

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, May 20, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Father Michael Petty, S.J., Chaplain of Cuban Crusade, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

O God, Lord of History and Prince of Peace, all nations are in Your hands and subject to Your care. Hear our plea as we strive to bring peace and understanding among nations.

We pray today for all the people of the noble Cuban Nation: may they grow and develop in harmony and solidarity.

We thank You, Lord, for endowing the many peoples of our hemisphere with an immense variety of gifts, with abundant natural wealth, with a great capacity for human sympathy, and with ardent desires of peace and justice.

Grant us your strength to accept the challenge of Your loving message to mankind which calls us to be builders of peace among men and summons us to anchor in our hearts a profound respect for the options of individuals and of nations. "Happy the peacemakers for they shall be called the sons of God."

Open our minds that we might see beyond the horizons that separate our shores, how children play on every beach, and sunsets glow for every land. Open our minds, Lord, that we might read in the signs of the times Your loving care for all men, so that someday Your justice may be acclaimed from east to west and someday all men might be completely one. 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. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On May 14, 1970:

H.R. 1049. An act to amend the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act of October 30, 1965, relating to the conservation and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fishing resources, to encourage certain joint research and development projects, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1187. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1961, providing for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore;

H.R. 1706. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights in and underlands in Pike County, Ga.;

H.R. 1951. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Sp4c. Aaron Tawil;

H.R. 2817. An act for the relief of Delilah Aurora Gamatero;

H.R. 3955. An act for the relief of Placido Viterbo;

H.R. 5936. An act for the relief of Kong Wan Nor;

H.R. 6125. An act for the relief of Anne Reale Pietrandrea;

H.R. 9001. An act for the relief of William Patrick Magee;

H.R. 11578. An act for the relief of Patricia Hiro Williams;

H.R. 12037. An act for the relief of All Somay; and

H.R. 12605. An act to amend section 613 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

On May 18, 1970:

H.R. 12673. An act to authorize the transfer by licensed blood banks in the District of Columbia of blood components within the District of Columbia.

On May 19, 1970:

H.J. Res. 1232. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2624. An act to improve the judicial machinery in customs courts by amending the statutory provisions relating to judicial actions and administrative proceedings in customs matters, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 782. An act to protect the civilian employees of the executive branch of the U.S. Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy;

S. 885. An act to authorize the preparation of a roll of persons whose lineal ancestors were members of the Confederate Tribes of Weas, Piankashaws, Peorias, and Kaskaskias, merged under the Treaty of May 30, 1854 (10 Stat. 1082), and to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 314, amended, 314-E and 65, and for other purposes;

S. 3558. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide continued financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; and

S.J. Res. 144. Joint resolution to provide for the appropriation of funds to assist school districts adjoining or in the proximity of Indian reservations, to construct elementary and secondary schools and to provide proper housing and educational opportunities for Indian children attending these public schools.

TULALIP RESERVATION, WASH.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 11372) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1956 (70 Stat. 290), 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, lines 15 and 16, strike out "within, adjoining, or adjoining other land of the Tulalip Tribes which adjoins, the boundaries" and insert "within the boundaries".

Page 3, line 22, strike out "Reservation and adjacent areas," and insert "Reservation,".

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 11372 is to give the Tulalip Tribes of the Tulalip Reservation in Washington additional authority to acquire, manage, and dispose of tribal property. As the bill passed the House it permitted, among other things, the Secretary to accept from the tribes and to hold in trust title to lands already acquired by the tribes in fee either within or adjoining the reservation. An amendment was adopted by the Senate which limits this authority to land within the reservation. The Secretary now has under the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, authority to acquire lands in trust either inside or outside a reservation, and the Senate amendment will therefore cause no problem. I believe the House should concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL)?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LONGER TERM LEASES OF INDIAN LANDS AT THE YAVAPAI-PRESCOTT COMMUNITY RESERVATION IN ARIZONA

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 12878) to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands at the Yavapai-Prescott Community Reservation in Arizona, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, after line 7, insert:
"Sec. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 539), as amended, is further amended by adding the following new sentence at the end thereof: 'Prior to approval of any lease or extension of an existing lease pursuant to this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall first satisfy himself that adequate consideration has been given to the relationship between the use of the leased lands and the use of neighboring lands; the height, quality, and safety of any structures of other facilities to be constructed on such lands; the availability of police and fire protection and other services; the availability of judicial forums for all criminal and civil causes arising on the leased lands; and the effect on the environment of the uses to which the leased lands will be subject.'"

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 12878 is to give the Yavapai-Prescott Indian community the same long-term lease authority that Congress has given to 18 other tribes. This is done by amending a 1955 statute that governs both long- and short-term leases by Indian tribes generally. All H.R. 12878 did

as it passed the House was to add this one tribe to the group that has long-term lease authority.

The amendment to the bill that was added by the Senate applies to both long-term and short-term leases by any tribe. It requires the Secretary to satisfy himself before approving any lease that adequate consideration has been given to the following factors:

First. The relationship between the use of the leased Indian land and the use of neighboring lands. One of those relationships might involve local zoning restrictions. The Secretary is only required to consider the zoning; he is not required to comply with it.

Second. The group of factors that are usually covered by building codes. Again, the Secretary is required only to consider—not necessarily to comply.

Third. The availability of police and fire protection.

Fourth. The availability of judicial forums for handling civil and criminal causes of action arising on the leased land. This is a subject governed by Federal statute, and there is not much the Secretary can do about the subject when he considers it.

Fifth. The effect of the lease on the environment.

While I see no particular need to add this kind of language to the 1955 leasing statute, because the Secretary is well aware of all of these factors, I also see no harm in it. For that reason I believe the House should concur in the Senate amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOTHING BUT THE FACTS

(Mr. BRINKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, to distinguish and differentiate between racial separation because of a history of dual schools, on the one hand, and a history of dual housing patterns, on the other; to label the former as de jure segregation and to label the latter as de facto segregation; to accord similarly situated citizens different treatment under different rules, is both illogical and invalid, and allows a technical, artificial distinction to take precedence over facts.

An analogy might be that of a man timing two cars on a measured track. One car has a speedometer and the other one does not. The timer clocks each of the cars at 60 miles per hour.

Yet the timer disqualifies the speedometerless auto from its time trial because it had no gage to record its speed.

Ridiculous?

Of course it is ridiculous; the cars should be "graded" according to the facts—according to their actual rate of travel, however it might be measured.

Likewise, there should be one nationwide standard on integration-segregation

on factual situations wherever they may exist.

If it is wrong to bus quotas of children in the North for the purpose of achieving racial balance in schools, it is just as wrong in the South under the same facts.

One country—one set of rules. That is all we ask. This is the rationale of Hands Across Georgia, the members of which are today testifying before a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee. I commend these dedicated, fair-minded citizens.

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

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

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is right. We in contending that there is really no difference in de facto and de jure segregation cannot have different rules, and we really cannot say when little children are isolated because of their color that it makes a difference whether it is de facto or de jure segregation. They are generally unacceptable in a nation dedicated to equal justice under law. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

NEWS CORRESPONDENTS ENCOURAGE DISUNITY AND DISLOYALTY IN AMERICAN FORCES

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, those who saw a May 6 CBS-TV network program involving CBS correspondent Gary Shepherd were shocked at this man's attitude and his apparent efforts to encourage traitorous conduct by American soldiers. In the telecast, three soldiers were interviewed in a way to encourage them to express their reluctance to fight, and in one instance where a particularly strong objection was made by a soldier, the scene was repeated. The network claimed this was due to an editing error. Very convenient. This is one of the worst of a long line of bad programs which, intentionally or otherwise, leave the impression that everything America does is wrong and that whatever our enemies do is right. Shepherd and his kind should be barred from Southeast Asia. It is bad enough to have to fight Communists there without having news correspondents encouraging disunity and disloyalty in American forces. It is this sort of thing that is causing the American people to give enthusiastic support to SPIRO AGNEW's criticism of the news media.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF BRUTALITY IN NEW YORK

(Mr. NICHOLS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that a Member of this body is so disturbed about recent events on the University of Alabama campus that he has gone down there to hold hearings into charges of police brutality. This is, of course, a free country

where Members of Congress and other citizens are allowed to go where they wish. Certainly this gentleman has every right to go to the university.

It would be wonderful if each of us here had a congressional district and a State that had no problems whatsoever, and we could concentrate our efforts where it would do us the most good politically. This gentleman is to be congratulated. In only one short term in the Congress, he has cleared up every problem his district had, and apparently solved so many of the problems of his State that he has time to help the rest of us with our problems.

He may have overlooked this one little matter, so I would like to call it to his attention at this time. This week's issue of U.S. News & World Report states on page 18

The attack by hundreds of construction workers at noon May 8 on young demonstrators gathered in New York's Wall Street was seen as an ugly portent. At least 70 protestors were injured. New York City police were accused of failing to halt the assault.

Now that our colleague has acquired some experience in investigating brutality, I sincerely hope that his next investigation will be held in his home State of New York.

SHORTEN OUR NATIONAL CAMPAIGNS

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, another country has again shown us the way in which national political campaigns should be conducted.

In yesterday's paper we read that Prime Minister Wilson of Great Britain had asked the Queen to dissolve Parliament. The news was also issued at the same time that the national campaign would be completed within 30 days from the dissolution of Parliament.

This again raises the question as to why we in the United States insist on continuing our quadrennial political circus, with their inordinate expenditure of campaign funds, with their wear and tear on the emotional and physical resources of the candidates, and, most importantly, with the gradual loss of contact with the voting public and the diminishing returns in communication which result from these expenditures.

I suggest again that we should follow the example of Canada, England, Israel, and nearly every other civilized country in the world, and reduce our campaigns to reasonable and manageable and constructive proportions.

UNIVERSITY OF MONTEVALLO STUDENTS, MONTEVALLO, ALA., SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my privilege to speak at the

annual Honors Day program at the University of Montevallo in Montevallo, Ala., near my congressional district.

While I was there a graduating senior, Dan Cooper, expressed his concern about student unrest and demonstrations and his desire to have registered support of the President on the part of many students like himself.

Out of that concern came a telegram to President Nixon yesterday signed by approximately three-fourths of the student body and faculty of that university. The telegram was 40 feet long. It took 3½ hours to transmit, and it was the longest telegram ever sent from the Birmingham office, according to the office.

Mr. Speaker, when the tumult and the shouting dies, it will prove true that the President is right in his Cambodian and Southeast Asian policy and it will become clear that the majority of the American people support our President, including many students at colleges and universities like those of the University of Montevallo in Alabama.

**APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON
H.R. 12941, DISPOSAL OF CADMIUM
FROM THE NATIONAL
STOCKPILE**

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12941) to authorize the release of 4,180,000 pounds of cadmium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PHILBIN, BENNETT, and KING.

**APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON
H.R. 15839, DISPOSAL OF TUNGSTEN
FROM THE NATIONAL
STOCKPILE**

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15839) to authorize the disposal of tungsten from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PHILBIN, BENNETT, and KING.

**APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON
H.R. 15021, RELEASE OF COBALT
FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE**

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15021) to authorize the release of 40,200,000 pounds of cobalt from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and

request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PHILBIN, BENNETT, and KING.

**APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON
H.R. 15833, DISPOSAL OF ACID
GRADE FLUORSPAR FROM THE
NATIONAL STOCKPILE**

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15833) to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PHILBIN, BENNETT, and KING.

**APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON
H.R. 15836, DISPOSAL OF TYPE A,
CHEMICAL GRADE MANGANESE
FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE**

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15836) to authorize the disposal of type A, chemical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PHILBIN, BENNETT, and KING.

**APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON
H.R. 15837 DISPOSING OF TYPE B,
CHEMICAL GRADE MANGANESE**

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15837) to authorize the disposal of type B, chemical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PHILBIN, BENNETT, and KING.

**APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON
H.R. 15831, DISPOSING OF BIS-
MUTH FROM THE NATIONAL
STOCKPILE**

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15831) to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, with Senate amend-

ments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PHILBIN, BENNETT, and KING.

**APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON
H.R. 15835, DISPOSING OF MAG-
NESIUM FROM THE NATIONAL
STOCKPILE**

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15835) to authorize the disposal of magnesium from the national stockpile, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PHILBIN, BENNETT, and KING.

**APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON
H.R. 15838, DISPOSING OF SHELLAC
FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE**

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15838) to authorize the disposal of shellac from the national stockpile, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, if there was not a single one of these bills, calling for disposals from the stockpiles, that the other body could accept?

Mr. PHILBIN. If the gentleman will yield, there was an amendment inserted in the other body.

Mr. GROSS. I beg the gentleman's pardon?

Mr. PHILBIN. There was an amendment inserted in the bills in the other body, we believe is unworkable and there was a disagreement concerning some of the language. We are going to conference to see if we can work out some agreement with the other body to insure proper disposal of critical materials in the interest of the Government and the economy.

As the able gentleman knows, these bills all relate to stockpile disposals, and we are asking to go to conference so as to work out differences between the House and the other body.

Mr. GROSS. I understand the purpose of the gentleman's request, but I could not understand why the other body would reject every one of these bills. The gentleman has explained and I accept his explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PHILBIN, BENNETT, and KING.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 15832, DISPOSING OF CASTOR OIL FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15832) to authorize the disposal of castor oil from the national stockpile, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PHILBIN, BENNETT, and KING.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 16291, DISPOSING OF CHRYSOTILE ASBESTOS FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 16291) to authorize the disposal of chrysotile asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PHILBIN, BENNETT, and KING.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 16292, DISPOSING OF CORUNDUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 16292) to authorize the disposal of corundum from the national stockpile, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PHILBIN, BENNETT, and KING.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 16289, DISPOSING OF NATURAL CEYLON AMORPHOUS LUMP GRAPHITE FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 16289) to authorize the disposal of natural Ceylon amorphous lump graphite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PHILBIN, BENNETT, and KING.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 16297, DISPOSAL OF MOLYBDENUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 16297) to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PHILBIN, BENNETT, and KING.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 16290, DISPOSAL OF REFRACTORY GRADE CHROMITE FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 16290) to authorize the disposal of refractory grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PHILBIN, BENNETT, and KING.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 16295, DISPOSAL OF NATURAL BATTERY GRADE MANGANESE ORE FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 16295) to authorize the disposal of natural battery grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PHILBIN, BENNETT, and KING.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 15988, DISPOSAL OF SURINAM-TYPE METALLURGICAL GRADE BAUXITE FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15988) to authorize the disposal of Surinam-

type metallurgical grade bauxite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PHILBIN, BENNETT, and KING.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered. The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 128]

Abbitt	Fallon	Ottinger
Adair	Feighan	Pepper
Anderson,	Flynt	Pollock
Tenn.	Foley	Powell
Ayres	Ford,	Rallsback
Baring	William D.	Rees
Biaggi	Green, Oreg.	Reid, N.Y.
Bingham	Gubser	Reifel
Brasco	Halpern	Roberts
Brown, Calif.	Hays	Roe
Brown, Mich.	Heckler, Mass.	Rogers, Colo.
Brown, Ohio	Jacobs	Rosenthal
Bush	Jones, Ala.	Roudebush
Button	Kee	Scheuer
Byrne, Pa.	Kirwan	Schneebell
Carey	Lowenstein	Smith, Iowa
Clark	McCarthy	Springer
Clay	McClary	Stokes
Cohelan	McDade	Stratton
Colmer	McMillan	Stubblefield
Conyers	Meeds	Stuckey
Corbett	Moorhead	Teague, Tex.
Crane	Morse	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Ga.	Morton	Tunney
Dawson	Murphy, N.Y.	
Edwards, Calif.	Nix	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 355 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION FOR SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Subcommittee on Education be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate for the purpose of considering legislation.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on rollcalls No. 100, 121, 123, and 124. Had I been present and voting I would have voted "yea" on rollcalls No. 100, 121, and 123. On rollcall No. 124 I would have voted "nay."

THREAT OF OIL POLLUTION FROM SHIPS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC NO. 91-340)

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The oil that fuels our industrial civilization can also foul our natural environment.

The threat of oil pollution from ships—both at sea and in our harbors—represents a growing danger to our marine environment. With the expansion of world trade over the past three decades, seaborne oil transport has multiplied tenfold and presently constitutes more than 60 percent of the world's ocean commerce.

This increase in shipping has increased the oil pollution hazard. Within the past ten years, there have been over 550 tanker collisions, four-fifths of which have involved ships entering or leaving ports. The routine discharge by tankers and other ships of oil and oily wastes as a part of their regular operation is also a major contributor to the oil pollution problem.

The development of world commerce and industry and its growing dependence on oil need not result in these added dangers. The growing threat from oil spills can be contained—not by stopping industrial progress—but through a careful combination of international cooperation and national initiatives.

This message outlines a number of actions which the Congress should take to reduce the risks of oil pollution. It also announces additional executive measures which will promote this same end and calls for the cooperation of industry and the American public to aid in this important effort.

1. INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS

The problem of oil spills is a major international environmental problem and any remedy must deal effectively with its global implications. Last year in Brussels, working under the auspices of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, an arm of the United Nations, the United States joined with other nations in reaching important agreements in this area. We signed two new conventions which would allow us to take actions within an international framework to prevent oil spill damages and to assure compensation when spills occur.

Today, I am transmitting these conventions to the Senate for its advice and consent. The ratification of the first of these conventions will empower us, by international agreement, to take preventive action against vessels on the high seas which threaten imminent pollution danger to our coasts. Had this treaty been in force at the time of the Torrey Canyon disaster in 1967, effective action could have been initiated without delay to prevent or limit the damaging effects. The second convention imposes strict civil liability upon the owner of vessels

responsible for pollution damage to coastal areas, regardless of the location of the vessel. The Congress should consider the differences between existing domestic legislation and this convention and, if necessary, enact conforming legislation. In ratifying these conventions, we will demonstrate our firm belief that the danger of oil pollution is an urgent matter for international regulation, and that innocent victims of oil spills should not go uncompensated.

Another major international action to curb oil pollution was the adoption last year of amendments to the 1954 Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil. These amendments deal principally with the intentional discharge of oil or oily wastes on the high seas and establish new rules prohibiting the discharge of oil within 50 miles of our coast. These amendments are also being submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent, and legislation will be submitted to provide for the effective enforcement of these new international requirements.

The amendments to the 1954 Convention may not go into effect for some time, since they require ratification by other nations. This process could take several years. Therefore, I am instructing appropriate United States authorities to bring the provisions of these amendments into effect with respect to American vessels as soon as the implementing legislation is adopted. I hope that other nations will take similar action to implement these changes for their own vessels before the treaty amendments go into effect.

The Government of the United States is eager to participate in any international forum considering the problems of marine pollution. We particularly support the efforts of NATO's Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society which will sponsor a conference this fall in Brussels to exchange information and make recommendations for further international action concerning oil spills.

2. INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR SHIP CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION

The best way to protect our ocean resources and coastal areas from oil damage is to prevent the occurrence of oil spills. The establishment of more effective international standards for both the construction and the operation of tanker vessels will materially reduce the potential hazard.

The Secretary of State is being instructed to seek effective multilateral action to prescribe international standards for the construction and operation of tankers. The Secretary of Commerce, with the assistance of the Secretary of Transportation, will develop the specific technical standards or criteria which could form the basis for multilateral action.

3. PORTS AND WATERWAYS SAFETY ACT

I am asking the Congress to enact the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1970, a law which would give the Coast Guard additional authority to protect against oil spills in several important ways. It would allow the Coast Guard to control

vessel traffic in the inland waters and the territorial seas of the United States, to regulate the handling and storage of dangerous cargoes on the waterfront, to establish safety requirements for waterfront equipment and facilities, and to set up safety zones or other controlled access areas in and near U.S. ports and harbors. This legislation could significantly enhance our drive to prevent oil pollution and I hope the Congress will give it early and favorable attention.

4. INCREASED SURVEILLANCE

A large number of oil spills occur in waters close to our shores. Many of these spills result from willful violations of laws which limit the discharging of oil. Such spills can be reduced by more stringent surveillance procedures. All government agencies are being directed to instruct their vessel and aircraft commanders and other personnel to immediately report all oil spills to the Coast Guard. Every citizen who observes a spill of oil should do likewise. The Commandant of the Coast Guard will increase all shore air patrols in the areas of highest spill potential and will enforce vigorously all of our antipollution laws.

5. HARBOR ADVISORY RADAR SYSTEMS

Just as air traffic controllers are necessary to the safe operation of airplanes, so an improved traffic control system is needed in our Nation's most active harbors. A system which is known as the Harbor Advisory Radar System has been developed and is now operating successfully in the San Francisco area. The Secretary of Transportation will establish more such systems in ports that have a heavy traffic of oil-bearing vessels. These radar systems, operated by the Coast Guard, will enable tankers and other vessels to move through congested areas with much less risk of collision and will make ports such as New York, New Orleans, and Houston safer than they are at present. Pilots who use these ports will receive harbor surveillance data and traffic information by radio from a control center that will be manned 24 hours a day throughout the year.

6. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT: EMERGENCY OIL TRANSFER AND STORAGE SYSTEMS

In addition to specific legislation and regulations that can contribute significantly to the reduction of oil spill hazards, a broad program of research and development concerning oil pollution must also be pursued. These efforts must be sufficiently diverse to treat all aspects of spill prevention, cleanup and the mitigation of ecological damage. Many such programs are now underway in government agencies and university laboratories. These research and development efforts will continue to receive emphasis until satisfactory solutions are found.

One notable result of our research is the test which was conducted last week of an ingenious system for collecting and removing oil from damaged vessels. Using this system, up to 20,000 tons of oil a day could be pumped from stranded or leaking tankers into oil-tight plastic bags. These bags could be delivered by air to the scene of the accident and could be towed away safely. The Secretary of Transportation will examine the results

of the current tests and will make such a system available for use on both the east and west coasts of this country as soon as practicable.

7. COOPERATION OF PRIVATE INDUSTRY AND PORT AUTHORITIES

If we are to stop or even reduce the discharge of waste oil at sea, then we must provide alternate means of disposing of it. Port areas should be equipped with facilities, stationary or mobile, to receive oily discharges from vessels upon their arrival in port. If the amendments to the 1954 Oil Pollution Convention I have referred to are adopted and permissible oil discharges at sea are further reduced, then such facilities will be indispensable. Therefore, I am calling upon private industry and port authorities to develop additional facilities for the reception of oily wastes. The Secretary of Commerce with the assistance of the Secretaries of Interior and Transportation will coordinate this effort.

8. RADIOTELEPHONES

Vessels in the United States navigable waters are presently required only to use whistle signals to communicate with other vessels. Direct radio communications between vessels would supplement and clarify the information they are able to exchange as they maneuver in close proximity to one another. Legislation to require the use of bridge-to-bridge radiotelephones is now pending in the Congress and I urge its prompt enactment.

9. THE LICENSING OF TOWBOAT OPERATORS

Legislation is also pending in the Congress that would require uninspected towing vessels to be under the direction and control of a licensed operator. I endorse that concept and call for its consideration by the Congress. We must do everything we can to increase the margin of safety for maritime traffic.

10. FINANCING CLEANUP OPERATIONS

When oil spills occur, considerable resources are required to finance the clean-up operation. The provisions of the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970 call for the establishment of a revolving fund which will assure that money is immediately available to initiate and conduct such efforts. The law provides that the fund shall be reimbursed by those who are responsible for the spill.

