off.

MARTIN DISCREDITS HIMSELF WITH THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY

The business community, the last to turn against Herbert Hoover during his great depression—and what names businessmen called him—was in sheer panic due to the Hoover administration mismanagement and lack of foresight in the years preceding the depression and during it—actually up until Roosevelt's reminder that the only thing Americans "have to fear is fear itself."

I have felt all along that Martin fears prosperity. He is trying to frighten people because we are prosperous. The very businessmen and financial leaders who have supported Martin in his debate with me through the years over the alleged independence of the Federal Reserve System are now beginning to scratch their heads and wonder whether perhaps I have not been right.

My telephone calls from all over America have been very heavy lately, saying: "What is this 'blank, blank' Martin trying to do?" "Who's back of him?" "What can we do to stop him from ruining our economy?" "Why doesn't he let well enough alone?" "Who's he trying to frighten, a few stock market manipulators or the American people?" "Is it right for an American official to have the authority to make our economy plummet?"

MARTIN'S POLICIES MUST STOP

The really disquieting similarities between our present time and the period immediately preceding the great depression is the fact that for the past 6 months the Federal Reserve has been carrying on a squeeze it policy, that is, they have tightened, tightened, tightened credit. That is what happened prior to the Hoover depression.

Besides, interest rates have been going up as they were before the big crash in 1929. Bankers then and now were asking big business, small business and consumers to pay more and more for money. While rates today have been going up moderately, except on short-term governments where they have been soaring, if a businessman wants to borrow money for a legitimate project, frequently he is asked to pay points to someone in order to obtain the loan. This is a subterfuge

employed to collect more than the advertised or announced rate of interest. Points are even asked sometimes in order to obtain a home loan.

Another way to increase the interest rate works as follows: The businessman goes to his bank and says he needs a hundred thousand dollars. The banker tells him, "We'll let you have it provided your account never goes below \$15 or \$30 thousand." This has a nice name—it is called a compensating balance. Through this practice, the bank collects interest on a hundred thousand dollar loan, but actually loans the borrower anywhere from \$70 to \$85 thousand.

Banks are getting bolder and bolder in carrying on this kind of shenanigans. William McChesney Martin is making it easier for them to make these demands on businessmen, large and small, and homeowners, and farmers, and laborers, and other consumers—he is encouraging this type of usury by tightening credit and ever seeking higher interest rates. Have you ever heard of Chairman Martin or any Federal Reserve official protecting the people against injustices caused by extortionate interest rates? The answer is a resounding "No."

Probably the worst practice that is going on in banking is when they find a businessman in distress, they move into his business, in its direction and its ownership. They get their pound of flesh. And the more William McChesney Martin tightens credit and increases interest rates, the more distress there will be in the business community and the more banks will muscle into it, particularly business in distress.

THE FED IS THE ROOT OF ALL FINANCIAL EVIL

Mr. Martin's Fed has caused every single depression and recession in our time, and always by tightening credit and increasing interest rates, and cutting down on the money supply. For the past 6 months, the money supply of the Nation has failed to increase. It has remained constant. The one way to assure economic trouble is to cut off an orderly increase in money supply necessary for the needs of an expanding economy.

Despite everything that Martin has been doing to curtail our economic progress and well-being, he cannot do away with the mighty pillar of strength erected to avoid disaster to our banking structure. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation makes it possible for everyone who has money on deposit in practically all of our commercial banks and savings and loan institutions to know that their accounts are insured up to \$10,000. Last year I attempted to make the insurance \$20,000, but the banking lobby defeated my proposal. William McChesney Martin may do the country wrong economically, but he cannot hurt the basic strength the FDIC represents.

I have enumerated several similarities between what went on in Hoover's day and today, some of them worrisome, that stem from the action of the head of America's central banking system.

Well, you will say, this is another one of PATMAN's diatribes against William McChesney Martin—we have been hear-

ing the same for many years. My colleagues, I do not wish to rub it in, but there are none so blind as those who will not see. If you have not had evidence to back up what my contention has been for a long, long time; namely, that Martin's tight money and higher interest rate policy, and his mouthings concerning it, are detrimental to the forward movement of the American economy, then Martin's supporters are absolutely right—PATMAN is just carrying on a feud without substance.

BUSINESSMEN ARE ASKING QUESTIONS

But the American businessmen, both large and small, who call me on the phone today know differently. They ask, "What can you do to shut this fellow up?" "What can you do to counteract the evil that he is doing?" "What can you do to make the Federal Reserve responsible to the President of the United States?" "What can you do to mesh monetary policy with fiscal and economic policy?" "How can you have the Fed going one way and the Government the other and come out whole?" "Must we have two governments in Washington—one elected and the other carefully selected by a few bankers?"

If you seriously want to know the answers to these questions that have all been asked me in recent days, then I say to you gentlemen, it is high time that we do what I have suggested we do for a long, long time—bring the money power back to the highest elected official of the U.S. Government and the Congress. No longer permit the spokesmen for great banking vested interests to govern the direction the American finance and economy should take.

Think hard, think long, my colleagues, I am not making a plea for a pet peeve of WRIGHT PATMAN'S. I am talking about the hard core of our economic life, our central banking system. The Federal Reserve is to the American economy what a generator is to a lighting system. If the generator functions properly, light is with us; if it falters, we're in darkness.

The forebodings of depression-minded Martin are those of an unhappy man, whose hand is at the switch of the generator. Or perhaps there is a better analogy. The chairman of the Federal Reserve is like the undertaker in the depression days who had not had a funeral for 6 months. He had the longest face in town. There had to be a cadaver somewhere or he would continue in his misery. William McChesney Martin hopes to find the cadaver—the American economy.

To sum up Mr. Martin's speech at Columbia University in New York takes but a few words—he came not to praise the economy, but to bury it.

SIR WILLIAM PETTY IN 1682 KNEW MORE THAN
CHAIRMAN MARTIN IN 1965

I wish to discuss a bit more about money supply, which is one of the keys to whether American businessmen and consumers have adequate credit for their needs.

In 1682, Sir William Petty, one of the first great economic geniuses to appear, wrote an essay called, "Questions and

Answers Concerning Money." In answer to a question, "Is there any way to know how much money is sufficient for any nation?", he answered to the effect that the amount of money has to be in relationship to the national income of a country.

What Petty knew in 1682, Martin has not learned to this day. I might add that Sir Samuel Pepys said of this early economist, William Petty:

He was the most rational man who I ever heard speak with a tongue.

Another question in Sir William Petty's essay was, "What remedy is there if we have too little money?" The answer:

We must erect a bank, which will computed, doth almost double the effect of our coined money: and we have in England materials for a bank which shall furnish stock enough to drive the trade of the whole commercial world.

MR. MARTIN AS HISTORIAN

In a memorable Washington Post editorial following the Fed Chairman's speech, called "Mr. Martin as Historian," the writer notes that:

Mr. Martin dilated on many of the factors that converted a stock exchange crash into the worst depression in our history. There are many references to collapse of the gold exchange standards, to speculation, to the lopsided distribution of income, and to loose banking practices. But nowhere in his chronicle does the Chairman mention the money supply, the central element in any monetary history. What Mr. Martin failed to tell his Columbia audience is that the stock of money declined by a third between 1929 and 1933, and that the Federal Reserve policy was directly responsible for that devastating shrinkage. This point is relevant because the Fed has of late been pursuing a policy of increasing monetary restraint. Their stock of money is now no larger than it was 6 months ago, and unless it is permitted to grow, the economic expansion will grind to a halt.

If Mr. Martin's selective history has any moral, it was stated by Santayana who wrote: "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." Congress, which under the Constitution is charged with the regulation of the Nation's money supply, can avert a repetition of the baleful past by instructing the Federal Reserve authorities to follow a consistent policy, one that will provide the stock of money required to sustain economic growth.

This editorial is, I believe, accurate in its summation and I shall have it printed in its entirety following my remarks. I wish to point out one fact that the editorial writer omitted; namely, that from early 1928 on, the money stock not only did not grow but actually declined slightly, which played a large part in undermining the economy prior to the 1929 stock market crash.

As an aside, I wish to state that the morning paper carried a story that I also wish to put in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. It is a dissenting view to Chairman Martin's from Federal Reserve Board member, J. L. Robertson. It seems that there is at least one convert among Mr. Martin's coterie. There may be more, because anyone in his right mind has to agree with Mr. Robertson, who said, according to the UPI story:

Tight money is not now an appropriate prescription for our domestic economic prob-

lems. We are not suffering from domestic inflation.

Board member Robertson concludes with this pungent paragraph:

I would not favor higher interest rates here unless and until it seemed likely that higher rates would either be needed to contain or curb inflation at home or would significantly improve the balance of payments without jeopardizing our domestic economy—which, of course, is the real source of our strength.

What the man who could not stand prosperity seems to be doing is emulating the disastrous monetary policy that led to the 1929 crash. This is the most disquieting similarity that can be documented. This is not a myth or a distortion of maladjustments, 1929 to 1933, vis-a-vis 1965. Mr. Martin's speech makes it clear that he has learned little, that he is prepared to repeat the mistakes of the late 1920's and early 1930's, and of the 1950's. This is truly a disquieting similarity.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN RANDOLPH OF VIRGINIA
WAS A WISE MAN

Mr. Martin has been called the king-emperor of America's money system. In other days the title was bestowed upon such men as Nicholas Biddle, Morgan the First, Morgan the Second, and, of course, Andrew Mellon. Certainly, early in American history, statements and debates over America's money power were as commonplace as they are today.

In 1811, during the debate over the renewal of the charter of the Bank of the United States, Representative John Randolph of Virginia expressed his opposition to the charter. The following statement is attributed to Representative Randolph:

Charter a bank with \$35 million of capital, let it be established and learn its power, and then find, if you can, means to bell the cat. It will be beyond your power, it will overawe your Congress and laugh at your laws.

The particular cat of Randolph's time, symbolizing the aggressive character of the money trust, is still very much alive. I am sorry to say that, to this day, we have not belled the cat. Today its name is the Fed cat. Its immediate parents are the fat cats of the banking community that inhabit an alley of Lower Manhattan Island, known as Wall Street.

In 1818, a committee of the New York State Legislature reported as follows:

Of all aristocracies, none more completely enslave a people than that of money; no system was ever better devised so perfectly to enslave a community as that of the present mode of conducting bank establishments. Like the siren that entices to destroy.

They hold the purse strings of society, and by monopolizing the whole of the circulating medium of the country, they form a precarious standard by which all the property of the country—home, lands, debts and credits, personal and real estate of all descriptions—are valued, thus rendering the whole community dependent upon them; proscribing every man who dares to expose their unlawful practices.

AN AWESOME BURDEN OF RESPONSIBILITY

Such is the power of money power, those who are in controlling position have a responsibility so heavy and awesome that it is almost too much for any man to assume.

One thing about this matter I do know, certainly the country cannot afford, even as prosperous as it is, a man at the helm of our monetary system who is so afraid of prosperity that he has to end it. Certainly, we cannot afford to have a monetary course set one way and a fiscal and economic policy set another. Assuredly, we cannot have President Johnson responsible for the well-being of the country and have Chairman Martin, who is not responsible for its well-being, put the brakes on the President's program for economic prosperity.

Eliot Janeway, the noted business economist, stated very clearly the situation when he said:

Any test of Presidential power is bound to be disturbing to business confidence which has come to rest on teamwork between the President, Congress, and the executive agencies.

And Mr. Janeway noted that the Fed's Chairman "has created such a disturbance by challenging President Johnson's policy of keeping the banking system supplied with reserves adequate to meet loan demand in an expanding world economy."

Mr. Janeway continues:

The present upset in the stock and money markets recalls the trouble which the Martin administration of the Federal Reserve Board caused during the Eisenhower and Kennedy years. But Johnson is not likely to permit Chairman Martin to involve him in any kind of stock market break or business slump. The prognosis is not for a muddle-along market in Johnson's name but under Martin's management.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON WILL NOT PERMIT
MISMANAGEMENT OF OUR MONEY SYSTEM

Knowing President Lyndon Baines Johnson from the time he was 12 years old, having followed his brilliant career, I can assure you that he will not permit the American economy to go to pot. He will not stand idly by and permit any arrogance on the part of a Federal Reserve Board Chairman, nor will he permit any ineptness to continue for long. Certainly, he will not have the show under his name and somebody else's management.

I have pointed out that the Fed has gone one way and the administration another, insofar as fiscal, economic, and monetary matters are concerned. This is a fact no matter how hard reactionary columnists, who support Martin and the Fed, are attempting to fool the public into believing otherwise.

Would Martin agree with Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, who said recently:

We saw in the late 1950's what fiscal and monetary restrictions did to jobs, to profits, to investment and to productivity. It is in the interest of all of us to avoid falling back into that trap. If we do maintain reasonable stability of costs and prices, we can continue the expansionary, monetary, and fiscal policies that have contributed so much to our present prosperity.

Or would Martin agree with Secretary of the Treasury Fowler, who said:

To raise interest rates, not only conflicts with our need to maintain our domestic expansion, but would not solve the (balance-of-payments) problem. An interest rate increase large enough to have a significant ef-

fect would almost certainly bring a recession. A recession, in turn, would severely damage the climate for foreign investment in the United States and would also create a strong movement to reduce interest rates immediately.

Mr. Martin would disagree with both of these—in fact, he did when he said in his Columbia University speech:

Our common goals of maximum production, employment, and purchasing power can be realized only if we prevent orderly expansion from turning into disorderly boom. If an occasion arose when we could preserve the international role of the dollar only at the expense of modifying our favored domestic policies, even then would we need to pay attention to the international repercussions of our actions.

As Frank Porter said, in an astute news analysis in the Washington Post, the Fed Chairman "directly questioned the view of top administration economists that 1929 is not 1965 and that the present 52-month expansion demonstrates the Nation is capable of sustained economic growth." The very able Mr. Porter pointed out that no matter what the intent, Martin's words have had a "depressing effect." Most objective observers will agree.

PATMAN'S SOLUTION

I believe I have the solution. In view of the fact that Chairman Martin has challenged our President; in view of the fact that the stock market dropped 14 points in 2 days following his gratuitous speech; in view of the fact that many business leaders are concerned lest his words cause the end of our 52-month prosperity; in view of the fact that Martin is advocating tight-money, high-interest-rate policies that will bring about the disaster he seems eager to foster—I suggest that the present Federal Reserve Board Chairman has outlived his usefulness as a public servant in charge of America's central banking system. I suggest that he ease himself out of his present occupation and permit President Johnson to name a Board Chairman of his own choosing.

Many, many times on the floor of this House, I have pointed out that it is only every 4 years that a President has the opportunity to name the Board Chairman of our Federal Reserve System, and then he must choose him from the seven Board members holding office. President Kennedy reappointed Mr. Martin, who had held the office for some time. But my colleagues, do you remember that it was Chairman Martin, reappointed by President Kennedy, who announced that if he felt it necessary, he would tighten money and raise interest rates if the tax cut suggested by President Kennedy overheated our economic system by permitting people to buy things with the money they didn't have to pay in taxes. He just could not stand prosperity for the ordinary American citizen.

It is apparent that the Federal Reserve Board Chairman, no matter who he is, under the existing law has too much power. Last year, the majority of the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am chairman, offered some recommendations which would alter the situation that nearly arose when Martin

indicated he would, if he felt like it, challenge President Kennedy. Today, the unfortunate situation has actually arisen through the challenge to President Johnson by Mr. Martin.