Today, I am announcing the formal establishment of that fund and am delegating responsibility for its administration to the Secretary of Transportation. As soon as regulations governing the operations of this fund are completed and approved, I will forward to the Congress a request for \$35 million to finance its operations.

This Administration is committed to protect the national environment without retarding social and economic progress. The program outlined in this message involves significant national and international actions which will help us to meet this commitment. By working to reduce and prevent oil spills and by responding more effectively to those spills which do occur, these measures will help to improve the quality of life in our nation and in all parts of our world.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 20, 1970.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, 1971

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1030 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1030

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. 17604) 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 two 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 by titles instead of by sections. 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 Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 minutes, pending which I yield to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1030 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 17604, the military construction authorization for fiscal year 1971. The resolution also provides that the bill shall be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections.

The purpose of H.R. 17604 is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments during fiscal year 1971. The authorization totals \$1,973,810,000, as follows:

Army	\$583,067,000
Navy	256,713,000
Air Force	244,792,000
Defense agencies	43,600,000
Family housing	808,138,000
Reserve components	37,500,000

Of the Army request, \$325.2 million is for construction projects for the Safeguard ABM System; \$3.2 million is for research and development facilities on Kwajalein Island.

The family housing portion of the bill is for support of the entire military housing program.

This includes operating expenses, leasing, maintenance, payment of principal and interest on mortgage debts, payments to Commodity Credit Corporation, mortgage insurance, and construction of 8,000 new housing units.

This year's bill has been modified to omit for each separate installation the general language for the so-called facility categories, thereby shortening and simplifying the act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1030 in order that H.R. 17604 may be considered.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

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

Mr. Speaker, as my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas, has said, the rule provides for 2 hours of debate, an open rule, for the consideration of H.R. 17604, the military construction authorization for 1971. It will be read by titles rather than by sections.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize military construction for fiscal 1971 including projects for the active military forces, the reserve components, defense agencies and military family housing.

The major divisions of the bill are as follows:

Army	\$583,067,000
Navy	256,713,000
Air Force	244,792,000
Defense Agencies	43,600,000
Family Housing	808,138,000
Reserve Components	37,500,000

The bill provides \$325,200,000 for construction for the Safeguard ABM System. Construction will be carried out at Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak., at Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont., at Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo., and at Kwajalein Missile Range in the Pacific.

For Southeast Asia, unlike previous years, very little construction funding is authorized—only \$25,000,000. Much of this is for highway construction in South Vietnam.

Family housing is authorized for a total of \$808,138,000 for all military service personnel. This will provide funding of 34 projects covering 8,000 new family housing units. Eighty-eight percent will be for enlisted men and junior officers. Seventy-three percent will be either three- or four-bedroom units. The bill also provides funds for trailer court sites, where appropriate.

The bill continues the existing rental guaranty program which provides family housing in foreign countries.

The bill is supported by the Department of Defense. There are no minority views.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RIVERS. 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. 17604) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

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. 17604, with Mr. STEED in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS), will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY), will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today we are presenting the annual military construction authorization bill H.R. 17604.

It provides \$1,973,810,000 for construction at military installations in the United States and overseas during fiscal year 1971.

The bill as reported by your committee is \$95,284,000 below the \$2,069,094,000 in new authorizations requested by the Department of Defense.

The increase in this year's bill over what was provided last year is due primarily to two factors: family housing and Safeguard.

The bill provides \$809,038,000 for all housing expenditures of the Department of Defense during fiscal year 1971, and \$325.2 million for construction related to the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system. These two items, thus, take a total of \$1,134,238,000.

This leaves but \$839,772,000 for all other military construction at home and overseas during the year. This is a particularly austere program when it is remembered that for several years construction has been held below requirements for economic reasons. The Members will recall that last year your committee recommended the deferral of many projects which were desirable, even necessary, in order to reduce spending in that particular year. We have taken a similar approach for the present bill.

HOUSING

The \$809,038,000 for all housing expenditures includes authorization for construction of 8,000 new family units at an estimated cost of \$219,502,000. In addition, the authorization covers all other housing costs such as leasing, maintenance and debt payment, and various insurance requirements. By contrast, last year's authorization bill—that is, for fiscal year 1970—provided \$699,418,000 for family housing.

Thus, if family housing expenditures are excluded for both years, the total for other construction is \$1,260,056,000 for fiscal year 1971, compared to \$1,198,921,000 for fiscal year 1970.

Thus, the increase in this year's bill over last year's bill exclusive of housing costs, is some \$61 million.

When you consider that we are providing, as indicated, \$325.2 million in authorization for construction of Safeguard compared to only \$12.7 million last year, and when you consider the effect of inflation on the relative construction value of the dollar, it is obvious that we are reporting a very austere bill indeed.

SAFEGUARD

The House has already expressed its approval of the President's proposed modified phase II of the Safeguard ABM system by its vote on the military procurement authorization bill. You will recall that the House overwhelmingly re-

jected amendments to knock out phase II of the Safeguard, as well as amendments to knock out all procurement.

The total authorized in procurement and research and development for Safeguard was \$1,026 million.

The funds authorized in the present bill for Safeguard \$325.2 million, represent the amount necessary to support the level of deployment called for by the earlier legislation.

The Safeguard funds will be used to provide support facilities and phase I and phase II work at Grand Forks Air Force Base in North Dakota; for the missile site radar—MSR—perimeter acquisition radar—PAR—support facilities and phase I and phase II work at Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana; for the MSR, support facilities, and site work at Whiteman Air Force Base in Missouri; for site investigation and planning activities pointing toward possible additional deployment at five additional sites; and construction of research, development, and test facilities at the Kwajalein Island test site.

COMMITTEE REDUCTIONS

Despite the austerity of the program, your committee, after extensive hearings by a special subcommittee, agreed to make reductions totaling \$95,284,000 in the bill.

All of the projects deleted by the committee were those which the committee felt were not of immediate or critical urgency and which would work no hardship on the services if deferred for reconsideration at a later date.

The Committee on Armed Services is convinced that these reductions will certainly not impair the operational effectiveness of the armed services nor will they in any way jeopardize our national security.

Of the total reduction made by the committee, virtually the entire amount was levied against the Active Forces portion of the program, which was reduced nearly 8 percent.

In view of the austerity of the program to begin with, I feel this was a significant reduction and belies the baseless charge that our committee blindly approves anything the military services ask for.

One area of concern to your Armed Services Committee is the large number of inefficient and overage structures which encumber our military plant.

This year, however, the severity of the fiscal situation will not allow us to make any substantial progress toward long-range replacement goals.

SOUTHEAST ASIA REQUIREMENTS

Crucial to the success of the Vietnamization program and, hence, to the withdrawal of our boys from Southeast Asia is construction in support of the Republic of Vietnam Armed Forces—RVNAF.

The construction program in South Vietnam is about 85 percent complete. However, substantial requirements remain.

A subcommittee composed of Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania and Mr. BRAY of Indiana reported in January on the importance of these various construction programs to both the Vietnamization and

pacification efforts. As reported by that subcommittee at the time, construction for our own forces in Vietnam is now limited to those items absolutely necessary for the safety and security of our forces or required in connection with the redeployment of U.S. forces. Remaining construction goes chiefly for the restoration of the essential highway network, for the repair of battle damage, and for cantonments and operating, training, and logistics facilities for the RVNAF.

General Abrams views the highway construction and restoration as the most essential program in relation to the disengagement of U.S. forces and has, thus, committed a major portion of both troop and contract construction efforts to this program. Proper highway construction not only helps the RVNAF but contributes substantially to the economy of the country and, thus, is essential to the pacification program.

The nature and magnitude of the overall construction backlog dictates that current levels of capability be retained into the calendar 1972 time frame.

However, your Armed Services Committee concluded that the \$40 million requested for these levels of activity should be reduced to \$25 million. We are confident that this amount should be adequate to meet construction requirements in this area for the new fiscal year.

CONSTRUCTION AT 305 BASES

The bill before you includes approximately 579 line items for construction at 305 military bases throughout the world.

All the construction authorized by this bill will occur at existing bases and military installations throughout the world, there being no new installations for the services proposed in this bill.

UNUSED AUTHORIZATIONS

The Committee on Armed Services had made a determined effort over the past years to continuously 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.

It is heartening to be able to report that based on estimated data furnished to the committee this year, there will be no residual authorization estimated to be available at the end of the coming fiscal year for any of the three services.

LAND ACQUISITION

The bill as submitted by the Department proposed the acquisition of approximately 7,200 acres of land at a total estimated cost of \$7 million. This is considerably less acreage than was requested last year, and similarly the total cost of proposed acquisition is much less than last year's \$25.7 million.

The major part of the proposed land acquisition involved acquiring 2,895 acres at the naval weapons station at Charleston, S.C., at a cost of \$5.2 million. An additional \$1 million is required

for land acquisition of 3,900 acres at Guam. The remaining requirements, which involve a much lesser amount of acreage and at relatively low cost, are for purchasing miscellaneous rights-of-way, clearance easements, and various minor base expansions at four other locations.

The committee has approved the full total of \$7 million for real estate acquisition on the grounds that those requirements are deemed to be urgently necessary to meet operational needs.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

Included in H.R. 17604 are authorizations amounting to approximately \$77.2 million for medical facilities of all types. These include hospital additions, dispensaries, dental clinics, and four new hospitals to replace the existing obsolescent facilities at Fort Gordon, Ga.; Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y.; Luke Air Force Base, Ariz.; and Keflavik, Iceland.

In the case of medical facilities, the committee feels strongly, as it has indicated in the past, that the pace of replacement for many of the outmoded World War II hospitals and similar facilities should be accelerated. Only in the past 2 fiscal years has the Department seen fit to recognize the committee's longstanding concern in this area and to submit programs which, in the committee's judgment, begin to meet the many overdue requirements for improved health facilities. Despite the enforced austerity inherent in this fiscal year, the committee is determined that the Defense Department should maintain a minimal but suitable emphasis on replacement of vital health facilities.

Now, I would like to briefly review the authorization by relating it to the nature of the support facilities which this construction is intended to provide for the operating forces.

For purposes of simplicity, the contents of the bill can be summarized in nine principal categories. Two of these, medical facilities and real estate, I have already discussed.

I will now briefly run down the remaining seven, not attempting to list all expenditures but giving only the major highlights:

Operational and training facilities, \$503.2 million.

The operational facilities contain essential airbase, fleet operations support, communications, security, command and control, and other operational facilities necessary to support the combat readiness capability of the services.

Within the above total, the requests for such facilities are:

Army, \$379 million.

Navy, \$47.6 million.

Air Force, \$76.6 million.

The most significant portion of the Army's request, which totals \$379 million, involves \$325.2 million required to continue the deployment of the Safeguard ABM system. Also included in the Army's authorization is \$50 million for financing the U.S. share of the NATO infrastructure program.

Of the \$47.6 million included in this category for Navy, \$19.4 million is for operational facilities, and \$28.2 million for training facilities. Operational facilities

include nearly \$9.4 million for waterfront facilities at seven Navy installations; \$1.2 million for undersea surveillance facilities; and \$3.2 million for an Omega navigation transmitter in Hawaii. The Navy's training request includes \$14.4 million for officer training facilities at the Naval Academy and War College, and \$13.8 million for urgently needed enlisted training facilities at eight Navy installations.

The Air Force program totals \$69.8 million for operational facilities and \$6.8 million for training facilities. Significant items within the operational portion include Minuteman facilities, \$1.2 million; theater airbase vulnerability—TAB VEE—facilities, \$7.3 million; facilities in support of Strategic Air Command aircraft, \$13.7 million; airfield pavement projects, \$13.2 million; airfield lighting and navigational aids, \$10.4 million; and air freight and air passenger terminals, \$15.9 million. Major items within the \$6.8 million for training consist of \$4 million for a technical training facility at Chanute Air Force Base, Ill., and \$1.5 million for a base engineer training facility at Sheppard Air Force Base, Tex.

Maintenance and production facilities, \$86.3 million.

This category includes all types of facilities necessary for the production, maintenance, and repair of military hardware, including field and depot maintenance shops and hangars, shore-based marine maintenance facilities for the fleet, and production, assembly, and maintenance facilities for rockets, guided missiles, and various types of conventional ammunition.

The totals of the services' requests for such facilities are:

Army, \$11.8 million.

Navy, \$39.8 million.

Air Force, \$34.7 million.

Over half of the Army's authorization entails construction of three tactical equipment shop complexes with supporting facilities at Fort Riley, Kans., for \$7.3 million.

Significant items for the Navy include \$10.9 million related to naval air rework facilities at three air stations; \$17.3 million for facilities related to the shipyard modernization program at five shipyards; \$2.7 million related to aircraft maintenance; and \$3.5 million related to submarine maintenance.

For the Air Force in this category are \$27.8 million for various aircraft maintenance shops, including \$15.7 million for an aircraft engine inspection and repair shop at Kelly Air Force Base, Tex.; and \$2.4 million for aircraft maintenance docks and hangars.

Research and development facilities, \$46.7 million.

This portion of the authorization program is considerably smaller than similar requests in recent years. Despite its reduced size, the Department of Defense considered the projects to be vital to the maintenance of U.S. technological leadership. The totals by the services for R. & D. facilities are:

Army, \$29.8 million.

Navy, \$4.1 million.

Air Force, \$12.8 million.

The largest part of the Army's request involves \$14 million for the initial phase

of the planned relocation of the Harry Diamond Laboratories to the grounds of the Naval Ordnance Laboratory at White Oaks, Md. Additionally, the bill would provide \$7 million for the initial phase of establishment of the Western Medical Research Laboratory at the Presidio of San Francisco; a weapons development laboratory at Watervliet Arsenal, N.Y., \$1.4 million; and miscellaneous laboratory improvements and range facilities at White Sands Missile Range, Yuma Proving Ground, and Fort Eustis, for \$3.7 million.

For the Navy, the bill provides \$2.5 million for a threat simulation facility at Point Mugu; and \$1.6 million for a systems analysis for computer facility at China Lake.

The Air Force program includes the following items: A propulsion engine test cell at Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tenn., \$4.3 million; aerospace environment science laboratories at four locations, \$4.9 million; an optical physics laboratory at L. G. Hanscom Field, Mass., \$1.2 million; an electronic research laboratory at Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y., \$1.1 million; and five miscellaneous projects, \$1.3 million.

Administrative facilities, \$42.3 million.

The total approved for administrative facilities, including headquarters, squadron operation, and similar facilities, is \$42.3 million. Within this total, the service increments are:

Army, \$10.2 million.

Navy, \$27.3 million.

Air Force, \$4.8 million.

Army's administrative facilities includes \$5.7 million for a reception station at Fort Dix, N.J.; and \$3 million to relocate Defense Department activities to Bayonne, N.J., in connection with the closing of the Brooklyn Army Terminal.

In the Navy's \$27.3 million for administrative facilities is included \$16.2 million for foundations and site work for the defense office building at Bolling-Anacostia. In addition, there is \$8.6 million for engineering management buildings at Long Beach and Portsmouth, N.H., as part of the shipyard modernization program.

The Air Force program provides consolidated base personnel offices at Eglin Air Force Base, Fla., and Charleston Air Force Base, S.C., \$2.9 million.

Housing and community facilities, \$177.9 million.

Troop housing is one of the most important and vital requirements in the defense construction program. We recognize the importance of this item in persuading personnel to stay in the military service as a career, and we believe implicitly that improved housing will provide both immediate and long-range benefits through increased reenlistment, heightened morale, and reduced recruitment costs. The service programs in fiscal year 1971 are:

Army, \$50.6 million.

Navy, \$66.1 million.

Air Force, \$61.2 million.

Within Army's request for troop housing and community facilities, the largest portion is directed toward construction of 4,920 enlisted barracks spaces and support facilities, at \$31.8 million, and

619 bachelor officer quarters for \$7.7 million. Additionally, the Army's request includes \$11.1 million for various community support facilities. Among these are a laundry at Fort Dix, N.J., two dependent schools in Germany, a commissary at Fort Ord, Calif., a chapel and enlisted men's club at Fort Huachuca, Ariz., and a post office at Fort Campbell, Ky.

The Navy's programing for bachelor housing totals \$52.3 million, and will provide quarters for 11,442 bachelor enlisted men and 311 bachelor officers. Mess facilities total \$4.6 million. Community support items total \$9.2 million, and include brig facilities at Quantico and Camp LeJeune; a chapel and Sunday school at Little Creek; and a theater and enlisted men's club at Gulfport, Miss.

The Air Force program for this category provides \$40.1 million for troop housing facilities, and \$21.1 million for community facilities. The \$41.1 million will provide 6,745 airmen dormitory spaces at a cost of \$26.7 million; alterations and improvements to existing dormitories, \$5.4 million; 480 bachelor officer quarters, \$6.1 million; alterations to existing officers quarters, \$600,000; and airmen dining halls, \$1.3 million. The \$21.1 million for community facilities will provide for dependent schools at Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D.C., RAF Alconbury, RAF Woodbridge, and RAF Chicksands, United Kingdom; Bitburg Air Base, Germany, and Goose Air Base, Canada; three chapel centers and two chapel support facilities, four commissaries, one post office, three gymnasiums, and eight miscellaneous community facilities.

Utilities and ground improvements, \$136.6 million.

This portion of the program provides for expansions and additions to utility systems and road nets at various United States and overseas locations. The Military Department totals in the category of utilities and ground improvements are as follows:

Army, \$55.4 million.

Navy, \$50.4 million.

Air Force, \$30.8 million.

A significant element of this year's, as in last year's program, is directed toward further implementing the national policies for controlling water and air pollution.

For pollution abatement at various installations of the active military services, there is included a total of \$69.3 million for 100 projects as a continuation of the program begun 2 years ago to eliminate pollution at our military installations. The committee fully supports this program.

Supply facilities, \$7.4 million.

This category includes various supply facilities, including fuel storage, cold storage, depot and arsenal warehouses, and open storage facilities.

The totals for the services for such facilities are:

Army, \$1.5 million.

Navy, \$4.2 million.

Air Force, \$1.7 million.

Mr. Chairman, that completes my presentation of the bill. Our committee worked hard on this legislation. We did the best we could. We drafted the legis-

lation with one eye on a troubled national economy. We were severe. Maybe we were too severe. If Members believe that we have cut too deeply, we are prepared to listen to suggestions for improvements in the bill. But the bill represents the considered judgment of your committee, and I urge Members to support it.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIRNIE).

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of our committee has very well outlined the material provisions of this bill. He has made reference to the provision for Safeguard construction.

Mr. Chairman, if we do not proceed with Safeguard construction now, we will deprive the President of the option to move forward rapidly with the phase II options should the need arise within the next few years.

Activation activities at phase I sites are proceeding according to schedule. At Grand Forks a contract for construction of major technical facilities was awarded on March 31, 1970 and at Malmstrom award of bids for major construction at both PAR and MSR sites is scheduled in the near future.

If the Army is permitted to keep to currently planned activation schedules for modified phase II, by the time its site activation procedures progress to the point of component and integration testing, sufficient highly valuable experience will have been gained from tests already completed at Grand Forks and Malmstrom. The equipment readiness dates—ERD's—for the first three sites in our currently planned schedules have been deliberately picked to be a minimum of 4 months apart so that the contractor may use the knowledge and experience gained at one site to apply directly from one to another.

It has been suggested that modified phase II deployment be delayed now in order to gain more experience and to obtain more definite results of tests now being conducted. Although continuation of phase I plus additional research and development with no action to move forward with modified phase II would certainly enable us to proceed toward one desirable objective—that of the operational checkout of the system—such a course of action would be disastrous from other angles. It would be very difficult to justify a delay which would amount to foreclosing the option to proceed with any kind of phase II until as late as mid-1975.

It must be emphasized again that the threat is real and exists today. The present growth of the Soviet threat is continued deployment of ICBM's coupled with the serious SLBM threat on the way, and the prospect of Chinese Communist deployment of an ICBM threat in the mid-1970's make it necessary for us to protect ourselves against these threats. There is no indication that the Soviets are slowing down their deployment. They have achieved a parity in ICBM forces and they are still moving forward. If we delay the Soviets could outstrip this country's capacity to produce a countering force short of a crash deployment of more offensive weapons

with a massive impact on our budget and resources.

With this in mind, and consistent with President Nixon's policy of an orderly and measured deployment of Safeguard through taking only those steps necessary to meet the threat as it evolves, your committee has considered very carefully all aspects of this fiscal year 1971 Milcon authorization request for Safeguard deployment. As you recall it totals \$325.2 million. Of this amount approximately \$322 million is required for site construction inside the United States. Basically this includes funds for:

First, continuation of construction at phase I sites near Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak., and Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont.;

Second, construction at the proposed modified phase II sites near Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo.; and

Third, advance preparation of five additional sites to include possible land procurement.

In addition, \$3.2 million is requested for construction in support of R. & D. at Kwajalein Missile Range.

We feel very strongly this authorization request represents the minimum essential funds to support the administration proposal for a modified phase II.

In summary, the administration has recommended moving forward now with modified phase II as a necessary step in the deployment of Safeguard in order to keep pace with the Soviet threat. The experience in both R. & D. testing being conducted at Kwajalein and the phase I site activation will be invaluable in support of this deployment. If no activity beyond phase I is conducted this year, a delay of at least 1 year in the deployment of a site will develop. Postponing authorization of a third site until phase I is completed would waste money through duplication of effort and production delays, and would delay installation of a third site by 5 years or more. The fiscal year 1971 MCA request as recommended for approval by the Armed Services Committee will support, to the minimum extent necessary the orderly and stepped deployment required to meet the threat which is fast developing.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment in behalf of the troop housing projects for the Army in the military construction bill.

As all of us who have served in the Army or visited Army installations know, a large percentage of the Army's barracks and bachelor officer's quarters on permanent installations consist of World War II mobilization facilities erected in the early 1940's. The temporary wood frame buildings, which had a life expectancy of 5 years when originally constructed, are now nearly 30 years old. These aging structures become more expensive to maintain each year and increase fire and safety hazards due to the obsolescence of their utility systems and electrical distribution lines. Temporary wood buildings are, by nature of their construction, unbearably hot during summer months in the warmer climates of the Southern States, and extremely diffi-

cult to heat during the winter in the colder climates of the Central and Northern States.

The Army troop housing projects in the military construction bill include a 2,696-man barracks complex for basic Medical Corps trainees at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.; a 326-man barracks at Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation, Calif., supporting troops of the Army's Combat Developments Command Experimentation Command; a 200-man BOQ for junior officers at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.; a 124-man BOQ at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.; and a 200-man BOQ for officer students attending the Defense Language Institute at the Presidio of Monterey, Calif. The personnel who will occupy these new facilities are presently housed in old temporary structures similar to those I described earlier, with the exception of Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation where the only troop billets consist of bivouac hutments constructed of wood framing and siding and rolled roofing. These uninsulated structures have no interior walls and latrine facilities are located in separate buildings.

Approval of this bill will result in removing slightly over 2½ percent of the Army's deficit in troop housing. At this rate it will take approximately 40 years before the Army's total deficit of troop housing in the United States will be erased.