I not only call upon Mr. Martin to do the decent thing and resign, but I ask that the Congress seriously consider H.R. 11, which was put together after extensive hearings, the most extensive in the 50-year history of the Federal Reserve System. H.R. 11 embodies the recommendations of the subcommittee and would alter most of the defects that now exist in the Fed. It would no longer permit a Federal Reserve Chairman and his Board to operate monetary policy contrary to the economic and fiscal policies of the President and Congress of the United States. It would make the Fed responsible to the President and Congress, who are elected by the people and who can be removed by the people if their policies do not meet with the people's approval.

Now, Martin and the Fed are responsible only to the banking interests that have been clamoring for tight money and high interest rates.

It is my notion that the American people would prefer to have as head of our central banking system someone who is responsible to them, rather than a man who has been so responsive to the wishes of those who believe in the divine right of money kings.

FEDERAL RESERVE AID DISPUTES MARTIN VIEW

PTTSBURGH, PA., June 9.—A member of the Federal Reserve Board took issue tonight with recent statements by Board Chairman William McChesney Martin, Jr., regarding the U.S. economy and balance of payments.

J. L. Robertson told a meeting of bankers that higher interest rates would be bad medicine both for business at home and for the dollar abroad.

"Tight money is not now an appropriate prescription for our domestic economic problems, given the current slackening in the rate of business expansion and our sizable remaining margins of unutilized resources—both human and material," Robertson said.

As for the dollar outflow, Robertson said that "our balance of payment: is not suffering from the 'traditional' ailments for which tighter money has come to be regarded as the 'traditional' solution."

"We are not suffering from domestic inflation, with a resulting excess of imports over exports and accompanied by a flight from the currency," he said in a speech prepared for delivery to a meeting sponsored by the directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.

Martin had compared the present prosperity to the roaring twenties which preceded the great depression. He said the Government must remain "willing and able to prevent orderly expansion from turning into disorderly boom."

Raising U.S. interest rates to make them more competitive with European rates would simply drive up European rates, too, Robertson said.

"Consequently, I would not favor higher interest rates here unless and until it seemed likely that higher rates would either be needed to contain or curb inflation at home or would significantly improve the balance of payments without jeopardizing our domestic economy—which, of course, is the real source of our strength," Robertson said.

MR. MARTIN AS HISTORIAN

Many professional historians would like to change the course of contemporary events,

but in the end it is only the amateurs who have any chance of success. The other day at Columbia University, Chairman William McChesney Martin of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System courted Clio with an address entitled, "Does Monetary History Repeat Itself?" But before the words could be uttered on Morningside Heights, Wall Street was reeled by what it regarded as the bearishness of the advanced text, and the Dow-Jones average fell by 9.51 points.

There are those who will argue that the market was already jittery, that the effects of Mr. Martin's muscle-flexing excursion through history are trivial. But they are wrong. Mr. Martin, by virtue of his prestige, both within the Federal Reserve System and outside, can indeed alter the course of contemporary events. And that is why his reading of past events, in this instance the great depression, is important.

It is tempting to subject Mr. Martin's remarks to a deep analysis, to find in them a veiled desire to boost interest rates in this country to the higher levels prevailing in Europe. But before moving into the subterranean realm of conjecture and imputation, one ought first to explore what is palpable and above the ground. There is an instructive parallel between Mr. Martin's very selective view of monetary history and the monetary policy now pursued by the Fed.

Mr. Martin dilated on many of the "factors that converted a stock exchange crash into the worst depression in our history." There are many references to collapse of the gold exchange standards, to speculation, to the lopsided distribution of income, and to loose banking practices. But nowhere in his chronicle does the chairman mention the money supply, the central element in any monetary history. It is as if had rewritten "Hamlet" without the Prince.

What Mr. Martin failed to tell his Columbia audience is that the stock of money declined by a third between 1929 and 1933, and that the Federal Reserve policy was directly responsible for that devastating shrinkage. This point is relevant because the Fed has of late been pursuing a policy of increasing monetary restraint. There stock of money is now no larger than it was six months ago, and unless it is permitted to grow, the economic expansion will grind to a halt.

If Mr. Martin's selective history has any moral, it was stated by Santayana who wrote: "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." Congress, which under the Constitution is charged with the regulation of the Nation's money supply, can avert a repetition of the baleful past by instructing the Federal Reserve authorities to follow a consistent policy, one that will provide the stock of money required to sustain economic growth.

THE TEENAGER—AMERICA'S FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, throughout our great Nation this week thousands of our young people are graduating from high schools and colleges. After years of diligent studies and good behavior, they have finally attained their goals and receive their much coveted diplomas. The years of work and learning were for one main purpose, to prepare themselves for a better and fuller life as Americans. Their proud families after years of sacrifice and concern watch with expressions of pride and joy their young ones, in cap and gown, re-

ceiving their reward and recognition. This scene is repeated over and over during this graduation week. However, these proud events, wherein lies the future and greatness of America, are soon forgotten. The happy news stories disappear and are replaced by the glaring headlines of the small minority of teenagers who commit crimes and other acts of civil disobedience which attract attention and headlines. The long years of study and good behavior are forgotten. I therefore wish to take this opportunity to acclaim and publicize and give recognition to those teenagers who are a credit to their families, themselves, and their country.

On April 28, 1965, the Boston Globe, in the middle of the front page, carried an AP photograph which contained the following caption:

Youth Lends a Hand—Young people were enlisted to help build a new levee as Mississippi River floodwaters flooded Rock Island, Ill. In several other cities young people were doing all they could to help.

I discussed the article entitled, "Students Battle Raging Floods," with the Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, and pointed out to him the ending of the article which reads:

A tired Red Cross worker said, "Year after year it's the kids that save these towns up and down the valley, simply because us old folks can't take it. We'd be lost without them." A gray-haired man standing at a dike added, "You consider the things you hear about kids today and you figure give or take a little, that maybe 10 percent of them aren't worth a damn and never will be. Then you take a look at the 90 percent up there in the dike, and it makes your belly crawl. They've just saved the Quad Cities, that's what they've done. I hope I never hear about the rotten 10 percent again, any of them. I just want plenty of time to think about this 90 percent."

I had to agree with this anonymous individual that too long have we heard and too much have we read of the juvenile delinquent and the teenage criminal, because this is what is called news and sensationalism. The good "kid" or honest teenager is not news and his story will not sell copy. He is not the subject of a story. Oddly enough, he is the real story, the story of success, the story of a good citizen, the story of a great American. The criminal teenager goes to prison or reformatory, the honest teenager goes to high school and college and becomes a doctor, a scientist, a successful businessman, a good American. He is the basis of our society, he makes this country great, he is the citizen and American of tomorrow, yet he is not the news which the newspapers see fit to print today on their front pages. This is indeed a strange paradox.

The Boston Globe of April 28, 1965, had on the same front page which I previously referred to, a line of photographs strung along the top of the page, with a headline over the eight photographs which read, "Fifty-One Bay State Students Win National Merit Scholarships." In contrast, the front page of the Washington, D.C., newspapers ran a series describing teenage gangs, muggings by

youth, and other sordid descriptions of crimes by teenagers. Perhaps this sells more newspapers, but I refuse to believe this, and I would be more inclined to agree with the approach taken by the Boston Globe, which praises instead of degrading our young Americans.

Therefore, today I wish to speak for, and of, the good teenagers, the future leaders of our country, those young people of whom we can be justly proud. Recent examples have come to me of other teenagers that roam our Capitol area, but never make the front pages. For example, one night during a driving rainstorm, a motorist and his family had a flat tire on Route 50, in Arlington. He attempted to change the tire, but one of the tire nuts was frozen. When he was about to give up, a car with two teenagers, in raincoats, pulled up and they said, "Can we help, sir?" When the trouble was explained to them, they went into the trunk of their 1955 model car and brought out a large tool chest. With a special wrench they loosened the nut and changed the tire. The grateful motorist reached for his billfold, but he was startled by the response from the two young men, when they said, "Oh, no sir, we can't take money. Our 'hot rod' club sends us out on nights such as this to rescue and help stranded motorists. We will be expelled and fined if we accept a cent." They then handed him a card which stated that he had been assisted by the members of an Arlington "hot rod" club.

These roving young samaritans never make the headlines, but the Arlington police can attest to their character and efficiency. They are expert mechanics and strictly behave themselves. A member caught speeding or breaking their club rules and regulations, which are more stringent than the Virginia Motor Code, is punished by his colleagues. These are the leaders of tomorrow that we should praise to the sky.

In my own files I have records of commendations issued to outstanding boys and girls, highlighting their accomplishments. From my own district, the 20th District of Ohio, I have commended the following students this year:

First. On January 15, 1965, I congratulated Miss Joyce Ann Barrett, 3855 West 160th Street, Cleveland, Ohio, for being 1 of 40 students selected from 22,692 high school seniors in the annual Westinghouse science talent search.

Second. On March 8, 1965, congratulations were extended to Miss Christine Krysiak, 3410 Russell Avenue, Parma, Ohio, for being the top winner in a national teen guest editor contest sponsored by the Extension magazine. This award brought a \$500 college scholarship.

Third. Again, in March 1965, Miss Janet Marie Rutkowski of 2716 Tuxedo Avenue, Para, Ohio, was recognized in the honors group of 300 in the field of science, her project was "Determination of the Source of Excess Ammonia Production in the Potassium—Depleted and Acidotic Kidney."

Fourth. On March 16, 1965, I congratulated Mr. James Dickinson, 16604 Westdale Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio, for being 1 of the 12 State winners of the

American Legion essay contest on Americanism and Government programs.

Over the years teenagers from my district have received scholarships, awards, and other citations for scholastic ability and accomplishments in the fields of science, athletics, oratorical ability, and writing. I have followed the careers of these outstanding young people and they have grown up to become leaders and outstanding citizens of our community.

We should all point with great pride to the splendid young men we have appointed to the service academies who are now serving their country with pride and distinction. My nominees and their subsequent graduations have always been a source of great pride and satisfaction, both to me and their families. Many of my nominees are now serving our country in Vietnam and other trouble areas. They make it possible for me to stand up today before this great body and praise their loyalty and service to our country. Of this I am justly proud.

The President's youth programs and the war against poverty are designed to assist the unfortunate minority that, because of environment, lack of opportunity, and poverty, fall into a life of crime and juvenile delinquency. After World War II many of the great cities of Europe were overrun by gangs of homeless children and what they called "street urchins." These countries solved their problem of homeless, parentless waifs, by establishing boy towns and other similar organizations. I am sure with our combined efforts and support for the President's program against crime, we could solve this problem with speed and efficiency.

Recently, the children of a local high school in Fairfax County were challenged on a school prayer which they had written and voted upon, almost unanimously to recite before their noon lunch. When an effort was made to stop the prayer, the boys and girls of the W. T. Woodson High School reacted with anger and determination. They had composed the prayer, the student council approved it, and the student body voted almost unanimously to recite the prayer and post it on the wall of their cafeteria.

The realization that some outside source wanted them to stop praying had a sharp reaction. The prayer is now recited with much more reverence and meaning. Many of them vowed to go to jail before they would cease saying the prayer. The principal and school board sided with the students. They still recite their prayer, now with much more pride and joy. They fought and won and kept their prayer, and every day give their thanks out loud to their God. These are examples of our teenage citizens of tomorrow who recognize their moral responsibilities and will bow before no man in order to exercise their freedom of speech and religion. This is the moral fiber of our great Nation.

I have cited only a few cases of the good teenager. Since he and she are not, as the news media interprets, sensational news, I plead with all of my colleagues to make them sensational news. I implore you to follow this speech with example after example of the fine accomplish-

ments, deeds, and positions attained by the teenagers from each of your districts. We should encourage these fine young people by recognizing their accomplishments and making them part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Too long have we stood back and let our youth be tainted and smeared by the acts of a small minority. It is high time we recognize the great majority of wonderful young men and girls who are a source of pride and honor to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I insert in the RECORD examples of the accomplishments and actions of the youth of America, who deserve recognition for achievements and I sincerely hope other Members of Congress will take similar action.

[From the Boston Globe, Apr. 28, 1965]

STUDENTS BATTLE RAGING FLOODS

The swirling water was up to their knees and the muddy Mississippi on the other side of the dike was higher than their heads. They could have been killed by a wall of water at any moment, but none of them gave up.

It was Bettendorf, Iowa, on a spring afternoon when most teenagers would have been out of school and free from care. But 75 youngsters were fighting one of the most important battles of their lives.

The flooding river had suddenly poked a hole through the 6-foot-high sandbag wall along Duck Creek, and the geyser of water shot out like a rushing mountain stream.

"It's comin' through," one shouted, and they ran to the spot from all sections of the dike. "We need some bags, hurry," another yelled, and they began tearing the green sacks of sand from atop a stronger section of the wall.

Then a flat-bed truck loaded with bags pulled in, and in seconds the youngsters had formed three lines and were heaving the bags along a brigade line to the bubbling water.

"More, more—get some more sand in here—get down off that dike—get those girls out of the line * * * faster." And the shouts were louder than the rushing water. But the river would not give up either.

A National Guard jeep bounced down the road and two soldiers hopped out, ordering everyone out of the area. The boys and girls climbed on the truck, some soaked chest high with water, one grade school boy barefoot and one coed with a raw and bleeding hand.

They watched almost reluctantly as trucks began to dump the first of several loads of broken rock that eventually saved the dike.

This was Bettendorf, but the scene was repeated in La Crosse, Dubuque, Sabula, Winona or any of the hundred other places which have fought the Mississippi in its angriest spree of the century. In every front line it's "the kids" who carry the load.

At Rock Island, Ill., Army Engineers called for a maximum effort from hundreds of weary floodworkers today as the mighty Mississippi rode down on the Quad Cities area with its highest crest in history.

The river early today tore a 150-foot hole in a dike south of Quincy, Ill., about 140 miles downstream from here, and swept inland across rich farmland. Civil Defense officials said no injuries were reported. However, they said 60 homes and 14 industrial facilities were endangered in a 6,000-acre area.

A cold, wind-swept rain drenched the scores of soldiers, students, city and State workers locked in a tense struggle to save Rock Island and Moline, Ill., and East Moline and Davenport, Iowa, from the runaway river.

The kids come from college and high school and grade school and their cowboy boots and tennis sneakers and Beatie boots slish in the

muddy water. They wear ski jackets and fraternity sweatshirts and old sweaters with jeans, pedal-pushers and shorts.

In the lots they shovel sand, tie bags, toss them on trucks and swarm about the Salvation Army truck when it's time for soda pop and ham sandwiches. Trucks rumble through the streets packed with shouting, laughing youngsters on their way to another dike.

They come because they've been asked to, or because the gang is going, or because, after all, it might be fun.

One night during a bleak hour when most people were short on humor, a young man stopped Rock Island, Ill., Mayor Morris Muhleman along a dike to say "there wasn't any need for us to come out here at all, mayor."

"What do you mean?" the mayor asked. "Haven't you heard? The flood has been called off." The remark brought a laugh from everyone.

A tired Red Cross worker said, "Year after year it's the kids that save these towns up and down the valley, simply because us old folks can't take it. We'd be lost without 'em."

A gray-haired man standing at a dike added:

"You consider the things you hear about kids today and you figure give or take a little, that maybe 10 percent of them aren't worth a damn and never will be.