The inadequacy of bachelor housing has constantly been cited as a source of irritation and discontent by both bachelor enlisted men and junior officers who compare their accommodations to those available to their civilian contemporaries. At this critical time when serious consideration is being given to the development of a volunteer force and reduction in the selective service system, it is even more paramount that we provide adequate accommodations for our soldiers. If we continue to require that they live in old dilapidated structures, which furnish nothing more than a roof over one's head, we cannot possibly expect to attract quality personnel to volunteer for service in our Armed Forces, much less retain those career personnel who are presently serving.

I therefore make this appeal to you to approve those troop housing projects included in the bill presently before you for consideration.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLODY).

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, this bill—H.R. 17604—is the result of extensive hearings held by the Armed Services Committee and I am of the opinion that the members of the committee have acted responsibly.

I note that the bill is more than \$95 million less than the administration had requested. This reduction is encouraging. It is my hope and expectation that much greater reductions in military spending can be accomplished in the future—including funds for military construction.

The bill provides essential funds for the Great Lakes Naval Training Center totaling \$19,054,000. This sum will be available to the Navy Public Works Cen-

ter which provides essential public works, transportation support, engineering services, utilities, and other public work-type logistic support. This total will also be utilized to improve facilities for recruit training and for the Service School Command. Perhaps the most important use to which this sum will be put is for the Naval Hospital which provides excellent care for many of the men who are wounded in South Vietnam.

The military construction projects at Great Lakes should enable the Navy to perform its missions more efficiently and should serve the essential needs of the men of the Navy—as well as the men of the other services who are cared for at the Great Lakes Naval Hospital.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that some \$325 million is provided for the Safe guard anti-ballistic-missile system. The principal argument against this appropriation appears to be that we should rely on our offensive deterrent. Indeed, that is the argument advanced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE). I prefer to support a "defensive" system which can protect American lives and discourage a potential enemy from attacking our cities or industries.

Mr. Chairman, in the event the SALT talks are productive—and I hope and pray that they will be—there is every expectation that all strategic weapons expenses and other kinds of military spending can be cut. The President's initiative in behalf of arms control—and reducing our military presence in various parts of the world—has resulted in cuts in overall military spending. Further reductions will be possible if the Soviet Union indicates its intention to cooperate in programs of mutual understanding—and peace.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. FOREMAN).

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY) for their leadership and work in the expeditious consideration and handling and guiding of this bill to the floor.

WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE

Mr. Chairman, I would like to provide support for a very vital group of construction projects at White Sands Missile Range. White Sands is the largest and most highly instrumented of all land ranges. It is operated for the entire Department of Defense and managed by the Department of the Army for the use of all military services, NASA, and other Government agencies.

Developments in solid propellants and improved command and control and guidance systems has resulted in higher missile acceleration rates, longer and higher trajectories, faster flight, and improved maneuverability. In order to collect more precise data during R. & D. tests, the Army embarked in 1965 on a 10-year program to improve the range instrumentation and data gathering capability at White Sands. These improvements consist of a complex of instrumentation developed with the most

advanced technology available, connected by communications to a computer center which directs the total instrumentation system, as well as processes, displays and reduces the data necessary to evaluate our missile programs. This very high precision data collection and reduction system must be available to provide precise data to technicians and developments contractors in the shortest possible time. This timely data provides the range users with full knowledge of launch and flight characteristics.

As improved instrumentation is developed and scheduled for procurement and delivery, corresponding construction to support this instrumentation is required in a parallel time frame.

The construction projects included in this bill will provide the buildings, instrumentation sites, and communications systems to house new equipment and furnish operational sites which will insure the most beneficial use of this instrumentation. These facilities are directly related to a measuring technique which is necessary for the successful test of systems now being evaluated at White Sands. Projects being tested at the range include missile reentry characteristics, advanced navigational aids for aircraft used by the Air Force, and include NASA's manned space flight efforts.

A brief description of the functions and construction requirements involved are:

Mobile Tracking Sites for the AN/MPS 36 radar will improve data accuracy three to five times over that presently available. These sites are concrete pads with an antenna pedestal, access roads, communication lines, and electric power.

Telescopes are deployed along the flight line of the missile being tested. Mobile instruments have been developed which can easily be relocated as necessary, to support specific trajectories. These sites consist of a mound with a concrete pad, access road, and supporting communications and power.

An improved computer system is to be housed in an operations control center to support the entire range. White Sands will automate and mechanize many of its operations so that the range customer will receive more accurate results in a reduced time frame. This building addition will complete the construction of this control center which was time phased to match computer development and procurement.

An optical calibration center will be constructed in an underground tunnel which will serve as an optical bench to permit calibration of the advanced optical equipment used at White Sands. There is a crucial requirement for the evaluation, acceptance testing, and calibration, as well as cleaning, and alignment of these long focal length telescopes.

Located at White Sands is a unique facility which was developed to test components of major weapon systems in a nuclear environment which simulates radioactive fallout without the necessity for actual atomic testing. A facility will be provided by this bill to house equipment which will provide pure gamma radiation of high intensity to simulate residual radiation from an atomic blast.

These tests will determine the susceptibility of weapon systems to nuclear radiation and help to reduce vulnerability.

This project also will provide the necessary range power to the instrumentation sites surrounding the White Sands impact area and will improve power reliability to the radar target scatter facility located at mid-range. The equipment to be supported by these facilities is on hand at White Sands or is under contract for procurement.

I therefore earnestly recommend that we endorse the continued development of this vitally important research and development installation. I would also like to congratulate Chairman RIVERS, our Construction Committee members, and the professional staff for the expeditious, but nonetheless thorough, manner with which this bill was guided to the floor.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17064, the fiscal year 1971 military construction authorization bill. This is a sound bill. I urge its immediate enactment.

At this point I would like to commend the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina, for his vigorous and patriotic leadership in drafting and presenting this bill. Members of the committee also worked diligently and effectively to produce it. They too, deserve much credit.

This bill reduces the legislation proposed by the Department of Defense. We have reduced it—not by a meat ax approach, but by a reasoned and systematic process. The result is admittedly an austere program, but one which will provide the essential and timely support needed by the Active Forces of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

During the hearings several witnesses spoke of new programing procedures. These interested me and therefore I considered they warranted a closer examination, Mr. Chairman. I would like to outline briefly the management techniques being pioneered by the Navy in the development of a planning and decision-making "tool" for military construction. I believe it will help you to reach a favorable decision on this bill. This management "tool" provides orderly and effective techniques for guiding decisionmakers. It is known by the Navy as multiyear programing. Multiyear programing is founded on the validation of the Navy's total outstanding military construction needs. Under the planning and programing system, the complete range of facilities needs are identified. The system identifies construction needs to satisfy new and emerging missions, as well as facilities for current missions, and those needed to modernize or replace old and obsolete facilities.

The Navy's defined backlog of essential military construction projects totals \$9 billion. As a result of our efforts in Southeast Asia, the normal construction effort had to be postponed in deference to urgent support for Southeast Asia

during the past 3 or 4 years. Of course, the backlog has not accumulated over just the past 3 or 4 years, the backlog to replace and modernize obsolescent and deteriorating World War II mobilization-type structures of the Navy and Marine Corps is long standing.

This situation has furnished a backdrop for the Department of Defense to establish a multiyear program for military construction. Although I will direct my discussion to the Navy system, I am advised that the Army and Air Force have similar systems in being or under development.

The basic implementing concept in the Navy's multiyear program is a balanced rate of correcting deficiencies in the various facility categories within an established time frame. The foregoing concept is, of course, measured in terms of budgetary constraints. Similar facilities, such as bachelor enlisted quarters, bachelor officer quarters and mess halls are grouped together under an investment category. This particular investment category, for example, is "troop housing and messing." Other examples of investment categories are: administrative, medical, training, and aviation operational facilities. A total of 19 categories are used to group the various facilities.

In addition to analysis by investment categories, the Navy has also found it advantageous to analyze military construction line items as functional or geographic groups. Functional and geographic investment programs were established to treat a set of military construction line items as an entity. Examples of functional investment programs are those in the bill under consideration for shipyard modernization, naval air rework facilities, and pollution abatement. Examples of geographic investment programs are represented by the implementation of master plans for the Naval Academy and the Naval Training Center, Orlando, Fla.

The purpose of defining investment programs is to illuminate the need for a particular program of facility acquisition at some established rate in order to improve military readiness. The rate is not established in isolation from the other needs of the Navy. On the contrary, it is related directly to other programs such as procurement and maintenance of ships, aircraft, and weapons; personnel and training. A comparative evaluation is made of the total capital investment program by investment categories and the functional and geographic investment programs. In this way it is possible to achieve an overall, balanced multiyear program. This enables the Navy to carefully examine the current year program as a single year increment of a plan to meet specific long-range needs over a period of years.

When one has carefully examined the Navy's long-range needs it becomes readily apparent that the level of funding of military construction for the past 10 years has been inadequate. If the last 10 years' average funding level is continued, new deficiencies will exceed the rate at which the deficiencies are being cor-

rected. The total deficiencies obviously would not be reduced, but would grow.

If we continue to authorize facilities at the level of this year's program, it would take approximately 30 to 35 years to eliminate the current deficiency of \$9 billion at noninflated costs. This does not take into consideration the new deficiencies that develop each year totaling approximately \$300 million. In the face of these facts which, incidentally, parallel those of the Army and Air Force, it was most difficult to make reductions in this program. But, in view of the increased need for fiscal prudence, we deferred those projects that could be safely postponed without seriously impairing our national security.

We must recognize a potentially serious problem that may be developing for the operating forces of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. The facilities base structure required for supporting operating forces may be declining at a time when it should be improved to support the new weapons systems of the 1970's. The Congress should take corrective action in future years to increase the authorization for facilities. We will not otherwise be fulfilling our responsibility to the services and the American taxpayer. I believe the bill is valid; that it is responsive to the needs of the military departments and to the American public in these troublesome times. Thank you.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the construction of the Western Medical Institute of Research included in the bill before you.

In the annals of armed conflict, infectious diseases, particularly tropical diseases, have taken a toll in man-days which has far exceeded that of enemy action. When our brave young men fight in tropical environments they must face these diseases. Many of these diseases are capable of killing and incapacitating just as surely as enemy arms. Many such diseases are parasitic and/or affect the skin primarily.

At the present time, the Army's research in tropical medicine is fragmentary and is conducted by two medical research institutes in the United States, two teams in Southeast Asia, one small research unit in Malasia, a small unit in Panama, and 35 contractors. The Walter Reed Army Institute of Research in Washington, D.C., is the largest of these elements and is charged with supporting the other elements. Walter Reed is operating under severely overcrowded, totally inadequate conditions. Scientists and equipment are spilling out into corridors. Broom closets are serving as research laboratories and numerous specimens must be kept in deep freeze for extended periods before analysis, because working space is insufficient for expedient processing. Although presently funded plans will solve this between the AFIP and the new Walter Reed General Hospital, it will be much worse before it gets better.

The Western Medical Institute of Research will correct this deplorable situa-

tion. The shipping costs now experienced by forwarding specimens and sending research teams from the west coast to Walter Reed or Fitzsimons General Hospital, will be eliminated. The Western Medical Institute of Research represents the first step in a long-range plan to consolidate the Army Medical Department's 11 research institutes in the continental United States into six such facilities. This consolidation will increase efficiency, reduce overhead costs, and diminish needs for supporting personnel. The Western Medical Institute will combine into one facility the activities of four laboratories now scattered over the United States. These activities will join with related programs of research on tropical skin diseases and combat surgical problems now in progress at the Letterman Army Institute of Research in San Francisco. This consolidation will enormously enhance the productivity of the research effort in tropical diseases. Collocation of the Western Medical Institute with Letterman General Hospital is essential to correct another of McNamara's follies, if for no other reason. This relationship will provide research expertise and corresponding research laboratory support to the hospital in return for access to its clinical facilities and patient population. The Letterman staff will be stimulated, and patient care will be improved to even higher levels than those now achieved. They will be side by side.