"Then you take a look at the 90 percent up there on the dike, and it makes your belly crawl. They've just saved the Quad Cities, that's what they've done. I hope I never hear about the rotten 10 percent again, any of them. I just want plenty of time to think about this 90 percent."

[From the Boston Globe, Apr. 28, 1965]

FIFTY-ONE BAY STATE STUDENTS WIN NATIONAL MERIT SCHOLARSHIPS—COMPOSER, DESIGNER INCLUDED

An outstanding group of 51 Massachusetts students, including the designer of an electronic computer and the composer of a choral mass, won 4-year awards today in the 10th annual merit scholarship competition.

They were among 1,900 students nationwide named merit scholars by John M. Stalaker, president of the National Merit Scholarship Corp.

More than 11,000 merit scholars have been appointed in the 10-year history of the program—which seeks out the very top fraction of 1 percent of students throughout the country.

The talents of the merit scholars go far beyond the purely academic, though excellence in high school studies is a must.

For instance, Nicholas D. Humez, of Lexington High School, has composed a choral mass and 20 shorter pieces during the past 4 years, has won a scholastic art competition, and is an accomplished photographer. He plans to study French literature at Harvard and then go into teaching of languages.

Stanley M. Cole, of Newton South High School, has won six awards with an electronic computer which he designed and built by himself. He was also active in student politics and was editor of the school newspaper. Cole earned three 800 scores (the highest score you can receive) on his college entrance exams.

He will go to Harvard and plans a career as a research physicist.

The inclination to teaching and research was not unique to these two scholars. In fact, the majority of the Massachusetts merit scholars indicated that they plan careers in one of these two general areas.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, May 3, 1965]

GIRL'S POSTER WINS AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION AWARD

Concern for the safety of young children has won a Collinwood High School student a

top award in the American Automobile Association poster contest.

Marilyn Halstead, 18, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Edward R. Halstead, 931 East 160th Street, also will receive \$150 for her poster, "Help Your Safety Patrol."

Sixteen other Greater Cleveland students won cash prizes totaling \$490. The Cleveland Automobile Club sponsored the AAA's 21st National School Traffic Safety Poster Contest locally.

Miss Halstead's poster depicts a youngster mimicking the safety signal of a student patrol boy. The poster will be reproduced by the AAA for distribution in schools throughout the Nation.

Other Greater Cleveland winners are:

Senior division: \$75 first place, Dwayne Michaels, South High; \$50 second place prizes, Ricardo Duhart, East High, and Linda Holliday, Lakewood High; \$20 third place, Linda Sherry, South High; honorable mention, Barb Hallisy, Parma High, and Florence Grzelka, South High.

Junior division: \$15 third place, Carol Dickey, Horace Mann Junior High.

Elementary division: \$25 first place, Pamela Kikell, St. Monica School; \$10 second place prizes (joint entry), Jerry Hackey and John Belter, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and Matthew Sejnowski, St. Casimir; \$5 third place, Brian Plachan, Nathaniel Hawthorne; honorable mention, Cordell Silvey, Louis Agassiz; Cynthia Domen, Steve Matyas, Marla Simpson, and Douglas Moltz, all of Nathaniel Hawthorne, and Beverly Carter of Robert Fulton.

[From the Catholic University Bulletin, Apr. 2, 1965]

IN SCHOOL FESTIVAL—NOTRE DAME GIRL REPEATS AS BEST ACTRESS

For the second successive year Charlene Corr, of Notre Dame Academy, was named best actress in the Cleveland Catholic Drama Festival at John Carroll University. Sharing honors with her last weekend was Gerald Fasko, Our Lady of Lourdes High, named best actor.

Fasko also received a scholarship to John Carroll as high-ranking eligible senior boy. An Ursuline College scholarship for an eligible high-ranking senior girl was awarded to Ann Anzic of St. Augustine Academy.

Miss Corr, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Leo E. Corr, 2221 Coventry Road, Cleveland Heights, won with her portrayal of Lady Macbeth in "Macbeth." She is a senior.

Fasko's winning role was Henry Drummond in "Inherit the Wind." He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Jack Fasko, 14612 Tokay Avenue, Maple Heights.

The role of Maggie in "Overtones" won the scholarship for Miss Anzic. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Anzic, 5818 Prosser Avenue.

For the first time this year the Cleveland Unit of the National Catholic Theater Conference, sponsor of the festival, presented the Order of St. Genesius Jewel to a director for outstanding service. It was given to Mrs. Charles Bill, drama coach at St. Joseph Academy, a past chairman of the unit.

Scholarships to a summer drama workshop at Kent State University, given to high-ranking nonseniors, were awarded to Joseph Bonczek, Elyria District Catholic High School, for his leading role in "Cyrano de Bergerac," and to Marry Anne Haskin, Mag-nificat, for her performance in "A Midsummer Night's Dream."

Mary Gallagher, Regina High School, received a season pass to Musicarnival as the first gold medal winner.

Other gold medal winners were LaRae Bundy and Janice Golub, St. Augustine Academy; Jane Cauldwell, Beaumont School, and Virginia Kubrak, Lourdes Academy.

Silver medals were given to Jeanette Holly and Margaret McEntee, St. Stephen High; Charlene Thompson and Eileen Burke, St.

Joseph Academy; Betty Gottenmoeller, Mag-nificat; Rosemary Eliason, Lourdes; Dorothy Macholl and Bryce Farrinacci, Regina, and Buzz Brossman and Tom DeChant, St. Ignatius.

Dr. Reuben Silver, director of Karamu, was critic-judge.

[From the Chicago Sunday American, May 2, 1965]

TWO KINDS OF TEENAGERS BEACH TOUGHS

Beach patrols were increased along the lakefront in both Chicago and suburbs over the weekend in the wake of two attacks Friday night by teenage toughs.

In Winnetka, advertising executive Paul J. Steffen, 50, of 330 Willow Road, was beaten and choked when a gang of about 15 boys and girls invaded Steffen's private beach. Steffen, his wife, and two of their children were attacked when the youths were ordered to leave the property.

Mrs. Steffen said one of the girls in the group shouted obscenities and struck her in the face. Two of the Steffens' sons, who ran to help their parents, also were attacked. Paul Jr., 18, had his glasses knocked off. None of the Steffens, however, required medical attention.

Two Evanston youths were arrested by police as they fled from the scene.

CIVIC AIDS

More than 800 Northwestern University coeds and fraternity men took up mops, brooms, paint brushes, hammers, and other tools yesterday to do their bit for Evanston in the national clean-up, paint-up, fix-up campaign.

The girls, from 14 sororities and 9 dormitories, were assigned to wash, clean, and paint walls and windows at 15 agency centers, churches, private homes, and garages throughout the suburb.

The young men, from 11 fraternities, cleaned out garages, repaired window screens, painted parking lot lines, and repaired bicycles for the Chicago Boys Club.

It was the 13th annual Operation Evanston sponsored by the Northwestern juniors and seniors, chiefly in the suburb. But this year freshmen and sophomores were enlisted because of calls from Chicago.

The Chicago squadrons worked chiefly in boys' clubs.

[From the Catholic Universe Bulletin, Feb. 26, 1965]

TOP EXTENSION TEEN EDITOR—NAZARETH GIRL WINS \$500 WRITING PRIZE

Christine Krysiak, Nazareth Academy junior, is the top winner in a national teen guest editor contest sponsored by Extension magazine.

She will receive a \$500 college scholarship, a 1-week trip to Chicago and will have her prizewinning work published in Extension.

The daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Emanuel Krysiak, 3410 Russell Avenue, Parma, Christine is the recently named editor of her school paper, the Nazareth Echoes.

Four finalists in the contest were selected on the basis of an essay on "Land of the Free—a Myth?" They were then given certain assignments.

Each wrote a personality sketch of a local, national or international figure. Miss Krysiak's selection was Anthony Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Second assignment was a detailed report of some school or outside activity in which the student participated, including photographs to illustrate it. Miss Krysiak's report was on "Junior Achievement."

Each student was required to edit a pro-and-con discussion between two classmates on a timely subject. "To change or not to change nuns' habits" was the discussion edited by Christine.

Each contestant also wrote an autobiography and listed five famous people who would be interesting interview subjects from the teen viewpoint. Choices made by the Nazareth student were Dr. Jacques Yves Cousteau, Katherine Cornell, Martin Luther King, George Szell, and Stan Musial.

Miss Krysiak entered the contest at the suggestion of St. Joseph Sister Mary Judith, Echoes moderator, who had selected her as the school's representative to Extension.

Miss Krysiak also is active in the National Honor Society, Future Teachers, and Home-makers of America and the mission club.

[From the Catholic Universe Bulletin, Mar. 26, 1965]

TWO TIE FOR SECOND—SEVEN DIOCESE STUDENTS SCIENCE FAIR STARS

Seven of twelve prizes in last weekend's Creative Chemistry Fair were awarded to diocese high school seniors.

Barbara Jean Spakowski, Magnificat sophomore, and Joyce Ann Barrett, Lourdes Academy senior, tied for second place. Each will receive a \$50 cash award.

Miss Spakowski also received a special award from the Electro-Chemical Society for the outstanding entry in electrochemistry. She made a model of a solar cell and used an electric fry pan to simulate intense heat conditions which affect the cell.

She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Adolph Spakowski, 26580 Butternut Ridge Road, North Olmsted.

Miss Barrett, 1 of 40 finalists in the 1965 Westinghouse Science Talent Search, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Francis J. Barrett, 3855 West 160th Street. Her project was a study of the cell which produces a substance related to gastric ulcers and mental disease and effects of two drugs on the cell.

In last year's Creative Chemistry Fair, Miss Barrett tied for third place.

Third place in this year's fair was a three-way tie between John Danko, Benedictine senior; Patricia Anne Fraser, Regina junior, and Brian Wozny, Parma High sophomore. Each will receive \$25 cash prizes.

Danko won a \$100 first prize in last year's competition. This year's top winner was Don Haberkost, Valley Forge senior. Miss Fraser won an honorable mention last year.

Dioocese students winning \$10 honorable mentions were Nancy Dorr and Pat Harrison, Magnificat and Gregory Kramer, St. Mary, Lorain.

The fair is sponsored by the Cleveland Chapter of the American Chemical Society. Prizes will be awarded at the chapter's May meeting.

[From the Catholic Universe Bulletin, Mar. 26, 1965]

STUDENT BEST IN NEWMAN ART SHOW

Dennis Zaborowski, 4899 East 97th Street, won the first place \$200 purchase prize in the 10th annual Newman Religious Art Show which closed yesterday at the May Co.

Zaborowski, a student at the Cleveland Institute of Art, won with a 5-foot oil painting, "Christ Resurrected."

Second prize, a \$100 Fred Epple Award was given to Charles Henry, 11322 Hessler Road, also an institute student. His winning entry was a bronze sculpture, "Prophet Number Two."

A \$50 third prize was awarded to Eugene Pawlowski, 4067 East 56th Street, for his oil painting, "Appropriation."

Awards were presented to the winners at a tea Saturday by Auxiliary Bishop Clarence E. Elwell, diocese superintendent of schools.

First place purchase prize winner becomes part of the Newman Apostolate collection at Newman Hall.

Honorable mention winners were Maurice Patrick Hintz, 1906 East 120th Street, oil painting, "Stations of the Cross"; Blanche Vanis, 3380 Milverton Road, sterling and

enamel chalice; Linda Woehman, 3211 Daisy Avenue, enamel, "Twelve Apostles"; Fern M. Giorgi, 12720 Triskett Road, sculpture, "Cross," and Donald B. Bins, 1690 East 117th Street, oil painting, "Annunciation."

Geraldine Rini was chairman of the 1965 show.

[From the Catholic Universe Bulletin, Mar. 26, 1965]

FOUR DIOCESE STUDENTS HIGH IN STATE SPEECH—TWO WIN SCHOLARSHIPS

Four diocese students were among the top contestants in the Ohio High School Speech League State championships last weekend at Ohio State University, Columbus.

Thomas Spalding, a senior at Akron Archbishop Hoban High, won second place in the humorous declamation category. His winning presentation was a cutting from "Teahouse of the August Moon." Spalding is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Ross Spalding, 1133 Grant Street, Akron.

Juniors Mary Anne Haskin, Magnificat, and Lee Walczuk, St. Edward, received scholarships to the Summer Center of Communicative Arts at Ohio State. The scholarships are awarded to the outstanding and highest ranking nonseniors in the final round.

Seven students are selected for the final round in each category. Only the first-, second-, and third-place winners are named in order.

The only other diocese student among the top seven was Jane Caldwell, a senior at Beaumont School.

Miss Haskin and Miss Caldwell competed in humorous declamation. Miss Haskin presented a cutting from the musical, "The Unsinkable Molly Brown," and Miss Caldwell one from "The Madwoman of Chailot."

Miss Haskin is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Dayton W. Haskin, 22860 Detroit Road, Rocky River. Miss Caldwell is the daughter of Col. and Mrs. Ross R. Caldwell, 2452 Edgemoor Road, Cleveland Heights.

Walczuk's entry was in dramatic declamation. He used a cutting from "Hamlet" to win. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Leo Walczuk, 4324 West 208th Street, Fairview Park.

POETRY WINNERS

First-prize winners of \$5 in the Court Cleveland, Catholic Daughters of America, were Carolyn Teare, St. Michael School, Independence, division 1 (grades 4, 5, and 6); Cynthia Yanosh, St. Philomena, division 2 (grades 7, 8, and 9) and Linda Staniszewski, Holy Name High, division 3 (grades 10, 11, and 12). Other winners: Division 1, Mary Jane Carpenter, St. James, second, and Steven Votovec, St. Michael, Independence, third; division 2, Kathy Batya, St. Philomena, and Anne Ribar, Lourdes Academy; and division 3, Sally Briggs, Magnificat High, and Daine Melbar, Holy Name.

[From the Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio, June 3, 1965]

WEST SUBURBAN SCHOOLS TO GIVE DIPLOMAS TO 3,689

Ten of fourteen high schools in the western suburbs report this year that their graduating classes are the biggest ever.

Those who will receive their diplomas this month were born in the high birth rate years immediately after World War II.

In all, the western suburbs have 3,689 boys and girls graduating. Here is a listing of times and places of graduations, with the name of each speaker.

Bay Village: June 10, 8:15 p.m., Lakewood Civic Auditorium, student speakers.

Berea: June 10, 8 p.m., Baldwin-Wallace College gymnasium, speakers to be announced.

Midpark (Berea): June 11, 8 p.m., Baldwin-Wallace College gymnasium, student speakers.

Brooklyn: June 10, 8 p.m., high school auditorium, Robert S. Gilchrist.

Fairview Park: June 8, 8:15 p.m., Lakewood Civic Auditorium, George H. Baird.

Lakewood: June 14, 8:15 p.m., Lakewood Civic Auditorium, student speakers.

North Olmsted: June 12, 8:15 p.m., Lakewood Civic Auditorium, student speakers.

Olmsted Falls: June 9, 8 p.m., Baldwin-Wallace College gymnasium, J. Calvin Reid.

Parma: June 9, 8 p.m., Public Hall, student speakers.

Valley Forge (Parma): June 11, 8 p.m., Public Hall, student speakers.

Rocky River: June 16, 8 p.m., high school, student speakers.

Strongsville, June 8, 8 p.m., High school gymnasium, student speakers.

Westlake: June 10, 8 p.m., high school, student speakers.

[From the Cleveland Press, June 1, 1965]

GRADUATING 814 AT 5 AREA HIGH SCHOOLS

The high school march for diplomas continues tomorrow in five areas of Greater Cleveland.

Getting their diplomas will be 814 more boys and girls.

These are tomorrow's commencement ceremonies:

Avon: School gym, 8 p.m.; 124 graduates. Bertram W. Gorman of the Kent State University faculty will speak on "Dedicated to the Proposition."

Lourdes Academy: At Lakewood Civic Auditorium, 8:30 p.m.; class of 136. Speaker will be Msgr. Joseph A. Spitzig of St. Mary Seminary.

Magnificat: At Music Hall, 8:30 p.m.; class of 251. Speaker will be Rev. Father Hugh E. Dunn, president of John Carroll University.

St. Peter: At St. Peter Church, 8 p.m.; class of 118. Speaker will be Rev. Father Edward J. Camille, assistant director of Catholic Charities.

Warrensville Heights: School auditorium, 8 p.m.; 185 in class. Speakers will be five top graduates.

Mary Ludwig, 17, is tied for top honors in the class of 222 at Nordonia High School. She wants to teach, will go to Valparaiso University. Her parents are the Reverend and Mrs. Dan R. Ludwig, 160 Northfield Avenue, Northfield.

Diane O'Rourke, 18, had perfect grades at Nordonia High, where she is tied for top honors. She will go to Wellesley College. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Russell O'Rourke, 9581 Akron-Cleveland Road, Northfield.

[From the Cleveland Press, May 29, 1965]

Vivian Malone, the young girl who walked past Gov. George Wallace to integrate the University of Alabama 2 years ago, graduates from the school tomorrow with a B-plus average. The 22-year old coed said she thinks integration at the school has worked all right. Sarah Healy, dean of women, said, "We are all proud of her."

[From the Cleveland Press, May 31, 1965]

PARMA YOUTH WINS HIGH SCHOLASTIC HONOR

When Mrs. Evelyn Schenke and her son, Richard, 17, came home Saturday, a neighbor told them they had a special delivery letter in the mailbox.

The letter was from President Johnson, informing them that Richard had been chosen among 121 high school seniors from all over the country to be honored as a Presidential scholar.

Richard is covaldictorian at Parma Valley Forge High School.

Next Tuesday he and his mother will go to the White House where the President will present Richard with a bronze medallion as one of the Nation's brightest high school students.

Richard, one of three winners from Ohio, has been a straight-A student at Valley Forge. Last November, he was chosen to attend a National Youth Conference on the Atom in Chicago and last summer he won highest honors at a National Science Foundation engineering institute at Northwestern University.

He likes bowling and swimming, sings in the school choir, is a member of the Key Club, a service organization, and is active in the youth fellowship group at Ridgewood Methodist Church.

Richard will enter Carnegie Tech next fall to study engineering, having won a 4-year, full-tuition scholarship.

His father, Theodore, who was a design engineer, died last summer. Richard lives with his mother and sister, Carolyn, 22, a secretary, at 7711 Essen Avenue, Parma.

The other Ohio winners are Dale Fogle, the son of the Reverend and Mrs. Maurice W. Fogle of Elyria, and Marilyn Ann Mount of Columbus. Dale is a student at Elyria High School.

[From the Cleveland Press, June 4, 1965]

PARMA YOUTH FIRST IN ESSAY CONTEST

Mark Peyton, 7335 York Road, Parma, a student at Holy Family School, won first place in an essay contest sponsored by Catholic Knights of Ohio. His prizes are a portable television set and a religious painting.

First prize in the Cleveland Catholic diocese in the contest went to Claire Knoblauch of St. Clement School, Lakewood. She won a wristwatch.

THE SCHMALTZ AROUND "GEMINI 4"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the latest in television spectaculars—our manned space shots—are fast becoming drenched in emotion. Unfortunately, it now appears that even the President of the United States will be continually making an appearance on these soap-opera-type programs. For a bipartisan program as large as these NASA programs one would think that the President would restrain his political nature and not participate publicly in each of these presentations on a partisan basis.

It is my opinion that we should publicly display our efforts in a more factual manner. We should attempt to emphasize the scientific value and its importance to world peace in a logical fashion. Certainly, our concern for the human lives participating in each venture into space should continue to be emphasized, but emotionalism is not the proper vehicle for conveying this message to the world. The scientific diligence, the care taken by technicians during construction, the accurate research techniques that are employed, the extensive testing by determined engineers, the hours of engineering design, the practiced management of our free-enterprise system and the NASA space management—presenting these should be the proper vehicles for conveying our concern for the men who dare to travel with the stars. The greatest benefit television might provide would be to help us better understand the coming age of science. Unless more men grow to understand the every-

day uses and needs of the coming advances in science we will not be able to cope with population growth or the required complex systems of automation.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Peoria Journal Star on June 9 clearly illustrates the importance of *Gemini 4's* mission and it reads as follows:

THE SCHMALTZ AROUND "GEMINI 4"

The *Gemini 4* space flight was a tremendous success.

That is the essential point to keep in mind in considering the 62-orbit flight of Astronauts White and McDivitt.

There is a danger of missing this essential point in all the hoopla, schmaltz, and downright corn which surround those space flights.

We think NASA officials are ill advised to submit to having these billion dollar projects turned into television spectacles in which emotion is more important than fact.

While it may be cute to know what the wives say to the astronauts, the danger is that we will lose sight of the fact that this isn't a show, that it is an historic flight—indeed the one that may prove most critical to putting man on the moon.

When Ed White walked in space it was interesting, in a way, to know what he said, but it was a thousand times more important to realize the significance of the fact which was being proved—that man could operate in space independent of a space craft.

While to some apparently (or at least television thinks so), it is worth noting that the fifth backup man on the *Wasp* recovery ship has two kids who are pulling for dad to make the pickup, it is a million more times important to grasp the significance of White and McDivitt's not falling unconscious when they got out of the craft as many medical experts had direly predicted.

What the astronaut's mother says about hoping her son gets home cooking, how the astronaut's son makes out in a Little League game, and the admonitions of the astronaut's wives should be kept in perspective. This is the trivia.

The significant facts are as large as those of Columbus' first voyage, McDivitt and White took the biggest steps yet to—what? A new universe?

Schmaltz, as we understand it, comes from a Hebrew word meaning melted fat. The danger in schmaltz on a daring adventure like this, is that the melted fat will so cover it that its true and tremendous significance will be obscured.

These astronauts and the army of technicians and scientists behind them have successfully accomplished a tremendous feat, which dispelled many fears about outer space and made moon landings only a matter of time. That's the significant point which must emerge from a welter of excessively sentimental trivia presented in the 4-day coverage of this event.

RECENT SPEECH OF WILLIAM McCHESNEY MARTIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment on the recent speech of William McChesney Martin. I have read his speech. It contained many truths and was very factual about the current economic situation. It pointed out what he honestly

thought were the danger signals. He also at great length went out of his way to point out the very favorable factors extant today working against a crash.

Mr. Martin is one of the outstanding economists in the country. I think we can be thankful that we have a man of his stature running our Federal Reserve System. Almost every day the White House issues a glowing economic statement. For the most part the facts bear out the conclusion made. On the other hand, a democracy calls for someone to state a responsible contrary conclusion if one is in order.

I think Mr. Martin has come forward with just the admonition the country needed. It gives us time to put on the brakes. It is that other voice crying in the wilderness.

I might point out the rumor is that Mr. Martin's remarks were shown to persons in high authority of the Government before they were made. That is all quite a possible situation.

Much is now being said about destroying the independence of the Federal Reserve Board.

First. The independence of the Federal Reserve System in my opinion must remain and continue.

Second. The Nation needs an independent voice to speak up when it is thought necessary.

Third. The policies of the Federal Reserve Board have given this Nation the strongest and most prosperous banking system in the world.

In my opinion, one speech by a governmental official will not cause financial unrest.

I believe the unrest in the country is caused by the following:

First. Loss of our gold reserves to the lowest amount in modern times.

Second. Unfavorable and critical balance-of-payments position.

Third. Taking the 25-percent gold coverage from bank deposits, and the plan to substitute a Federal non-interest-bearing note for the \$37 billion in Federal bonds owned by the Federal Reserve System.

Fourth. A long series of unbalanced Federal budgets.

Fifth. Drastic tax reduction one week, and raising the Federal debt ceiling the next week by an almost like amount.

Sixth. Removing the silver from our coins.

Seventh. Anxiety of businessmen caused by the prolonged Kennedy round trade negotiations.

Eighth. An almost complete cessation of expansion by our businessmen abroad, as a result of so-called voluntary agreements.

I personally consider William McChesney Martin one of the ablest, most fearless, and loyal persons in our Nation today.

I do not think he should be asked to resign, any more than, let us say, the President should resign if he makes an unpopular statement.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Yes, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If I remember the figures correctly, in the last year or year and a half there have been more bank failures in Texas than any other one State in the United States.

Does the gentleman not think that it could be possible the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Martin, may be speaking out now in an effort to save the east Texans from again eating jack-rabbits?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT AND THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the newspaper reports of June 6 that the future of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts has been assured by gifts by the Governments of Germany, Italy, Denmark, Japan, and Norway, testify to the growing international recognition of the importance of this cultural project. Since the trustees of the Kennedy Center are seeking gifts from other nations the President should take a good, hard look at the activities of the Center's trustees and make sure that this presidential memorial is not irreparably harmed by activities which apparently ignore the Civil Rights Act. Under title IV of the Civil Rights Act the President is required to withhold all Federal funds from the trustees if they ignore the Civil Rights Act, inasmuch as this act covers all performances in the Kennedy Center as well as all performances, programs, and companies financially aided or sponsored by the trustees.

The time has arrived for the President to establish a firm art policy for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, which will leave no doubt in anyone's mind that it will truly reflect the views of our country at large; such a policy will unite our people and advance our foreign policy. The Metropolitan Opera Co., after many years in which it insisted that it could find no qualified Negro singers, finally opened its doors to Marian Anderson, Leontyne Price, George Shirley, and other Negro singers to the great benefit of our country. The fight made by the American people to force open the doors of the Metropolitan Opera Co. in New York City, the National Theater and Constitution Hall in the Nation's Capital, in which the integrated Actors' Equity Association took a prominent part, is a proud chapter in our Nation's history. A new chapter must now be written.

I include as part of my remarks a letter signed by Roger L. Stevens, Special Assistant on the Arts to the President, and Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center

for the Performing Arts. Also included are newspaper articles and related items:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., June 8, 1965.

Mr. THOMAS A. WAGGONER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WAGGONER: The Metropolitan Opera National Co., referred to in your letter of June 7, is under the complete control and management of the Metropolitan Opera Association.

I am forwarding your letter to Miss Rise Stevens and Mr. Michael Manuel who are general managers of the company.

This is the first time I have heard any objections to the policies of the Metropolitan Opera because as far as I know talent is the foremost consideration in any selections they make.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER L. STEVENS,
Special Assistant on the Arts.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 7, 1965.

The CHIEF, WASHINGTON BUREAU,
New York Times,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: The weekend reports in Washington, D.C., newspapers that the future of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts has been assured by the gifts of five nations, Germany, Italy, Denmark, Japan, and Norway is most welcome news. We must now prove to the world that we are deserving of these gifts, since similar gifts are sought from other nations by the trustees of the Kennedy Center.

With its future assured, and with the eyes of the world upon us, it is now up to the trustees of the Kennedy Center to bring their practices into line with the things President Kennedy stood for. No performing arts company should be financially aided and sponsored by the trustees of the Kennedy Center until satisfactory proof is furnished that it has a nondiscriminatory hiring policy. Such proof is urgently needed, and should be required of the New York City-based Metropolitan Opera National Co., the parent company of which is the Metropolitan Opera Co. itself.

The reason for this is that the trustees of the Kennedy Center and the President's Cabinet sponsored the company's debut performance May 3 at the new State Department auditorium in Washington before an invited audience which included members of the President's Cabinet, Supreme Court Justices, Members of Congress, and other dignitaries. This company was also entertained at the White House by Mrs. Johnson on May 4. It was revealed at this time that the trustees, from interest earned on gifts, would give \$300,000 to this company, and that the trustees are sponsoring the company on a tour of 70 cities in the United States and Canada. A flat fee of \$10,000 is demanded for each of the 240 performances on this tour. This new company, with its assured future, did not have a single Negro singer in its Washington appearance. Inquiry has since revealed that only 1 Negro is in the company of 63 singers, and this lone Negro singer is in the chorus. It has been reported that the management of the company maintains that the lack of Negroes in the company is due to the fact that there are no Negro singers in our country of the quality deemed necessary to be members of this company.

In view of President Johnson's great speech at Howard University on the American Negro problem, he should demand that proof be furnished him that this company has a non-discriminatory hiring policy where Negroes

are concerned before 1 penny of this \$300,000 is made available to it by the trustees of the Kennedy Center. He should also require the trustees to comply with the Civil Rights Act before any Federal funds are released to them. Whatever opera companies the trustees sponsor should be integrated, as required by the Civil Rights Act in Federal installations, and those trustees not in sympathy with such a policy should be replaced.

In view of the painful and humiliating experiences with Constitution Hall and the National Theater in matters of racial segregation, these are the minimum steps which the President should take at this time. A Presidential memorial which pays only lip service to the concept of racial equality is unthinkable.

Sincerely,

THOMAS A. WAGGONER.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, June 6, 1965]

FIVE NATIONS' PLEDGES ASSURE KENNEDY CENTER FUNDS—BEAT JUNE 30 DEADLINE FOR PRIVATE GIFTS

(By Roberta Hornig)

Pledges of generous gifts by five nations have made it sure that the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts will meet its June 30 deadline for raising \$15.5 million from private sources.

Under the terms of the bill approving the center, the Federal Government would donate \$15.5 million only if it were matched by private contributions in either money or gifts. Another \$15.5 million came in the form of a deferred loan from the Treasury.

The foreign gifts, estimated to be worth more than \$2 million, are:

Germany: Bronze doors to be placed at the center's entrance.

Norway: Chandeliers and glass fixtures for the concert hall.

Italy: All the marble to be used in the building, estimated at about \$1 million.

Denmark: Furniture for the grand foyer.

Japan: Silk fabric to be used as the curtain in the opera hall.

These gifts are considered assured, with only minor arrangements pending.

The arrangements include diplomatic notes from each of the countries to the State Department to serve as evidence of the gifts. The gifts themselves will be delivered after the deadline date.

Other gift offers from foreign nations also are being worked out.

With money problems over, bids for construction of the \$46.5-million center, designed by architect Edward Durrell Stone, will be taken late this summer. Construction should start sometime this fall.

The center's groundbreaking ceremony was held last December on the shores of the Potomac with President Johnson officiating.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 4, 1965]

NEWS OF MUSIC: MET NATIONAL GROUP MAKES PUBLIC BOW

(By Irving Lowens)

Last night at the State Department, an invited audience witnessed the debut of the Metropolitan Opera National Co. No fewer than 13 of the 31 principal singers in the company were heard during the course of the concert, an event in the Cabinet's distinguished artists series. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony J. Celebrezze was the host for the occasion.