The research program will include field studies in representative areas of Latin America, Africa, and Asia, as well as laboratory work in the United States. The latter must be accomplished principally in Army facilities to provide continuity, responsiveness to military needs, and the flexibility to change emphasis as required. Focus will be on the tropical disease and combat surgical problems. The results will be available to all, of course.

Location of this facility in San Francisco is ideal as this city has an outstanding medical and educational community. It is a communications hub. It is a center for concentration of military patients from the Southeast and Western Pacific, and it is a base for deployment and supply of research teams operating in Southeast Asia and the Western Pacific. Well-located Government-owned property is available for the building site.

The trouble spots in today's world are found predominantly in tropical or subtropical environments, where these diseases needing study abound. Before committing troops to such areas we should, if possible, develop the medical weapons to conquer, and especially prevent these diseases.

The present inadequate facilities severely limit research upon prevention and treatment of such conditions as malaria, snail fever, dengue fever, sand fly fever, and diarrheal diseases. All of these diseases plus many others, have the capability to immobilize armies. These few examples are provided to illustrate the urgency of construction of the Western Medical Institute. Research programs addressing these kinds of problems are indispensable to timely development of effective preventive measures for future

use with troops. This effort must be launched now, since the research to accomplish the stated goals will require a number of years for completion. The preventive measures must be ready in advance. The cost of not having them will be tremendous. Exemplary of the cost of tropical disease are the more than 42,000 cases of malaria which have occurred in U.S. troops operating in Vietnam that has cost over \$36 million in hospitalization, personnel replacement, and man-days lost. To delay the necessary research will not save money. It will, on the other hand, engender a significant risk of an enormously more expensive disease among combat troops in the next several decades.

Protecting the health of our fighting men will continue to be an essential ingredient of our national preparedness posture. Regardless of the level of U.S. military involvement, our men must be kept sufficiently well to function effectively. This is best achieved by development of individual disease-preventive measures through meaningful research. This is the aim and objective of the medical department of the armed services.

Gentlemen, I solicit your support of this worthy project which is clearly in the national interest to say nothing of the quality care of our service personnel. The citizens of the United States of America will settle for no less. Thank you.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG).

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I am appalled that there is not one red copper cent in this construction authorization bill for Fort Polk, not one single item, not one single project. It is doubly appalling that the Department of the Army and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget would not have approved requests for construction at Fort Polk in view of all the promises, in view of all the commitments made by the Department of Defense and by the Department of the Army to the people of Louisiana for the permanency of Fort Polk as an active military installation.

On October 23, 1968, Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford announced the decision to make Fort Polk a permanent military installation. Secretary of the Army Stanley Resor later advised me by telephone at my home in Louisiana that the decision to make Fort Polk a permanent post was based on an Army engineering study showing a real need for Fort Polk with or without a war in Vietnam. This is not the first time Fort Polk has been made permanent. During the Eisenhower administration it was declared permanent and its designation changed from camp to fort, and then it was promptly closed. In fact the post has been opened four times and closed three times, something of a record even for the Army, and left to interminable doubt as to its future. It is now operating in one of its perennial doubtful periods, inasmuch as the Army has seen fit to withhold funds appropriated and authorized by the Congress for construction of 260

family housing units at Fort Polk pending "studies (now) underway pertaining to the size, location and structure of the future Army."

This refrain is all too familiar to those of us who are concerned with the future of Fort Polk, both as a military facility and an economic factor, and it has a familiar and ominous sound.

Let us review the rationale of the civilian sector which necessarily supports any military installation, because even a defense facility does not operate in a vacuum. It is affected by and affects the civilian community from which it draws much of its sustenance. In the case of Fort Polk, the thousands of small homesteaders, the lumbermen, the stockmen, the businessmen of western Louisiana did not want to give up their homes and lands and their peaceful and normal way of life to make way for a military reservation. They did because it was necessary to national defense. They swallowed their pride and pocketed their losses and looked to the future. It has not been a rewarding future. Out of Vernon Parish the Army and the U.S. Forest Service carved 300,000 acres of land. This is land out of production whether the post is open or closed. The Army uprooted thousands of families, and it periodically threw a huge burden on the limited tax base of the parish for essential services. In times of national emergency it contributed a great deal to the local economy. In times of peace and prosperity elsewhere it sat on its investment, and the civilian sector fell into depression. More important, it kept out of the area other normal economic units, such as manufacturing plants which have located in adjacent parishes and which could be expected to grow up there and provide jobs and payrolls.

In 1940 when the Army condemned and seized the 200,000 acres of land for military purposes it paid about \$4.50 an acre for title to the surface rights, leaving to former owners in most cases the mineral rights. But because of the imposition of a prohibition against mineral exploration and drilling, these are rights neither the owners or the parish can benefit from until the Army allows it.

Still, the people of the area are willing to accept Fort Polk as a permanent active installation, but they will not accept further deception and prevarication.

Take the matter of funds for family housing on the post. In January 1969 the Army requested and the Congress granted funds to build 260 homes for military personnel. As a result of the President's directive of September 1969, Defense housing funds were deferred until February 1970 when they were released, except for the 260 units at Fort Polk. Repeated requests for clarification of the status of the Fort Polk funds results in well-phrased doubletalk about certain studies now being conducted.

On March 24, 1966, during hearings before the House Armed Services Committee, I asked Lt. Gen. Leonard D. Heaton, Surgeon General of the Army, if the Army would request and build a new permanent hospital at Fort Polk to replace the present structure, a wood frame building thrown up in 1941. Gen-

eral Heaton answered affirmatively. The dialog is recorded on page 5768 of the Armed Services Committee Reports for 1966—book 1, 89th Congress, second session. This constitutes a flagrant misrepresentation, but it is not at all unusual. In fact, it is wholly typical of the Army's attitude toward Fort Polk. To date only one permanent structure has been built on the post from appropriated funds, a cold storage plant simply because there is no way to build a temporary cold storage plant. A few months after it was opened the Army discontinued the plant's meat-cutting operations, leaving that single permanent structure almost unused.

These are a few of a long series of deceptions by the Army, the result of which undoubtedly will be complete mistrust among the civilian sector which heretofore has firmly supported Fort Polk. This view is widely held in both military and civilian circles in the vicinity, as excerpts from a letter written by an officer at the post will attest. His letter states:

The state-wide community in Louisiana is becoming increasingly impatient with this attitude because thirty years ago they gave up this land in good faith. The populace has subsequently invested heavily in the economy surrounding the post, only to be threatened with annual bankruptcy or pacified with false and broken promises by military officers.

This area is dissimilar to those populated sections of New Jersey, Washington, California, or Maryland where other large posts are located. The loss of Fort Polk, or any part thereof, would effect a severe blow to the economy of the area. As an example: Eight million dollars in taxes have been voted for improved schools here. A loss of the largest single payroll in the State of Louisiana would significantly be felt by those left to face the bonded indebtedness.

Over half of the children in Vernon Parish Schools, where Fort Polk is located, are military dependents. In Beauregard Parish, which borders Vernon Parish, there are thirty full-time and thirty substitute military dependent teachers, comprising 25% of the total teaching staff. In Vernon Parish, 59 are full-time, while ten military dependents perform substitute teaching, combining for a 33% portion of the Parish teaching force.

These considerations are important from a local viewpoint and materially affect our Army relationship in this area, but they are not overriding when considering a cut in Defense budget.

What is significant, however . . . Fort Polk is one of the Army's most valuable resources. Here are the facts.

(1) There are 200,000 acres of land at Fort Polk with another 100,000 immediately available from the U.S. Forest Service. This land area duplicates topography found in North Africa, Europe, Latin America, and the Far East. The post itself is one of the most beautiful on which I have ever had the privilege to serve.

(2) The climate affords year-round training.

(3) There are no real estate or industrial developers encroaching upon the reservation or its training area.

(4) Training is cheaper at Fort Polk because (a) fuel costs are low since there are fewer days required to heat the barracks; (b) Fort Polk enjoys one of the best soldier health records of any post in the world (it is the only CONUS post offering basic training that has surpassed two years without a meningitis death); (c) there is no smog, no air or water pollution, and the post has

an inexhaustible supply of fresh water for utilization and recreation; (d) there is no requirement for special seasonal clothing as is the case in wet or cold weather climates; (e) food costs are reduced since soldiers who train in warm climates require less caloric intake than soldiers who train in cold weather; (f) construction costs are lower since insulation requirements are depreciated.

(5) Fort Polk is located in a rural area away from the major jet airways, thus providing unrestricted skies.

(6) There have been no dissident or racial problems at Fort Polk and the communities stand solidly behind the military establishment.

These are but a few of the many assets this resource offers. Vacillation on the part of our planners at Department of Army level as to the permanency of the post is in my judgment completely irresponsible and unwarranted.

Every general officer who ever served or visited here, from the present Chief of Staff on down, has praised Fort Polk as an outstanding facility.

LTG Harry H. Critz, the present Fourth Army Commander, has publicly declared it the "finest training area in the world." General Richard Irby, who left Fort Polk recently to take command of Fort Knox, unequivocally stated "Fort Polk is without a doubt the finest training area I have ever known." Others, such as MG Ellis W. "Butch" Williamson, MG William B. Fulton, MG Charles M. Mount, and BG Emil P. Eschenberg, have spoken the same sentiments on numerous occasions.

These officers are sincere and honest men. They know whereof they speak. The dilemma is clear: Why must Fort Polk suffer the trauma of yearly threats of closing when men of this calibre praise it so highly? The Army must take cognizance at the highest level of the fact that it has an asset here that far exceeds mere monetary considerations. Unlimited land areas and wholehearted community support are precious items in this day and age and we must not—we cannot—afford to lose them.

The land area and climate of this Louisiana facility could be lost if the post is closed again. The Army faces severe criticism if it turns its back on the post now. Three times Fort Polk has been closed. Should it be closed a fourth time, an Army officer's word will never be trusted again.

Editorials are beginning to appear in the state press. The Army should stop its vacillation of thirty years and award Fort Polk a permanent mission so the American people can take advantage of the unique resource offered by this post.

Possible mission options for Fort Polk are:

(1) Home station for an airmobile or mechanized infantry division, or components thereof.

(2) The conduct of all Basic Combat Training for Infantry.

(3) Permanent home of the U.S. Army Chaplains School (as the only major installation named for a clergyman, Fort Polk is a logical home for such a school.)

(4) Training of foreign national allies, unit size or junior leaders.

Here this officer completes his appraisal with the hope that the Department of the Army will take positive action to save Fort Polk for the Army.

One of the editorials he mentioned appeared in the Shreveport, La., Journal on May 2, 1970, and I think it would add immeasurably to this discussion. The editorial follows:

FORT POLK'S CONTRIBUTION TO LOUISIANA
The following is an editorial which appeared in the Shreveport Journal May 2.

Although Fort Polk at present enjoys permanent status, its potentials for a permanent installation have not been fully developed. What the fate of the big base will be after most American troops are withdrawn from Vietnam is conjectural, but it is to be hoped that the Defense Department will show better judgment than did the Pentagon when it placed the fort on a stand-by basis at the end of World War II and then ordered it closed in 1954 and again in 1959.

The uncertain status of the fort in years past retarded improvements and old facilities with inadequacies and inconveniences gave the place a bad public image. But since reactivation of the fort in 1961, millions of dollars have gone into modernization. The current value of the installation is approximately \$335,000,000. The reservation embraces about 200,000 acres and if a larger area were needed an additional 200,000 acres could be taken from U.S. Forest Service lands. Among the new buildings that have been completed are brigade classrooms, a 1,000-seat theatre, a large post exchange and a bowling alley. Planned construction includes a new post chapel, bachelor officer quarters, 260 housing units, dental clinic and a new club building for noncommissioned officers. Preliminary plans have been drawn for a new hospital.