The Met's National Co. was organized about 2 years ago after some 15 years of dreaming and planning. It is now a repertory touring

company with a staff of approximately 125 persons, and it will soon begin to operate on a year-round basis. Its first national tour (four operas are to be presented in 70 United States and Canadian cities) gets underway September 20 with a production of Carlisle Floyd's "Susannah" at Butler University in Indiana, and the company will rehearse these for 8 weeks before opening night.

The idea of a first-rate touring opera company, providing employment for our excellent singers at home and bringing live performances to parts of the country where a fully staged, fully professional production has never been seen, is an excellent one. It deserves every opera-lover's wholehearted support, and cosponsorship, by the Kennedy Center (its sole commitment to any program to date) is thoroughly merited.

Curiosity about the company and its personnel has been mounting steadily in musical circles, and this was no doubt reflected by the larger than usual fashionable audience on hand last night to sample its work.

Unfortunately joy in the materialization of the National Co. must be somewhat tempered by the imperfections of its initial public appearance.

The singers and the company's management cannot be held responsible for the wretched acoustics of the handsome but highly sound-absorbent State Department auditorium. Without some kind of shell, it is simply impossible to project the voice in the hall. Tones, instead of floating, drop limply to the floor as if they had been squeezed out of a toothpaste tube. The place is a model of low fidelity. The sound of music in it reminds me of that produced by one of the Victor Talking Machines during the preelectrical recording era. To expect anything by way of a musical experience from voices in such a sound-killing environment is asking for the moon.

Because of this, any attempt to evaluate the work of the 13 singers is futile. I can only say that they were very pleasant to look at. I will assume that they are unusually gifted, since they were chosen from among more than 1,300 candidates by competent judges of operatic talent. When the company mounts a production in Washington (the schedule calls for a May 2, 1966, opening in the National Theater), I hope to be more specific in my comments.

But if Washington served the company poorly with such a wretched showcase for such a dazzling array of talent the company's management served Washington (and the Nation) just as poorly with the wretched program that it brought here. It has been a long time since quite so many overworked standard arias have been piled higgledy-piggledy one on top of another in a rather short concert. Surely something less provincial was called for on such a potentially important occasion.

There were other shocks also. Some mildly inoffensive posturings during the arias (expected from opera singers in concert) led to an incredible finale, with the 12 singers draped across the stage while Ron Bottcher essayed the "Toreador Song." I haven't seen such ham and corn since I was in high school. No respectable college opera workshop couldn't do better.

In his introductory remarks, Secretary Celebrezze spoke of President Johnson's concern about the "quality of American art," something shared by all intelligent Americans. If yesterday's sorry gala represents the artistic quality the Metropolitan Opera National Company expects will "create more and exciting opera for an increasingly large and interested audience across the country," it is due for a rude awakening. It badly

underestimates the sophistication and the intelligence of the non-New Yorker.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 4, 1965]

BRIGHT NEW STARS TWINKLE IN ARIA-SPACE
(By Dorothy McCardle)

The flow of golden American voices to Europe was stemmed last night as the fledgling Metropolitan Opera National Company showed what it can do for U.S. culture at a Cabinet evening at the State Department Auditorium.

A dozen of the top singers with the brand new company won an ovation from a top echelon audience when they ran the gamut of virtuosity in arias from Puccini to Bizet to Gershwin.

Met star Rise Stevens, has ditched singing temporarily to become comanager of the new company, heralded the event as a part of President Johnson's program to encourage art in this country.

"With this company, we hope to arrest the flow of American talent to Europe," said Miss Stevens in a curtain speech before the concert.

"As you know, President Johnson takes a dim view of travel abroad until we explore all parts of this country. There is enormous natural talent in this country."

Host for the evening, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony J. Celebrezze accented this same motif as he introduced Miss Stevens.

It was explained that the evening's concert with the singers in evening clothes instead of stage costume was a preview of things to come when the new company opens officially on September 20 in Indianapolis. The 126-member troupe begins 7 weeks of rehearsals on August 1. After its opening in Indiana, it will then travel 25,000 miles giving performances in 70 cities.

The new company has been formed under the joint sponsorship of the Metropolitan Opera Association and the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. Miss Stevens predicts that it will eventually attain the same fame as the parent Metropolitan Opera Co.

The audience agreed with her.

Secretary of Labor and Mrs. W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of the Interior and Mrs. Stewart Udall, and former Secretary of the Interior and Mrs. Oscar Chapman were all thrilled by the charm, talent, and good looks of the dozen singers on stage.

The new Secretary of the Treasury and Mrs. Henry Fowler underwent their ordeal by klieg lights as attention focused on them right after White House Press Secretary and Mrs. George Reedy had arrived.

Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, who returned yesterday from Texas, sent her congratulations to the young singers, plus an invitation to the White House, where she will receive them at 11:30 a.m. today.

At the end of the performance, the audience gave the stars a standing ovation. Likewise, the stars applauded the audience.

Since Indianapolis was very much in the spotlight, Senator and Mrs. Vance Hartke, of Indiana, played hosts after the concert at a reception for the cast, a contingent from Indianapolis, and most of the audience in the State Department's eighth-floor reception suite.

Senator HARTKE, in a brief speech, said "Make sure that America takes its place in opera throughout the world."

Anthony Bliss, president of the Metropolitan Opera Association, in a brief talk told the group that "I am thrilled to see young singers starting out on their careers."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 6, 1965]

JAPAN TO GIVE CURTAIN FOR J.F.K. OPERA HOUSE

The magnificent red silk curtain, handwoven with gold, which will hang from the proscenium of the opera house at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts will be a gift from the Government of Japan.

In the Land of the Rising Sun, a curtain raiser like this one would come, commercially speaking, to about 15 million yen, or \$150,000. If it had been produced in the United States, it would go higher—a \$300,000 item.

The curtain was being discussed at the party given last week by Ralph Becker, trustee, general counsel, and one of the founders of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and Mrs. Becker.

Genichi Akatani, Counselor at the Embassy of Japan, said his country had been working closely with Edward Durrell Stone, architect of the Kennedy Center, to be sure the color of the opera theater curtain would be a perfect match for the decor of the theater walls and seat coverings.

The Norwegian Government is giving all of the crystal chandeliers and all of the glass fixtures for the concert hall. Germany is giving the bronze doors for the Center's main entrance. Italy is furnishing all the marble for the interior and exterior and Denmark is contributing \$150,000 to the Center.

Becker said that by June 30, the Center must be able to match the U.S. Government's contribution of \$15½ million toward its construction. He declared he had no doubt but that the committee for the Center would be able to do this, but, he added, "This is the hardest work I have ever done in my entire life."

Pakistan Ambassador Ghulam Ahmed soloed to the party, explaining that Mrs. Ahmed is now in South Africa attending the meetings of a world federation of women's clubs. Also at the party from embassy row were the New Zealand Ambassador Mrs. George Laking, and the Japanese Counselor Mrs. Akatani.

The event was one in a series of two given by the Beckers. Unlike the first on Wednesday evening, guests weren't rained-in. Most everyone stayed outdoors in the garden.

[From the Evening Star, Washington (D.C.), May 4, 1965]

A FUN EVENING FOR SINGERS
(By Ruth Dean)

It was a case of who had the most fun last night—the guest artists, all 13 of them, or the guests?

The evening began with a concert and ended with one—the last an impromptu songfest that was the hit of the evening and which put Indiana's Mrs. Vance Hartke on the list of Capital hostesses whose parties are fun.

Things got off on a formal footing in the State Department auditorium when Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and Mrs. Anthony J. Celebrezze were hosts at another in the Cabinet's distinguished artist series.

STIR ENTHUSIASM

Last night's performers, principals from the new Metropolitan Opera National Company, were distinguished in their artistry. They brought "bravos" and cries of "more, more" from the VIP audience of diplomats, Supreme Court Justices, White House officials, the Cabinet, and Members of Congress.

Their youthful verve also made an impression for certainly, as the evening wore on, it

had a more informal note, particularly at the reception in the eighth floor reception rooms where Senator and Mrs. Hartke entertained the Celebrezzes, Met officials including former opera diva Rise Stevens, Presidential Fine Arts Adviser Roger L. Stevens, and Senator and Mrs. Birch Bayh.

The artists were there, too, of course, and it was their presence and youth—they have looks to go with those golden voices—that gave the evening its zip. They were excited about having had such a distinguished audience as their first before whom to perform; top that with the chance to meet and talk with the President's Cabinet, and finally today at 11:30 to shake hands with the President himself, and Mrs. Johnson at the White House.

No wonder Enrico di Gisuseppe found his way over to the grand piano and burst into song. His strong powerful tenor brought the guests flocking in from the terrace, and soon his fellow performers were egging each other to "go on next," and the fun was on.

Miss Stevens, cogeneral manager of the company with Michael Manuel, was even serenaded when baritone Ron Blitcher sang to her to say "Just the Way You Look Tonight."

Postmaster General John Gronouski so enjoyed himself, he told Mrs. Hartke as he and his wife were leaving, "you've given the best party I've been to in Washington."

FIRST TIME TOGETHER

For Miss Stevens and the other Met officials, including Anthony A. Bliss, chairman of the Metropolitan Opera Association's board of directors, the evening was more than a musical triumph, for it also marked the first time the young people had met and worked together. Judging from their camaraderie at the party this should be no problem when they begin 8 weeks of intensive rehearsing in July for their opening in Indianapolis in September.

Among those present last night were Indianapolis music patrons Mr. and Mrs. George A. Kuhn, and the president of Butler University, where they'll be doing much of their rehearsing and Mrs. Alex Jones.

The Indianapolis opening will be the start of a 70-city tour which will take the group 25,000 miles. The company, cosponsored by the Metropolitan Opera Association in New York and the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, has a total of 31 artists who were chosen from 1,300 heard in Europe, the United States and Canada.

In a short speech before last night's concert audience Miss Stevens explained it is the purpose of the company to stimulate audiences through its youthful verve and attractiveness and to discover the stars of tomorrow.

She also expressed the hope the company will "arrest the flow of young American talent who find it necessary to go to Europe for operatic training. As you know," she added, "President Johnson takes a dim view on traveling abroad—especially before we explore all our possibilities at home."

Later at the party, Bliss, for whom creation of the company fulfills a long-cherished dream, said he hoped the company "will become a catalyst to stimulate formation of regional Metropolitan companies" that would be supported by several cities and thus be able to carry the expense of a full opera season.

OFFICIALS PRESENT

Cabinet officials attending both the concert and reception included Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler who complimented soprano Janet Pavek on singing "way out of this world;" Secretary of Interior and Mrs.

Stewart Udall, Secretary of Agriculture and Mrs. Orville Freeman, and Secretary of Commerce and Mrs. John Connor.

Senator and Mrs. Frank Church also were there, along with Utah Senator and Mrs. Frank Moss, Presidential Assistant and Mrs. Hobart Taylor, Civil Service Commissioner John Macy, Assistant Secretary of State and Mrs. Harlan Cleveland, Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, WALTER MONDALE, and STROM THURMOND, Mrs. Morris Cafritz, and Miss Stevens' husband, Walter Suroby.

Presidential Press Secretary George Reedy was seen at the concert. Also there were Swiss Ambassador and Mrs. Zehnder, Burmese Ambassador On Sein, Pakistan Ambassador and Begun Ahmed and Philippine Ambassador and Mrs. Ledesma, as well as Mrs. Jouett Shouse, Mrs. Robert Low Bacon and Assistant Secretary of State and Mrs. G. Mennen Williams.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 4, 1965]

A NEW ROLE FOR RISE

(By Marie Smith)

Rise Stevens, as sparkling and glamorous as ever, appeared here yesterday in a new leading role, but not a singing one.

She was starred—as comanager of the new Metropolitan Opera National Co.—at a luncheon given by Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, at the Capitol to announce the company's first season, which opens September 20 in Indianapolis.

Miss Stevens told about the new company with great enthusiasm emphasizing that she's stepping off the opera stage to leave the spotlight for aspiring young Americans whom she hopes won't have to go abroad to win fame and acclaim.

Over the past year, the brunette soprano has traveled throughout the United States, Canada, and Europe, auditioning aspiring young opera singers for the company that she anticipates will give them greater advantages than they could acquire abroad.

Out of the 1,300 auditioned, by her and two other participants in the new company, 31 principal singers, 31 chorister-dancers and 45 orchestra members were chosen.

"We think we've chosen wisely—and they represent every State in the Union except North and South Dakota," she said.

Their world premiere will be in the new Clowes Memorial Hall at Butler University in Indianapolis.

Four operas will be presented during the first ten performances. The first, "Susannah," is an American opera by Carlisle Floyd, a contemporary composer. Others will be "Carmen," "Cinderella," and "Madame Butterfly." All will be presented in English and the latter two will be presented also in Italian and French, respectively.

Miss Stevens said they hope to determine whether Americans listen to opera in a language they can understand or just to the beauty of the music, whatever language.

Miss Stevens suspects they prefer a language they understand and that is why each opera will be performed in English. And that is as it should be, she added. In other countries opera is sung in the language of the country.

Although she has gone into opera management, Miss Stevens plans to continue singing, by devoting about 10 percent of her time to concerts.

She shared the head table spotlight yesterday with another Stevens—Roger—who is chairman of the board of trustees for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. He said if the new company "works as well as we hope it does it should very nearly break even in its 70-city tour.

But to help launch it, the Center has given an undisclosed amount of financial assistance. "We're not using any of the building funds, it comes out of a special fund," he explained.

Other head table guests included Reginald Allen, special assistant to Anthony A. Bliss, president of the Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Opera Association and special assistant to its general manager, Rudolph Bing, and Richard Lockton, Indiana businessman who has donated time and money for the Metropolitan Opera National Co.'s premier.

The new company will appear at the National Theater here May 2 to 7, 1966.

SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, last week a reporter for the Minneapolis Tribune asked me if I had gotten a call from the Post Office Department, from Mr. Fred Belen, asking me to name some young people to work for the Post Office Department this summer under President Johnson's youth employment campaign. I had not been contacted by the Department, but later on that afternoon I was contacted by the Minneapolis Tribune office and told I would be able to suggest names. No numbers were given, the numbers I could suggest, or whether these should be young people from poor families, or any of the details that had been given to the majority.

These questions were in my mind, and I wondered why Members of Congress should be suggesting names. Perhaps my concern comes from the fact that I doubt the wisdom of Members of Congress continuing to have a hand in the naming of postmasters or rural carriers. I think this should be left to the Civil Service Commission.

I have received letters from young people who want jobs. What intrigued me were two letters from girls in my district who are now attending school in Minneapolis.

They contacted the Minneapolis post office for information on securing jobs. They did not know about it. Then they contacted the Minnesota Employment Bureau, and they seemed to know nothing about it. Then they contacted the Members of Congress from that area. They could not find out much there. So they wrote to me.

I have a number of questions I would like to have answered from the Postmaster General as to what they are really attempting to do. I sent a telegram to them today in which I stated as follows:

I would appreciate receiving an explanation of the policy being followed by your Department in making available summer jobs

under President Johnson's youth employment campaign. Also please answer the following questions:

Why were certain Senators and Congressmen given specific quota numbers of jobs to be filled while others were simply told that they could submit a list of names when personnel directors are not supposed to indicate to the postmasters, who are supposed to make the final decision, whether an applicant has been endorsed by a Congressman or Senator?

If the 6,000 jobs to be filled do not involve political patronage, why do the regional offices have authority to advise local postmasters which applicants are to be appointed after Executive Assistant Monroney stated to the press that individual postmasters would assist with the hiring?

Why were members of the majority contacted by high officials of your Department concerning these choice available appointments, while members of the minority were contacted by lower echelon personnel days later and only after the press began asking questions? What happens to the qualified applicants already on the civil service eligible register who are waiting for summer jobs in post offices throughout the country?

If this program is not being operated on a political patronage basis, why in many cases are county Democratic committees consulted for recommendations and clearances?

Why did high officials of your Department, in soliciting patronage appointments for certain Members of Congress, fail to point out that the President had designated these jobs as being created for economically and educationally disadvantaged young people?

Why is the Post Office Department not working through State employment offices when other agencies are supposedly following such procedure?

Will qualified young ladies be given appointments as well as young men?

I shall appreciate your early reply.

Mr. Speaker, we need some answers to these questions because we are embarking upon an effort to provide summer jobs for young people. When I first heard the President's recommendation this was to be done I thought it was a wise move, but I surely hope it does not develop into the chaos that we see operating in connection with the poverty program. This would be a misfortune, and would put a bad name on the whole operation if it was ever tried again.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS— PART XCIV

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns the poverty program in New York City and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of April 21, 1965.

It is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis" and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: ANTIPOVERTY WAR CALLED FRAUDULENT

The dean of the New York University Graduate School of Social Work yesterday criti-

cized the Federal antipoverty program as a partial "fraud" which attacks the effects of poverty rather than the cause.

Dr. Alex Rosen, long-time social worker who has headed the NYU school for 5 years, said at a State regional welfare conference in Patchogue, Long Island, that the program is aimed at the individual rather than the condition in society.

"To give this program the attitude, that all we have to do is to change the poor, is a fraud," he said.

After his speech, Dr. Rosen said he wished he had used some word other than "fraud," since he had no intention of questioning the motives of those who inaugurated the program.

"But there has been so much bland acceptance of what's being done that I thought somebody ought to call a spade a spade," he said.

Dr. Rosen said that 40,000 jobs are being lost each month to the automation process and those jobs must be matched by Government and private industry if there is to be any effective attack on poverty.

"It is a myth—at best a half-truth—that people are unemployed only because they are uneducated and untrained," he said. "It is the characteristics of the economic structure that have been changed rather than the characteristic of the youth. Industry no longer needs the unskilled and semiskilled."

He called Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz "very honest but very incorrect" in his recent statement that Newark was solving its poverty problem by signing up hundreds of young people for jobs.

Dr. Rosen said the basic problem involved the number of these young people who could follow basic instructions to hold the jobs. He said most could not and that there was no curriculum in today's schools that could give adequate training to high school dropouts.

As an example of lack of official understanding of the problems, he cited an official who gave 10 high school dropouts enrollment forms for the Job Corps during inauguration of the organization in New York and discovered to his surprise that 8 of them could do no more than sign their names to the form.

In Washington, a spokesman for the Office of Economic Opportunity, which is conducting the war on poverty, said Government and industry already are teaming up through "blue ribbon" committees to study the problems of providing the jobs for which the young people are being trained.

He said opportunities in the service fields appear to offer at least as many opportunities as those being lost through automation.

"The auto industry tells us 100,000 more mechanics will be needed within a year to take care of the increased number of autos on the road," he said. "The oil companies say there are thousands of service stations which can't get the proper kind of help. Hotels and travel agencies have formed a special committee to organize training for their job openings."

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS— PART XCV

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following installment of "New York City in Crisis" appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of April 22, 1965.

The article concerns the rising crime rate in New York and follows:

CRIME UP—THE MAYOR'S NEW TACTICS

Here is the quarterly crime report based on the FBI uniform crime reporting system:

Crime	1965	1964	Percent
Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter.....	137	139	-1.4
Forcible rape.....	275	258	+6.4
Robbery.....	2,384	2,226	+7.1
Assault.....	3,400	3,402	-1
Burglary.....	12,910	12,735	+1.4
Larceny or theft, \$50 or more.....	17,043	16,718	+1.9
Auto theft.....	7,575	7,501	+1.0
Total.....	43,724	42,979	+1.7

(By Edward J. Silberfarb)

On the eve of an expected dramatic announcement by Mayor Wagner, on fighting crime in the streets new figures revealed that crime in the city is up 1.7 percent for the first 3 months of the year.

Meanwhile, squadrooms buzzed with a report that Commissioner Michael J. Murphy will order detectives into uniform and onto the street to work overtime possibly 7 days a week, to try to stop the growing danger.

Police officials would not confirm the report, but it was understood that this would be part of stage II in Mayor Wagner's war on crime. According to the report, traffic patrolmen, who normally work the day shift, will be pressed into service at night also to strengthen the army of police during periods of highest crime incidence.

The mayor will make his second television appearance on the subject at 6:15 tonight. His first, 2 weeks ago, dealt with crime in the subways, and, at that time, he announced a program to put a policeman on every train. Tonight, he will deal with crime in the streets.

The details of his announcement are not known, but he is expected to announce a plan to beef up police forces and deploy more troops in areas where the crime rate is highest.

An announcement yesterday by Commissioner Murphy revealed a crime increase for the first quarter of the year compared to the same period last year. He reported that major crimes, ranging from rape to auto theft, rose from 42,979 to 43,724, or 1.7 percent for the period.

The statistics were reported under the Federal Bureau of Investigation's uniform crime reporting system, whereby each city, using a common basis for categorizing crime, compiles quarterly totals and submits the figures to the FBI.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY BILL

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which I feel will adjust the pay of postal and Federal employees realistically and fairly.

I would like to say at the outset that I am proud that our President, Lyndon B.

Johnson, has himself made recommendations for a general pay raise for all Federal and postal employees. This action, unique in the administrations of the late President John F. Kennedy and President Lyndon B. Johnson, is a wholesome contrast to the approach of the White House in past years which has been to oppose all pay increases whatsoever, and to veto pay raises when Congress has approved them.

However, I do feel very strongly that the administration's pay recommendations are somewhat inadequate and, therefore, my bill differs from those recommendations in some important respects.

In the first place, the administration's recommendation of a flat across-the-board 3-percent pay increase is simply not sufficient. It may be sufficient for those postal and Federal employees in the rarified atmosphere of the higher echelons of the pay structure, but it is not adequate down in the middle and lower echelons where the vast majority of our employees live and work. My bill will give a 7-percent increase to those employees in level 4 of the postal field service and in grade 5 in the classified service and will be somewhat more generous to the other levels and grades than would the administration's bill. I feel that the administration's proposal would not grant true comparability with private industry. I feel that my bill would do this.

I have also inserted in my bill a provision that the pay structure of State governments, county governments, and city governments cannot be used in the computing of comparability for Federal and postal employees' salaries are far too low. Certainly, they are far too low for valuable employment as a nationwide yardstick. It is obviously unfair to take the low-level wages that are paid in some communities and even in some State governments and make them a norm by which postal and Federal salaries should be measured.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, also deletes from the administration's proposal the provision that would make the President's recommendations for a pay adjustment automatic, unless the Congress were specifically to disapprove it. I feel this is an entirely wrong approach. The construction of pay scales should be a positive process, not a negative one, and it should be a prerogative of the Congress. I feel that we as Members of the Congress have an intimate and realistic picture of the economic conditions of postal and other Federal employees.

If our Government offices are to be run efficiently, we must provide sufficient pay to attract and keep capable and dedicated employees. Trained postal employees are forced to leave the postal service each year because they are unable to meet their obligations on their inadequate salaries. Many of the letter carriers hold two jobs, and a large number of wives must work to supplement their husband's salaries. I have many postal and other Federal employees liv-

ing in my congressional district and I have received a large volume of mail from them and their families telling me of their financial plight—how impossible it is for them to meet increased living costs on their present salaries.

Also, Mr. Speaker, in my bill I would make the effective date January 1, 1965, not January 1, 1966. The figures on which the administration relied for its recommendations were compiled early last year. To make the pay raise based on those figures effective on January 1 next year would create no comparability whatsoever. It would bring the pay of postal and Federal employees up to where comparable wages in private industry were 2 years ago. I feel that the intent of the Congress in the Federal Pay Reform Act of 1962 was to give postal and Federal employees contemporary comparability with private industrial workers and my bill will do this.

My bill will also adopt, in principle, the so-called Dulski amendment which my colleague from New York [Mr. DULSKI] tried so hard to have enacted into law in the last Congress. This proposal is a just one and will permit postal and Federal employees to retain time credits which now are lost to them.

Mr. Speaker, my bill finally will delete from the existing law that a Federal employee must meet acceptable standards of work if he is to get his step-in-grade promotion. This business of meeting acceptable standards of work sounds all very well, but we must remember that the determination must be made by an employee's supervisors. At the moment the wording of the law creates a loophole through which many an injustice could penetrate the fabric of personnel management. A personality clash between a supervisor and an employee could result in the employee's being deprived of his in-grade promotion unjustly and arbitrarily. I think this acceptable standard of work provision makes many unhealthy conditions possible in the post offices and Government offices of the country and that the best way to meet the situation is to eliminate the provision and make the promotions automatic.

After all, if an employee is not meeting acceptable standards of work he can be separated as incompetent. If the supervisor takes this route, the employee can defend himself through the appeals procedure. Under the wording of the law as it now stands, the employee has no real means of defending himself from vindictiveness and injustice.

If we wish to retain good, loyal workers in the Government—if we are to preserve employee morale and maintain a high level of efficiency in our postal service and in other Government offices—we have a definite responsibility to provide them with adequate pay and fair and equitable work standards and promotion schedules.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the improvements imbedded in the bill I have introduced should receive favorable attention from the Members of this House and I strongly urge that it be given the consideration I think it deserves.

FPC RECORD DEFECTIVE ON STORM KING

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on March 9 of this year, the Federal Power Commission granted the Con Edison Co. of New York a license to build a pumped storage hydroelectric power station at the foot of Storm King Mountain on the shores of the Hudson River at Cornwall, N.Y.

This was obviously a heaving blow to the citizen forces and the conservationists who had been battling for more than 2 years to prevent the desecration of the Hudson Gorge and Highlands. But I can assure you that it was by no means the end of the fight. The citizens are now preparing to bring the entire matter in the open for judicial review.

One fact that stands out with shocking clarity: the utter inadequacy of the record upon which the FPC based its decision. One member of the Commission, Charles Ross, recognized this is his perceptive dissent from the majority. In fact, the Commission itself tacitly acknowledged that the record was seriously defective in remanding two of the most important aspects of the project for further hearings after the license was granted.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to set this deplorable record straight, I would like to bring to the attention of this House and the American public some of the evidence of the inadequacy of the record. It would not be feasible to cover the entire range of error, but I would like to draw primarily from the words of Con Edison's own president, Mr. Charles E. Eble, in a speech at the dedication of New England's first extra high voltage line. It should be noted that this speech was made on November 23, 1964, after the FPC hearings had been closed, but months before the license was issued.

Commissioner Ross in his dissent warned that the record was deficient on the subject of alternate sources of power. In particular, he noted that the question of power available from interconnections had not been fully explored and that the record did not show that abundant power would be available to Con Edison from interconnections opened since the record was compiled. The FPC majority, in its haste to advance Con Edison's project, chose to ignore this.

But Mr. Eble, the Con Edison president, said on November 23:

The pattern of interconnecting and pooling resources has extended far beyond tying isolated systems into one company system. With increasing sizes of generating units and advances in transmission technology, the interconnection of companies, and indeed regions, has become highly desirable. This type of development has been proceeding at an accelerating pace over the past decade,

and our presence here is testimony to the most recent step that has been taken in this effort—the first extra-high voltage interconnection between the New York and New England companies. Today we have seen the physical evidence of this interconnection.

Over these wires may come power from a steam station in New York City or from a pumped storage project at Cornwall-on-Hudson to help serve New England. Through them may come power from the Yankee Atomic or Connecticut Yankee plants to help meet New York City's needs. Interconnections such as this enable our industry to achieve the economy and reliability of service unimagined by the pioneers of our industry.

Mr. Eble added:

This link to New England is with much more than just with the New York companies. It connects New England firmly with the interconnection companies known as the Canadian-United States Eastern group. This group is already tied to the Pennsylvania-Jersey Maryland pool. P.J.M. is building a new transmission line in connection with large minemouth plants being built or planned in western Pennsylvania and West Virginia. That interconnection will be extended to connect with Con Edison and thus with you here in New England.

In a November 24, 1964, press release on the power available through the new interconnection, four major New England utility companies were even more specific. This release, issued jointly by the United Illuminating Co., the Hartford Electric Light Co., the Connecticut Light & Power Co., and the Western Massachusetts Electric Co., said:

The new line is capable of carrying 345,000 volts of electricity, the largest capacity of any transmission facility in New England. It will become the backbone of the region's power system and will enable large blocks of power to be exchanged between the CONVEX companies and the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, providing an additional source of economical electricity and increasing the high dependability of service already provided * * *.

CONVEX, from its system operation center, located in an underground nuclear fallout-proof structure in Southington, uses skilled load dispatchers and computers to determine which of the four companies' generating units can produce most efficiently the electricity needed at a given time in the areas served by the utilities.

Mr. Speaker, surely a full and complete record would not dismiss this rich source of power, just one of many available to Con Edison, as unworthy of consideration. Yet this is, in substance, what the FPC did in their decision of March 9. I hope that this cavalier attitude will receive the kind of review and treatment that it deserves.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 4, 1965, President Johnson made a vitally important speech on the

subject of the plight of our Negro citizens and the problems that cannot be solved by Federal legislation to effectuate the 14th and 15th amendments.

In a large sense, the President has called for a moral crusade in the most meaningful terms yet proposed by a Chief Executive of the United States of America. The goal is equality and the call is for a mobilization of millions of our citizens in and out of government at every level.

The New York Herald Tribune carried an article on the President's speech which reflected one audience's reaction. I think that our colleagues and other readers of the RECORD may be interested in this article, which follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, June 6, 1965]

JOHNSON SPOKE FOR HISTORY

(By Douglas Klker)

WASHINGTON.—The Nation was watching its two Gemini astronauts whirl through space Friday and thus did not pay much attention to President Johnson's Howard University address on the American Negro problem.

But it may be that history will remember that speech as the more important of the two events, because it marks an important historical turning point in this Nation's agonizing attempt to adjust national principles with national realities.

Mr. Johnson stunned a Negro audience of 14,000 by speaking of the Negro problem as no President ever has spoken before, but as a result it is doubtful that any future, serious discussion of the problem ever can be attempted without consideration of what he said.

The President said that, with the certain passage of the new voting rights bill this session, about all now has been done that can be done through legislation to assure Negroes of their civil rights.

The time now has come, he said, to begin the full, true assimilation of the Negro into the mainstream of U.S. society. But, he added bluntly, this is going to be the most difficult social task in the Nation's history.

He spoke forthrightly of the differences and voids which separate black and white in America. They live in cities within cities, he said. They almost constitute a nation within a nation. The color of their skin is a factor, and an important one, he said. Negro poverty is different from white poverty, he said.

And, most important of all, he said that "despite the court orders and the laws, the victories and the speeches," the grim fact is that the Negro slowly is losing—not winning—his fight for equality in modern America, and drastic revolutionary steps must be taken if that trend is to be reversed.

Mr. Johnson said that part of the reason for this is the fact that Negroes are "trapped in inherited, gateless poverty," but that there is a "second cause more desperate in its force," which stems from the fact that the black man is exiled in a separate America.