Military authorities recognize Fort Polk as an ideal place for military training. It offers a diversified terrain, fuel costs are low, there is little pollution of air or water, the water supply is abundant and health conditions are excellent.

Training costs are lower at this fort than at many other posts, because of the mild climate. An adequate, civilian labor force is available for jobs that require trained personnel who aren't in service.

DeRidder, Leesville and other communities in the Fort Polk area have an unblemished record of cooperation with military authorities. Fort Polk men and their families are welcomed in civilian activities. Great outdoor recreation assets are available to military personnel.

More than 770,000 troops or more than one-half of the infantry replacements for the Army's combat forces in Vietnam have been trained at the fort since 1961. During the Korean War 37,000 soldiers received training there and during World War II 8,000,000 men were given training at that installation. The low AWOL rate at Fort Polk is proof of the high morale of men stationed there and evidence of the outstanding character of the whole military organization.

Basic combat training is the primary mission of the post. Secondary missions are advanced individual and combat support training. The present population of the fort includes 6,759 permanently assigned military men, 19,234 trainees, 2,300 civilian employees whose salaries are appropriated by Congress and 869 civilian workers whose pay is not appropriated.

Louisiana's stake in the operation of the post is far greater than the average citizen realizes. Total disbursements at the fort this current fiscal year amount to \$139,366,079, including the military payroll of \$55,301,179, the civilian payroll of \$19,526,400 and military allotments of \$30,000,000.

Local expenditures for supplies and equipment, as projected for the present fiscal year, will come to \$8,267,958. Expenditures within a 350-mile-radius of the post will be \$23,410,042.

According to a study made by military authorities, the monetary impact of the post on the state is as follows: \$1,713,300 in the First and Second Congressional Districts; \$1,104,800 in the Third Congressional District; \$2,406,000 in the Fourth Congressional District which includes Caddo and Bossier parishes; \$504,000 in the Fifth Congressional District; \$184,600 in the Sixth Congressional District; \$4,328,800 in the Seventh Congress-

sional District; and \$39,692,000 in the Eighth Congressional District, where the fort is located. These figures include civilian pay, military pay, contracts, local procurement, non-appropriated fund personnel pay and non-appropriated fund supplies.

Beneficial as the post is to Louisiana economy, the installation is by its very nature a restrictive agent in development of a more diverse economy in the region, because the fort has taken a huge acreage out of agricultural and industrial production. Naturally, when there is uncertainty about the future of the post, private capital is hesitant to invest in new businesses in the area that would depend in large part on a post-dominated economy.

What the fort needs to assure stability is an addition function. Several possibilities have been suggested: the stationing of a new airborne division; the permanent stationing of an Army Chaplains School; or training of noncommissioned officers from Latin America, Thailand, South Vietnam, Indonesia, Cambodia, Korea or the Philippines. Present facilities are reported to be adequate for such training.

The Army Chaplains School at Fort Hamilton, N.Y., is tentatively scheduled to be transferred to Fort Knox, Ky., within the next four or five years. But, as Fort Polk bears the name of the illustrious Louisiana Episcopal bishop who became a Confederate general, it would be an appropriate place for the Chaplains School.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army to keep faith with the people of Louisiana and of the Eighth Congressional District, and with me, by living up to their word and their commitment to us in Louisiana to make Fort Polk a permanent active installation. I urge these departments to release funds already authorized and appropriated for much-needed family housing at Fort Polk. I urge them to fund the dental clinic, for which funds have been authorized and appropriated. And I urge them to keep the commitment made to me by Surgeon General Leonard D. Heatton to build a much-needed new permanent hospital at Fort Polk. We in Louisiana ask only that the Army keep its promises.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DANIEL).

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support of the military construction authorization bill. Under the able guidance of our committee chairman, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, this bill has been composed of only the most essential projects required by the military departments. A number of other proposed projects have been deferred when it was determined that they could be reasonably included in a future program. I urge enactment by this body of the measure as it has been reported by your Committee on Armed Services.

As you know, each military department prepares its annual program very carefully. Then, these are combined into a Department of Defense program. The review by the Secretary is critical. It is done by a small but competent staff. They view the professed needs for facilities on

the basis of known commitments, available facilities, current and future plans and manpower requirements. The manpower criterion is of vital importance in today's unsettled world. It has only been in recent years that the Navy Department has given precedence to facilities for their ships, aircraft and other weapons systems.

Because of this importance of the Navy and Marine Corps' manpower, I propose to address my remarks to their program for people-oriented facilities included in the bill before us. This distinguished assembly is well aware of the needs for high motivation and morale, and specialized skills by the military personnel of our Defense Department.

The complex and sophisticated force structures, weapons systems and defense measures of this Nation are increasingly costly. Their effective functioning would not be possible without the military personnel. People are the most important part of our operating forces. We spend large sums of money on procurement of modern ships, aircraft and equipment for military officers and enlisted men to operate in the interest of national security. Large sums are also spent to educate and train them in the use and maintenance of complex systems of equipment and weapons. When these people are assigned to duties at shore installations, it is not only desirable, but logical, that they be provided suitable living conditions.

The minimum amenities of civilian life must be provided. These include adequate space and reasonable privacy in sleeping quarters, study and recreational opportunities, and health and medical care. Your Armed Services Committee recognizes the severe and longstanding need to have a standard of living that will allow the services to attract and retain the people who are the very heart of our military capability.

There has been a continued and uneconomical use of outmoded and obsolete facilities which were constructed many years ago under austere criteria. A large portion of the structures have far outlasted their emergency need. This has resulted in conditions which are simply unacceptable by modern standards. We must face the fact, however, that the continuing austere economic climate, coupled with the overriding necessity to provide urgently needed operational, maintenance and production facilities, permits us to approve only a nominal portion of longstanding facility needs.

During the hearings on this bill, your committee reviewed the Navy and Marine Corps personnel facilities by particular groups. Those which withstood our objective examination we believe to be the bare essentials needed.

The first group considered is for construction of barracks. The Navy and Marine Corps representatives stated their requirement for approximately 459,793 bachelor spaces for enlisted personnel. They reported that they have only 210,454 existing, adequate spaces at their shore bases. They also stated that approximately 14,976 spaces are available

at reasonable rental cost in nearby communities. This leaves a deficiency of 243,375 barracks spaces. This bill includes two line items for amended authorization and 19 for new authorization for a total of 21 line items to provide 11,630 barracks spaces, only 4.8 percent of the deficiency. These barracks will be at 19 installations inside the United States, one oversea location, and one classified location. Many of the enlisted personnel are students, others are assigned to exacting tasks during the day or at night. In either case, a quiet, restful environment is essential and will be provided by the new barracks.

The next group considered is for construction of bachelor officers' quarters. The service witnesses testified that 42,169 spaces are needed, but that only 14,790 are available at their shore bases, with an additional 4,832 available for rent in neighboring communities. This leaves a deficiency of 22,547 accommodations for the young officers. This program includes two line items for 276 spaces, only 1.2 percent of the deficiency. One of these line items is located at an activity inside the United States and one will be at an overseas activity. Like the barracks for the enlisted personnel, the proposed spaces will provide proper quarters for the bachelor officers to study and rest.

Another group of personnel support facilities is for construction of four mess halls for enlisted personnel at stateside activities. The dining facilities will accommodate the personnel living in the bachelor quarters plus the relatively few who must use the mess for only the mid-day meal.

The next group is also for a small number of line items. These are for construction of two commissary stores. One store will be located at the Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland. This will provide a larger and more conveniently located facility to replace the existing badly deteriorated store which is the only available reasonable source of food supply. Foods in Keflavik stores cost much more than in their American counterparts with the exception of fish, lamb, and dairy products. The stores are small and the relatively few items stocked are primarily European in origin and of a variety designed to satisfy the Iceland style of diet rather than American. This new store will be located nearer the family housing area where it will become part of a planned community center. This consolidation of facilities will greatly benefit dependents by reducing the time they must be exposed to the rather harsh Iceland climate. A second commissary store is proposed for the Naval Station, Charleston, S.C. Replacement of this 27-year-old facility has been justified by structural failure of trusses supporting the roof which forced closing of approximately half of the store. Prior to this occurrence, the store was about 50 percent undersized for current business by existing commissary store standards, which I might add do not permit construction of stores as spacious as the present-day civilian supermarkets.

Another important group of personnel support facilities provides for the confinement of prisoners at the Marine

Corps base, Camp Lejeune, N.C., and the Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Va. Two confinement facilities are proposed, one to alleviate severe overloading, up to 300 percent, and provide confinement space for an alarming number of pending disciplinary cases where no confinement space is now available. The second item proposes a much needed addition to include a workshop, classrooms, laundry, barber shop, and similar facilities necessary to support a proper rehabilitation program and adequate control of prisoner population. These facilities will further enable the Navy to meet its obligation in providing modern, adequate facilities for confinement and rehabilitation which are acceptable under current penology standards and within the Navy's responsibility.

In August of last year Hurricane Camille struck the Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport, Miss. The result was extensive damage and destruction in the surrounding area as well as at the Center. There are two line items in this bill for personnel support facilities at the CB Center which are related to Hurricane Camille destruction. One provides for a theater and visual training facility, the other for an enlisted men's club. Prior to the hurricane, both facilities were accommodated in inadequate structures built during World War II; however, the hurricane damage they sustained makes it no longer possible for their use. As I mentioned before similar facilities existing in the local communities have also been damaged and destroyed. In addition the possibility of utilizing the enlisted club at Keesler Air Force Base is impractical as it is located 13 miles away and is already overcrowded.

This program includes one line item for construction of a chapel and Sunday school. It will provide the proper religious environment for conducting worship services, counseling and instruction at the Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Va. It also includes a line item for a multipurpose building at the Naval Radio Station, Thurso, Scotland. This will provide a single facility to house administrative and dispensary functions currently occupying needed barracks space, an exchange and commissary now taking valuable warehouse space and provide additional areas for a library and conference, training and counseling rooms.

Another personnel support line item in this program is for construction of a gymnasium at the Naval Communication Station, Harold E. Holt, Exmouth, Australia. Indoor recreational and sports activities for personnel and dependents at this station are required because of temperatures ranging between 90° and 120° for 8 months of the year, 15- to 20-knot prevailing winds, blowing sand and fine clay, and large infestations of Australian bush fly. The nearest existing indoor facility to this isolated activity is located 800 miles away at Perth; therefore, it becomes mandatory for the Navy to provide the proper facilities for morale as well as to assure the physical fitness of its first line personnel.

The final group of personnel support facilities considered by your committee

is for construction of Navy and Marine Corps medical and dental facilities. In this program there are two line items for amended authorization for construction of hospitals. One is a 600-bed hospital at Camp Pendleton, Calif., adjacent to the Marine Corps base and the second is a 195-bed hospital at Corpus Christi, Tex. Both facilities replace obsolete World War II structures built in 1941 and 1942. Requirements have since changed such that the medical needs of the present eligible active duty, retired, and dependent population cannot be served by the functionally inadequate and deteriorated facilities. The new hospitals will provide modern facilities for inpatient nursing care, outpatient department and the repertory of medical services. There is a third medical facility line item for amended authorization which provides a 5-bed dispensary for the San Onofre area at the Marine Corps base, Camp Pendleton, Calif. This item will provide facilities for replacement of quonset huts now crowded to the point that Marines with respiratory ailments must often wait outside during inclement weather for treatment.

The single dental facility included in this program provides for the construction of a dental clinic at the Marine Corps base, Camp Pendleton, Calif. The operating efficiency of the existing 24-year-old facility and equipment is critical at this major clinic providing treatment for 38,000 officers and men. The use of modern dental techniques, severely curtailed under present conditions of obsolescent equipment, will be made available through construction of the proposed clinic.

Within the constraint of prudence and economy, your Armed Services Committee has developed a well conceived, balanced construction program. I repeat my endorsement of this bill and strongly recommend your support.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, this is the second of the major authorization bills that the Armed Services Committee presents to the House each year. Earlier we presented the weapons procurement authorization bill.