Perhaps the greatest shocker of all was Mr. Johnson's frank statement that there is a dangerous breakdown of the Negro family structure. "This is not pleasant to look upon, but it must be faced," he said, and then he quoted statistics.

One answer to this problem, he said, is "welfare and social programs better designed to hold families together." Sources yesterday said Mr. Johnson has in mind the possibility of making drastic changes in current welfare laws to provide economic incentives for more Negro fathers to stay with their families.

Current laws, this source said, more often than not provide opposite incentives, since fatherless families receive more relief.

The new plan, if adopted, would provide for family allowances, payable only when mothers and fathers are living together with their children.

This is only one idea currently being considered, however. In fact, the administration at the moment really is groping for new programs to deal effectively with the Negro problem, and the White House conference, called for this fall, is an attempt to find new answers.

Mr. Johnson's address was eloquently worded, but the eloquence was supported by strong, undeniable new statistics compiled by the Department of Labor.

The speech was made for a variety of causes. There is a growing interest among intellectuals and Negro leaders as to the best future course in the civil rights march. Mr. Johnson has been speaking mostly on foreign policy lately and wanted to return to domestic problems.

It was a rare thing: a Johnson speech without many built-in applause lines. Mr. Johnson delivered it straight away, at times riding over tentative applause, which also is unusual for him to do.

His Negro audience was one accustomed to hearing national political leaders speak in traditional ways about civil rights, and the reaction was interesting. At first they applauded the traditional lines. Then they sat in stunned silence. And finally they applauded out of shock and self-identification.

LET AMERICANS SEE "YEARS OF LIGHTNING, DAY OF DRUMS"

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GRABOWSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my voice to those of so many of my colleagues who have offered concurrent resolutions, along with my own, to permit the American people to view the USIA documentary on the life and death of President Kennedy, "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums."

I know that it is not the function of the USIA to make domestic propaganda, but surely that is not involved in this case. John F. Kennedy is now a man for the ages. He is above party. What he did, and how he did it, and how America reacted to his tragic death is now part of history, American history, the experience of the present and the inheritance of future generations.

John Kennedy was a man of our time, of our generation. He matured in the fires of World War II, and in the cold war that followed it, as have so many of us in this House. Perhaps because our lives coincided in time and in certain shared experiences, we all lost a part of ourselves when he was cut down. However that may be, the fact remains that in his almost 3 years in office John F. Kennedy came to grip the hearts of the people as have few Presidents in modern times. He gave to the Presidency a certain syle, wit, youth, gaiety, while underneath this smiling exterior there was strength, purpose, and determination.

What he might have achieved had he lived is not for us to know, but that the potential for greatness had already been revealed by the time of his assassination is patent.

When that assassination took place, the shock was felt around the world. The sorrow was felt around the world—so deeply that in some areas weeks later men and women would break down at the mere mention of the tragedy. For President Kennedy had made an impact abroad, a deep and a lasting impact, and to the people of the world he represented the best in America, and the hope that they have always had in America.

It was only natural, therefore, for the U.S. Information Agency to make a documentary of President Kennedy's administration, and of the funeral which so many of us saw in person. It was a documentary of the highest quality, praised around the world for its moving account of the problems, trials, and triumphs of the presidency, as well as of the final tragedy. I could consume the rest of my time merely quoting favorable comment from foreign critics. Certainly this film, which has been called the best documentary ever made by the USIA, has had a tremendous impact wherever it has been shown, and has probably done more to enhance the impression of America held abroad than any other single piece of informational material we have ever produced.

My concurrent resolution, No. 281, and those of my colleagues, proposes that the American people, to whom this film should mean the most of all, have an opportunity to see it. This could be done through simply making it available for public showing. As matters now stand, this cannot be done, for the USIA was not set up to inform or propagandize the American people, and its materials are not, and quite properly should not, be available for domestic distribution. The fear has been expressed that were Congress to authorize an exception in this case a bad precedent would be set, and that the foot would be in the door for the future showing of productions, or the future distribution of material at home as well as abroad.

But I do think that such fears are misplaced. I do think that rather than establishing dangerous precedent we will simply be creating an opportunity for the American people to view a motion picture which can only deepen and augment their feeling for their country, and contribute to their understanding of the problems we all face in common. I think it would be salutary for Americans to realize how efficiently and beautifully a civilian agency of their Government can function on occasion. "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" can make us all proud to be Americans. I hope this House will approve it for domestic showing, so that each of us may have the opportunity to renew that pride.

BILL AMENDING EXPORT CONTROL ACT

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GRABOWSKI] may

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, outwardly, the bill before us does not give the appearance of a formidable and important piece of legislation. Yet on closer inspection, it reveals itself to be a reflection of the very principles on which the United States always has been and still is basing its foreign policy. It is a reflection of the uncompromising commitment to stand against the aggression with which the Communist colossus aims to envelop the entire world; it is, likewise, a reflection of the steadfast opposition to prejudice, conspiracy, and blackmail in international relations.

I am happy to see that the bill, first of all, extends the life of the Export Control Act of 1949 for an additional period of 4 more years. Ever since the onset of the cold war, the strict limitations placed on the exportation of the products and technical know-how of the American economy to Communist countries and watchful control over export trade with our friends, have been a powerful and effective tool of American foreign policy for peace. In cooperation with our allies, these controls have restricted the flow of strategic goods to the Communist countries, and thereby impeded to some extent their capacity to pursue more aggressive paths in the world.

The menace of the Red dragon is by no means over, and the continued use of every means restraining its expansion is of vital importance to our country and to the entire world. The extension of the Export Control Act is precisely such an instrument of restraint.

Another gratifying aspect of the bill amending the Export Control Act is the provision authorizing additional administrative penalties for the violators of the export control legislation and regulations. I have felt for some time that the two types of penalties currently authorized by the act do not afford sufficient flexibility of sanction to make the administration of the act meaningfully fair. The currently applicable civil penalty of suspension or revocation of export privileges may occasionally be too severe and again, depending on circumstances, too lenient. The choice afforded by the present amendment; namely, the imposition of a fine not exceeding \$1,000 instead of, or in conjunction with, the export privilege suspension or revocation, adds much needed flexibility to the system of penalties for the violators of the export control procedure in cases in which the much more severe criminal penalties are not appropriate.

In my opinion the most important and significant provision incorporated in the amendment before us, however, is the declaration of policy opposing discriminatory and malicious boycotts imposed by foreign countries on other countries friendly to the United States and the forcible involvement of American businessmen in such boycotts.

Mr. Speaker, it is certainly no secret that for 15 years the member nations of the Arab League have been waging a war against the young State of Israel, a war which occasionally took the form of direct armed aggression, but also a war in which by subtler, yet no less malicious, means of persistent economic boycott, they have hoped to sap the economic fiber of that country and bring it to its knees. In this treacherous discrimination they have attempted to embroil every other nation of the world, and unfortunately they have in part been successful. In their attempts they have not even stopped short of plain, though highly organized, blackmail. For, Mr. Chairman, what other name than that of organized blackmail can be given to the establishment of a special office whose only purpose is to compile blacklists and use them as a club over the businessmen of the world who, true to the principles of nondiscriminatory trade, wish only to serve all comers with the goods and services at their disposal? Is it not blackmail of the vilest sort to say, in effect: If you trade with Israel, you cannot trade with us, or even worse: If any Jews are involved in the financing, ownership, management, or operation of your firm, you cannot trade with us? Is it not humiliating blackmail when an American firm is asked to answer questions about itself, questions that have nothing whatever to do with the business at hand, but are instead fraught with prejudice and malice? Is it not humiliating blackmail when the same American firms are told that even a refusal to answer such questions will disqualify them from the trade with their customers in Arab countries? Is it not humiliating blackmail when American firms are being pressured into answering questions, the asking of which as well as the answering, has been illegal in the United States for quite some time?

Mr. Speaker, it is high time to put a stop to this nefarious practice and serve a notice on its practitioners that it will no longer be tolerated. The amendment to the Export Control Act now before us does just that. It unequivocally declares that the United States is unalterably opposed to the underhanded practices of boycott, blackmail, and bias in international trade. It protects the American businessman from being used as a pawn of international politics. It lends to the American exporter the full support and backing of the United States in his resistance to this reprehensible practice. It tells him, in effect: When you are asked an impertinent question, do not answer, and send the fellow who is asking it to see me.

Only in this way, Mr. Speaker, by solidly standing together, we can hope to counteract this plague which has been afflicting the commercial relations of the world for some 15 years. Only in this way, we can let the blackmailer know that we will not be blackmailed, and that by any further attempts at blackmail and by insistence on his treachery, he will only succeed in denying himself the access to the richest and largest supply of goods and services in the world. The sooner this realization sinks into his

mind, the better chance there is for his giving up his blackmailing pursuits.

If the past history of the disdainful response of some courageous American firms to the attempts at involving them in the anti-Israel boycott is any indication, the Arab League will indeed find the way to discard its blackmailing sandals as soon as they start pinching.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the amendment to the Export Control Act in its entirety and urge all my colleagues to do likewise.

CREDIT TO SPACE AGENCY AND ASTRONAUTS

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, too much credit cannot be given the top management of the Space Agency, headed by the able Administrator, James E. Webb, and his capable assistants, Dr. Hugh Dryden, Dr. Robert C. Seamans, Jr., Dr. George E. Mueller, Dr. Robert Gilruth, Dr. Werner von Braun, Dr. Abe Silverstein, Dr. William H. Pickering, Dr. Kurt Debus, Dr. Harry J. Goett, Dr. Floyd L. Thompson, Dr. Smith J. DeFrance, and many others.

To this group of distinguished gentlemen, must go the credit of spending some \$17 billion without the slightest breath of scandal attached to the many thousands of transactions. In addition, they have mobilized industry and brought into this brandnew field of endeavor one of the most magnificent performances ever achieved in any area of industry.

The top management has also assembled in their midst some of the most outstanding and distinguished scientists in the world. They have plowed in a virgin field and the results they have accomplished have been almost miraculous.

We cannot give enough recognition to our dedicated astronauts who have performed beautifully under splendid leadership. It is no small task to assemble and train such a group of men. In addition, the top management has assembled many thousands of scientists and technicians, who have turned in some of the most outstanding scientific feats the world has ever known.

These able managers have performed the most capable job I have seen in my 28 years in government. May their efforts continue and bring to the world more knowledge, world peace, and universal happiness.

KAMEHAMEHA THE GREAT

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the political consolidation of the Hawaiian Islands was the most significant development in the 40 years of Hawaiian history that followed the visits of Captain Cook. In achieving that consolidation, the role played by Kamehameha the Great was crucially important. He dominated this period of Hawaiian history. He is universally recognized as the most outstanding of the Hawaiian chiefs of his own era and of all the periods that preceded and followed his.

He was a fearless leader of powerful physique, skilled in the arts and practices of war and government. He was highly intelligent, filled with the accumulated learning of his race, and curious about new things and new ideas. He was a good judge of men, and, as do most great leaders, had the ability of inspiring loyalty in those who followed him. He was the first chief to have an understanding of the advantages to be gained by friendly relations with foreign visitors to the islands, but he was far too sagacious to fall into their power.

This great chieftain did not invent a new system of government. He made use of the system already existing, with such modifications as were required by new circumstances or were suggested to him by his own experience. Essentially, the government was autocratic; the king's will was the supreme authority, but Kamehameha did not exercise this power capriciously. He governed his kingdom in accordance with the traditions of his people.

Even in his last years, Kamehameha evoked praise from such men as the Russian naval officer Golovnin, who wrote of him in 1818 that:

He is still strong, active, temperate and sober. His honesty and love of justice have been shown in numerous cases. He will always be considered as an enlightener and reformer of his people. One fact which shows his good sense is this. None of the foreigners visiting his country enjoy any exclusive privileges, but all can trade with his subjects with equal freedom.

During his long and brilliant reign, Kamehameha the Great wisely managed the internal affairs of his kingdom in a way that minimized the danger of insurrection or revolution. His relations with other chiefs, his disposition of lands, and his general administration of the government all tended to thwart disruptive influences, to weld discordant elements into union, and to create national feeling and national pride.

Kamehameha maintained the ancient religion of his people with great strictness. To one man who told him that his gods were not true gods, he is reported to have said:

These shall be my gods, for they have power, and by them I have become possessed of this government, and through them I have come to my throne.

Secure in his religious faith, honored by all of his people, Kamehameha the Great died at Kailua, Hawaii, on May 8, 1819.

June 11 is celebrated as Kamehameha Day in Hawaii where the citizens of the 50th State observe with songs, dances, pageants, luaus, exhibitions of ancient Hawaiian art, water sports, and parades

the memory of this great Hawaiian leader. The pride of all Hawaiians in the tradition and achievement of Kamehameha is thus displayed for all the world to see. The greatness of Kamehameha has also been recognized by the U.S. Government; it has named a Polaris submarine the *Kamehameha*.

Hawaii, the newest State of the United States, and all Hawaiians will continue on Kamehameha Day as on all the other days of the year to express their joy in their unique traditions and their pride in being Americans.

SENATOR BREWSTER'S MEMORIAL DAY SPEECH

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRALEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 30, I had the honor and privilege of introducing to the people gathered in Gettysburg for the purpose of participating in Memorial Day services the Honorable DANIEL B. BREWSTER, senior Senator from the Free State of Maryland.

Gettysburg has become nationally known and recognized for these Memorial Day services, traditionally held in the National Cemetery dedicated in 1863 by President Lincoln, and has always been privileged to attract outstanding leaders and speakers from throughout the Nation.

Senator BREWSTER certainly belongs to this group. The Senator was born in Baltimore County, Md., in 1923.

In 1942 Senator BREWSTER enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps. He rose from the rank of private to captain, serving 2 years in the South Pacific. During campaigns he was wounded, decorated with the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, and the Gold Star in lieu of a second Purple Heart. Senator BREWSTER has remained active in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve and now holds the rank of lieutenant colonel.

The Senator attended Princeton and Johns Hopkins Universities and received a law degree from the University of Maryland in 1949. In 1950 at the age of 27 he was elected to the Maryland House of Delegates from Baltimore County and was reelected in 1954.

In 1958 Senator BREWSTER was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from the second district of Maryland and was reelected to the 87th Congress in 1960. For those two terms he served on the House Armed Services Committee.

In 1962 Senator BREWSTER was elected to the U.S. Senate where he now serves on the Armed Services, Commerce and Post Office and Civil Service Committees.

Senator BREWSTER has also been active as a former president and a present director of the Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society at Timonium, and as a member of the YMCA, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled

American Veterans, the American Legion, the Reserve Officers Association, and in behalf of his church—St. John's Episcopal.

By virtue of Senator BREWSTER's extensive and exemplary military service and by virtue of his association with the congressional Armed Services Committees, he was in an excellent position to address those gathered at the recent Memorial Day observance in Gettysburg.

I am pleased to include as part of my remarks today the text of his speech which follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR DANIEL B. BREWSTER, DEMOCRAT, OF MARYLAND, DELIVERED AT THE GETTYSBURG BATTLEFIELD NATIONAL CEMETERY, GETTYSBURG, PA., MAY 30, 1965

From Bunker Hill to Gettysburg's field, from Guadalcanal's jungles to Korea's bloody ridge, and now in Santo Domingo and Vietnam generations of Americans have seen the ugly face of war. They defended freedom in its hour of danger.

We pause on this Memorial Day to honor those who gave that last full measure of devotion. We recognize that the real monuments are not the marble tablets we see in these fields, or in U.S. military cemeteries around the world—the lasting monuments are the legacies of liberty and freedom that have been passed on to us.

On a cold raw November day in 1863, President Abraham Lincoln came to dedicate this cemetery. He quietly spoke those 10 beautifully constructed sentences which have become one of the hallmarks of our heritage. When Lincoln spoke here, our young Nation was torn by the cruelest of all human conflicts, civil war.

The courage and sacrifice of brave men, some of whom rest in this beautiful Pennsylvania countryside, helped preserve our Union.

I am sure that Abraham Lincoln would be proud today of the Nation which he helped so much to sustain; but were he with us now, he would recognize, as he did in his time, that the struggle to preserve our Union is never ending. Each succeeding generation of Americans has faced new challenges to the unity which binds us together as a nation.

Today the United States is beset by hostile influences both from without and from within.

There are those among us who would belittle our efforts to protect freedom in far-away and unknown villages and hamlets. These same detractors would have us ignore new frontiers, strife and obstruct opportunity and stall our growing prosperity.

These irresponsible voices seek to divide our country—socially, economically, and racially. In recent years, these voices have grown louder. Surely as any foreign foe, they threaten the very structure of our democratic process, they would ignore the lessons from the greatness of our past and prevent the fulfillment of the promise of our future.

In his inaugural address delivered in our Nation's Capital on January 20 of this year, President Johnson said, "Let us reject any among us who seek to reopen old wounds and rekindle old hatreds. They stand in the way of a seeking nation. Let us now join reason to faith, and action to experience, to transform our unity of interest into a unity of purpose. For the hour and the day and the time are here to achieve progress without strife, to achieve change without hatred, not without difference of opinion, but without the deep and abiding divisions which scar the Union for generations. Under this covenant of justice, liberty, and Union, we have become a nation; prosperous, great, and mighty."

It has been 189 years since the Founding Fathers signed the Declaration of Independence. The course of events which followed their action has led this nation from a loose confederation of a few States to a solid Union of 50 States, with a population approaching 200 million. Ours is a proud record.

Never in the history of the world have a people settled so vast a land in so short a time.

Never before has a nation opened its borders to so many immigrants and drawn its strength from so many divergent elements. Never has a truly democratic government so long prevailed, or power passed so peacefully from generation to generation and between different political philosophies.

Never before has such a large measure of a people's ingenuity, resolve, and resources been devoted to the cause of freedom beyond their own borders. Our contribution of our time, our talent, our people, to the interests of other nations is unique in the history of the world.

We have been blessed through our history in many respects. The men who have led our country have met the tests of their times. Abraham Lincoln led us through the agony of Civil War; Franklin D. Roosevelt rallied our people in the struggle to overcome the great depression and defeat the Axis; the indomitable and courageous Harry Truman saw us through nuclear war and the Korean crisis. General Eisenhower, your neighbor, served in both war and peace—the war was won and the peace preserved; John Kennedy brought to the presidency a brilliant mind, a dynamic personality, and dedication to an ideal—a great student of history, he fully understood the lessons that lie therein. Our present leader, President Lyndon Johnson, is a forceful, wise, and compassionate man, who has demonstrated his ability to meet crisis with calm judgment.

I remember John Kennedy's inaugural address at the Capitol on January 20, 1961 as he called upon us to join in the struggle against the common enemies of man: Tyranny, poverty, disease, and war. Here are his words: "In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course. Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been summoned to give testimony on its national loyalty. The graves of young Americans who answered the call to that service, surround the globe."

The soldiers of yesterday, who we honor today, call us to the colors. We, the living, have the job to carry on their fight.

As Disraeli said many years ago, "The youth of a nation are the trustees of its posterity." Our young people are the trustees of the freedoms preserved for us by the men we remember today.

Our people, and particularly our young citizens, are charged to achieve the highest level of their capacity. This they must do as this Nation meets its increasingly complex economic, social, and international challenges.

Abraham Lincoln's words on these very grounds remind us that we can have government of the people and for the people only so long as we have government by the people.

Our Government cannot function unless dedicated men and women, by the tens of thousands, work to make it function. New ideas, new concepts, new programs and new laws depend on the willingness of our citizens and our leaders to apply them and to improve them.

We honor our commitment to the dead. They made it possible for us to live in liberty.

I know of no more appropriate day, nor no more fitting place, to remind all of the glorious heritage of America. Let us join in

the pledge President Johnson made in his state of the Union message to the Congress: "In 1965, we begin a new quest for union. We seek the unity of man with the world he has built—with the knowledge that can serve or destroy him—with the cities which can stimulate or stifle him—with the wealth and machines which can enrich or menace his spirit."

"We seek to establish a harmony between man and society which will allow each of us to enlarge the meaning of his life and all of us to elevate the quality of our civilization."

The creation of the Great Society is a challenging task. It will not be finished in my generation, nor in yours. But it cannot be begun less each of us does our share—and a little more.

Today, at this hallowed place, at this time, "let us begin."

ARE THE WORKERS IN THE COTTON TEXTILE INDUSTRY SHARING IN THE BENEFITS OF THE SUBSIDY PROGRAM?

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, when the cotton subsidy bill was considered in the 88th Congress, the claim was widely made that its passage would result in the cotton textile industry passing along to its employees a large part of the financial benefits in the form of wage increases and fringe benefits. Actual experience has indicated that those who hoped that this would be done have been sadly disappointed.

The large cotton textile mills of the Nation which are mostly situated in the Southern part of our Nation continue to pay substandard wages and provide substandard fringe benefits. I might also add that they continue to resist legitimate unionization fiercely.

Despite the fact that they have been crying poverty for years, the giants of the textile industry are earning high profits, and the industry is increasingly becoming the property of the giants of the textile world.

The average wage in the cotton textile industry ranges between \$1.75 and \$1.85 an hour while the national average is in excess of \$2.50 an hour. In one major mill, the workers earn \$1,500 a year less than the average factory worker across the Nation.

Such fringe benefits as exist are grossly inadequate. Employees in the southern cotton textile industry generally have received only one paid holiday a year, that being Christmas Day. Likewise the hospitalization and pension benefits when contrasted with those existing in other industries in other sections of the country are meager, to say the least. I think that these facts must be kept very much in mind by the Congress when we are called upon to determine again whether the cotton textile industry is entitled to subsidies from the Federal Treasury.

THE PRESIDENT HAS REVIVED THE SPIRIT OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE, DECLARES THE SALISBURY, MD. TIMES

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Salisbury, Md., Times declared editorially on May 11 that President Johnson "revived the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine" when he stated that the United States would not stand for establishment of "another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere."

I am pleased to include the text of this editorial in the **CONGRESSIONAL RECORD** for the information of my colleagues.

[From the Salisbury (Md.) Times, May 11, 1965]

BACK TO MONROE DOCTRINE

When President Johnson declared on May 2 the United States would not stand for establishment of "another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere," he revived the Monroe Doctrine.

It would be better to say he revived the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine. The doctrine, itself, has been a dubious international instrument.

But the spirit of the doctrine—that the Western Hemisphere shall be dominated by the New World and not subjected to the blood feuds and ideological infections of the Old World—has been and can be again a powerful point of view.

It was at issue in the Cuban missile crises, when the United States learned that a potentially hostile government had strongly armed an offshore island and had dominated the island's government.

Many U.S. citizens thought the Monroe Doctrine should have controlled policy in the Cuban crisis. They were shocked when Soviet Premier Khrushchev said he thought the doctrine had "outlived itself."

It is of historic interest that one of the prime reasons for the enunciation of the doctrine in 1823 was fear of Russian encroachment on the west coast of the United States. No one would have dreamed of encroachment in Cuba in 1823.

Perhaps a third of Dominican Republic industry is owned by Americans. The Government controls another third. The Republic is the third largest producer of sugar in the Western Hemisphere. It also has large deposits of bauxite ore, which have attracted the Aluminum Co. of America. The United Fruit Co. enjoys the island nation's tropical wealth.

Since the overthrow of the Trujillo dictatorship, U.S. business interests, through the Business Council for International Understanding, have done a truly remarkable job of management counseling and assistance. American diplomats have advised Dominican officials patiently and intimately.

The United States committed itself to Dominican democracy in 1961 when we sent warships to within sight of Santo Domingo to influence reversal of an army takeover.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ZABLOCKI, for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

Mr. KORNEGAY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for June 10, on account of illness in family.

Mr. DYAL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), from June 10–June 15, on account of official business.

Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. ARBENDS), through June 21, on account of official business as member Subcommittee on Armed Services reviewing matters pertinent to military situation in Vietnam.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through June 21, on account of official business as member Subcommittee on Armed Services reviewing matters pertinent to the military situation in Vietnam.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, after 4 p.m., on account of official business in Scotland, Neck, N.C.

Mr. PURCELL (at the request of Mr. FRIEDEL, for today, June 10, 1965, on account of official business.

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. FEIGHAN, for 60 minutes, on Tuesday next.

Mr. MICHEL (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Utah), for 15 minutes, on June 10; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Utah), for 15 minutes, on June 10, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Utah), for 10 minutes, on June 10; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Utah), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. RONCALIO), for 5 minutes, today; and 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. NEDZI to revise and extend his remarks made today in Committee of the Whole and to include certain newspaper articles and editorials.

Mr. HICKS to revise and extend remarks made by him in Committee of the Whole today and include an editorial.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Utah) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. AYRES.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RONCALIO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. ST. ONGE in three instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. VIVIAN.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The **SPEAKER** announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1000. An act to amend the act of July 29, 1954, as amended, to permit transfer of title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsibility for project works serving municipal and industrial functions.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 14, 1965, 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:

1212. A letter from the President, Board of Commissions, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, as amended, and the act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto, approved June 6, 1892, as amended, to exempt from licensing thereunder physicians and dentists employed by the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1213. A letter from the Chairman, U.S.-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act establishing the U.S.-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1214. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report of funds of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to provide additional research laboratory space at the University of Minnesota, pursuant to 78 Stat. 310, 311; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

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: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 400. Concurrent resolution to provide for printing of additional copies of House document entitled "Documents Illustrative of the Formation of the Union of the American States";

with amendment (Rept. No. 492). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 415. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a report on the Sino-Soviet conflict by the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, together with hearings thereon held by that subcommittee, and of additional copies thereof; with amendment (Rept. No. 493). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 428. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of "History of the House of Representatives", and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 494). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 411. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Communist Activities in the Buffalo, N.Y., Area," 88th Congress, 1st session; with amendment (Rept. No. 495). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 412. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report 1739, 88th Congress, 2d session, entitled "Annual Report for the Year 1963, Committee on Un-American Activities"; with amendment (Rept. No. 496). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 413. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Violation of State Department Travel Regulations and Pro-Castro Propaganda Activities in the United States, Parts 1 Through 5," with amendment (Rept. No. 497). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 414. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Communist Activities in the Minneapolis, Minn., Area," 88th Congress, 2d session; with amendment (Rept. No. 498). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 390. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "The Communist Party's Cold War Against Congressional Investigation of Subversion—Report and Testimony of Robert Carrillo Ronstadt," 87th Congress, 2d session; with amendment (Rept. No. 499). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 4170. A bill to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; with amendment (Rept. No. 500). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DANIELS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 432. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 and the Civil Service Retirement Act with regard to filing designation of beneficiary, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 508). 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. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2871. A bill for the relief of

Dorota Zytka; without amendment (Rept. No. 501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2678. A bill for the relief of Joo Yul Kim; with amendment (Rept. No. 502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3345. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Meneshian; with amendment (Rept. No. 503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3505. A bill for the relief of Beverly Helen (Smith) Bowers; without amendment (Rept. No. 504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4032. A bill for the relief of Carlo Antonio DeLuca; with amendment (Rept. No. 505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 504. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6442. A bill for the relief of Rocky River Co. and Macy Land Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 507). 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. ADAIR:

H.R. 8948. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation to reflect the increase in the cost of living and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GLENN ANDREWS:

H.R. 8949. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to delete those provisions which permit employers to discriminate in regard to hire or tenure of employment to encourage union membership; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 8950. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLEVINGER:

H.R. 8951. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 8952. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8953. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREIGG:

H.R. 8954. A bill to amend the Safety Appliance Acts to require railroad cars to be equipped with certain luminous markings;

to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 8955. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACKIE:

H.R. 8956. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 8957. A bill to provide that the National Bureau of Standards shall conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to determine the practicability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 8958. A bill to establish a Federal sabbatical program to improve the quality of teaching in the Nation's elementary or secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 8959. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply and water systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 8960. A bill to provide time off duty for Government employees to comply with religious obligations prescribed by religious denominations of which such employees are bona fide members; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 8961. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes; to the Commission on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 8962. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide that individuals with religious convictions against joining or participating in a labor organization under a union security collective bargaining agreement shall not be required to join or contribute to the support of that labor organization; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 8963. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 8964. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 8965. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 8966. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 8967. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 8968. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 8969. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 8970. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 8971. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 8972. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 8973. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 8974. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 8975. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 8976. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 8977. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 8978. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 8979. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 8980. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 8981. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 8982. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 8983. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 8984. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 8985. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN DERLIN:

H.R. 8986. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 8987. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 8988. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 8989. A bill to promote health and safety in metal and nonmetallic mineral industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 8990. A bill to provide for the control and progressive eradication of certain aquatic plants in the States of Maryland, Virginia, New Jersey, and Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 8991. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 8992. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 8993. A bill to incorporate the U.S. Submarine Veterans of World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 8994. A bill to amend section 8(b) (4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with respect to strike at the sites of construction projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8995. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 8996. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 8997. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 8998. A bill to more effectively prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 8999. A bill to more effectively prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 9000. A bill to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia to provide for the financial protection of certain persons suffering injury as a result of the operation of a motor vehicle by uninsured motorists; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9001. A bill to strengthen the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9002. A bill to authorize civil commitment in lieu of criminal punishment in certain cases involving narcotic addicts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9003. A bill relating to the penalties for violations of certain narcotic and marihuana laws of the United States, and to the treatment of narcotic addicts and other persons suffering from a mental or physical condition committed to the custody of the Attorney General; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9004. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States to assist them in establishing treatment and rehabilitation services for drug abusers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9005. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States to assist them in the construction of facilities for the treatment and rehabilitation of drug abusers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.J. Res. 506. Joint resolution to adopt a specific version of "The Star-Spangled Banner" as the national anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 507. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the last week in October of every year as National Student Council Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9006. A bill for the relief of Ora Fux; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 9007. A bill for the relief of Karen Maloney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 9008. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Adamo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 9009. A bill for the relief of Venanzio Falzetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 9010. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ismay Paulina Mack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 9011. A bill for the relief of Dr. Iraj Assefi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9012. A bill for the relief of Miss Isil Feride Engin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9013. A bill for the relief of Miss Dobrila Makic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 9014. A bill for the relief of Mr. Pasquale Provenzano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9015. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hyung Je Yeon, Dr. Woon Bok Rhee, and En Chu Yeon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO (by request):

H.R. 9016. A bill for the relief of Dr. Abraham Ruchwarger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9017. A bill for the relief of Houry Der Sarkissian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 9018. A bill for the relief of Hossian A. Meshkati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

227. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the president, International Union of the United Plant Guard Workers of America, Detroit, Mich., relative to repealing section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.