H.R. 17604 provides the authorization for construction at our military installations both in the United States and overseas.

The legislation provides \$1,973,810,000 in construction funds for fiscal year 1971. I think the bill recognizes twin goals:

It provides construction which is absolutely necessary if our Armed Forces are going to retain their capabilities; and, at the same time, it recognizes the persistent call for economy and for reduction of defense expenditures whenever possible—calls that are heard frequently in this Chamber as well as elsewhere in our society.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee, in his usual competent fashion, has explained the bill in great detail, and I will not take the time of the House to go into the measure extensively. I do not think it is necessary

for me to repeat what the chairman has already said.

Let me assure you that the Armed Services Committee, and particularly the Subcommittee on Military Construction, has given extraordinary attention to this legislation. In addition to their attendance at the hearing sessions, the members of the subcommittee spent many, many extra hours studying the justification books and the various other backup material concerning the requested projects.

Almost 600 line items are included in the bill, involving construction at more than 300 military installations.

I think it is fair to say that the committee's approach this year is summed up not by the question, "Is it needed?" but by the question, "Can we possibly do without it?" Is it essential? Can it be deferred?

The reductions the committee made in the bill were not based upon a judgment that the items were not desirable or important. In many cases we were convinced that the items will eventually be necessary. But our judgment was based on the premise that we would defer projects if we possibly could, because of the pressing demands on our Federal budget and because of the extraordinary effort that the Government must make in the coming year if the inflationary trends in our economy are going to be controlled.

There is included in the legislation \$325.2 million for construction in support of the Safeguard antiballistic-missile system. This is the minimum construction required as part of the President's program for measured minimal deployment of Safeguard at this time. Amendments may be offered today to delete these funds. Such action would merely create chaos in our defense program.

The Safeguard construction included in this bill is merely that which is required to support the deployment that the House has already extensively debated and approved. You cannot have antiballistic missiles unless you construct facilities from which to launch them. I cannot think of anything that would make the House look more ridiculous than to approve an ABM system and then refuse to approve the construction of the facilities to house the very system we approved.

The legislation contains \$25 million to support long-range construction needs in Vietnam. The committee reduced by \$15 million the amount requested in this category by the Department of Defense. We may have been too stringent in this regard. But we wanted to assure that construction in Southeast Asia would be limited to that which is absolutely essential. Bear in mind that this proposed construction is necessary for the improvement of the Republic of Vietnam Armed Forces. These forces suffer a severe shortage of adequate training facilities. And bear in mind that improvement of the Republic of Vietnam Armed Forces is crucial to our Vietnamization program and withdrawal of our American boys from Southeast Asia.

Mr. Chairman, this year's legislation is

only \$426,595 more than the authorization recommended last year. At the same time, the amount recommended for Safeguard construction is \$312.5 million more than recommended last year. And the amount recommended for family housing is \$116,721,000 more than provided for that category last year.

So the total addition for these two categories from what was provided last year is \$429,221,000.

Therefore, if the additions for housing and for Safeguard were excluded, the bill would be \$2,626,000 less than the authorization we recommended last year. This indicates the care we took in preparing this bill.

Let me also point out that what I am talking about is what our committee recommended last year to the House. The amount finally authorized last year was higher. Thus, when compared with last year's authorization, if the additions for housing and Safeguard are excluded, this year's bill is \$82,321,000 less than the authorizations finally approved last year.

When you consider the effect of general price increases, I think you could say that the committee has been, if anything, too stringent in its approach.

As far as the major additions for housing are concerned, I can think of no area where the requirement is more justified, or where we are likely to get a better return for our money. Numerous Members of the House have called for increased pay for members of the Armed Forces, and for an all-volunteer armed force. The call has come from Members on both sides of the aisle.

In line with such objectives, the President has recommended a substantial pay increase for those with under 2 years of service, and has indicated his desire to move to an all-volunteer force as soon as feasible. I can think of nothing more contradictory than to approve a pay increase, and then disapprove the housing expenditures which have, if anything, an even greater impact on career retention. In this regard, I am especially pleased with the bill not only in relation to family housing, but in the steps we have taken to improve the quality of bachelor housing for both officer and enlisted personnel. We are long overdue in making improvements in this area. We have repeatedly shortchanged the single people in our Armed Forces; and we have paid the price by reduced reenlistments among our bachelor personnel.

The bill provides an increase in a unit cost of bachelor housing to \$3,200 for enlisted personnel, and \$11,000 for officers. And in the case of barracks, it provides an increase in space allowance and other facilities. Most of the barracks projected in the bill are for the lowest enlisted personnel in the grades of E-4 and below, and would provide 90 square feet in area per man, as compared with the present standard of 72 square feet per man.

Mr. Chairman, there are many other things I could say about this legislation, but I will not take the time of the House to do so now. The committee report fully spells out the various programs approved, and we are prepared to answer

any questions that the Members may have.

I know that there are Members who feel that there are justifiable programs in their districts which deserve to be financed. I can only say that, looking at one project alone, I would probably agree with them. But we are obliged to evaluate each project on its merits relative to other proposed projects. This bill is limited to what we deem essential. We look upon a stable economy as the second line of defense.

I hope that the Members of the House will support the bill in that spirit.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

(Mr. SCOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this measure not only generally but specifically with regard to a \$2.2 million item at Fort Belvoir in my district.

This item will be for sewage facilities at Fort Belvoir and will permit pipelines to be run from the present Fort Belvoir plants, which only provide secondary treatment of sewage, to a new facility being constructed in Fairfax County at the Pohick Sewage Treatment Plant.

These new facilities at the Pohick plant will provide for tertiary treatment of this sewage, which I am advised is 98 percent effective, well above the 96 percent currently given as a standard for effluent discharge into the Potomac and well above the approximately 80 percent presently provided by secondary treatment. This worthwhile project will go a long way toward reducing pollution in the Potomac and practically eliminate such pollution insofar as Fort Belvoir is concerned.

I appreciate the committee including this item and urge passage of the bill.

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation, and would like to point out particularly that it contains construction funds for enlarging the research facilities at the Watervliet Arsenal in Albany County, N.Y. I think this is an especially significant item in view of the cutbacks that have recently taken place at the Watervliet. Obviously the construction of these new facilities will not only increase our ordnance capability in the high-grade weapons turned out at this great arsenal, but it is another indication that Congress does not intend this great facility in New York State to be eliminated or further reduced.

I am proud, as one member of the committee, to have been able to persuade the committee to leave these funds in the bill, and I am hopeful they will also be approved by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak briefly in support of two vital medical projects in the military construction bill—the new hospital at

Fort Gordon, Ga., and the project to relocate services and expand utilities in preparation for the replacement of Walter Reed General Hospital.

The Fort Gordon hospital is urgently required as a replacement for the existing substandard, crowded, obsolete hospital plant. The existing facilities, which were erected in 1942, are of World War II mobilization design, comprising 138 separate wooden buildings dispersed over an 85-acre site.

The existing plant becomes increasingly inadequate as the utility systems and electrical distribution lines become more and more obsolete.

The aging wooden structures require greater maintenance each year; are fire, safety, and sanitation hazards; and fail to provide facilities satisfactory to the needs of a specialized treatment center.

They do not contain adequate space for radiology, clinical laboratory, intensive care, or examination and treatment rooms.

It becomes necessary to improvise facilities, resulting in inefficient operations.

Dispersion of facilities interconnected by miles of wooden corridors causes highly uneconomical operations and wastes much staff time on travel between scattered elements.

These distances consume many staff and maintenance dollars and are aggravated by a lack of modern communications and labor-saving equipment.

The new facilities will meet long-range requirements for the Fort Gordon area and meet the specialized treatment requirements for the southeastern part of the United States.

The Walter Reed project is required to permit orderly execution of construction planned for a new Walter Reed General Hospital. The existing hospital, one of the foremost medical centers in the world, is the primary Army professional teaching hospital. It is presently housed in structures some of which are 60 years old.

Despite constant, costly maintenance the utilities and buildings meet only minimal acceptable levels of safety.

Due to the age and inflexibility of the existing structures, the use of advanced medical technological procedures is frequently hampered.

In order for the hospital to continue patient care and professional training programs, and provide the necessary regional medical support to northeastern United States, some functions and services must be relocated prior to construction of the new hospital at its proposed site.

Additions to and rehabilitation or modification of buildings are required to accommodate the services to be relocated.

Utilities within the construction site require relocation, and additional connections are necessary to support continuing operations during the construction phase.

Portions of these utilities will support the new hospital when it becomes operational.

Walter Reed General Hospital is the largest of the Army's seven specialized treatment hospitals.

In addition to serving the Army medical requirements in the Washington area,

special services are rendered to the Office of the President, the State Department, and other designees of the Secretary of the Army. Walter Reed General Hospital is the focal point for worldwide referral of military patients with complex and demanding medical problems.

These problems require the utmost in modern scientific equipment, professional talent, and health administration.

Space requirements for efficient accomplishment of this mission are presently critical.

The dispersion, congestion and structural inadequacies present today are impediments to maintaining or improving the quality and proficiency of medical care.

In order that Walter Reed General Hospital continue in the forefront of medical progress in the United States, a new physical plant is a most urgent requirement.

Completion of this project is essential to clear and prepare the site in sufficient time to allow construction of the new hospital to begin in the subsequent fiscal year.

These two hospital projects are necessary for the orderly replacement of obsolete and antiquated medical facilities.

For this reason I strongly urge the approval of these two projects included in the military construction bill presently before the Congress.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, two urgently needed pollution control projects for Radford Arsenal are included in the legislation under debate. Briefly described, they are the following:

First, \$1,549,000 for an electrostatic precipitator to be installed near the powerhouse at Radford Arsenal and a new concrete stack 300 feet in height to handle the smoke presently insufficiently handled by five smaller stacks. The present mechanical cyclone separators associated with the five stacks remove 75 percent of the smoke components, but the 25 percent released into the atmosphere is in excess of Federal standards and is detrimental to the health of employees and local residents; and second, \$784,000 for construction of water pollution abatement facilities. Work will include construction of a 40,000 gallons per day sanitary sewage treatment plant to serve the cast propellant area; construction of a waste acid facility including storage house, settling basin, and neutralization pits; replacement of components and reactivation of ash removal system; construction of sewage systems for 11 separate areas.

On behalf of the people of the community surrounding Radford Arsenal, including sportsmen and others who have occasion to use the waters of New River which flows through the Federal reservation, I want to thank the chairman and members of the committee and subcommittee for recognizing and acting upon these two problems. Radford Arsenal is an important industrial citizen of this area of Virginia, and the military personnel and civilian contractor are to be complimented upon their decision to cooperate in this effort to improve the environment.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the military construction authorization.

I am opposed to this bill because it authorizes more money for the Safeguard ABM system. We have been over this territory over and over again. Ever since I voted against the Nike X, an earlier version of ABM in 1966, I have not been convinced that available technology could produce an operational ABM. All my information leads me to conclude that the new Safeguard system will not work. To compound the disastrous initial decision to deployment of the Safeguard ABM, we are now asked to go ahead with further deployment at a time when the entire system has not been tested.

Within the committee report, there is specified that Safeguard construction funds can be used for "advance preparation for five additional sites" beyond phase I and II requested by the administration. This is unconscionable.

Nothing has changed since I voted against the ABM on the military procurement bill in early May. During that debate I stated my objections:

The official justification of an ABM system is confounded by the strategic objectives of the ABM. In 1968 we were to build an ABM against the Chinese threat, in 1969 it was the Soviet Union, and now in 1970 it is the threat from the Chinese again. What is more discerning is that Secretary Laird himself predicts that if the USSR continues in their present pace in ICBM production and development, by 1975, the year of the operational Safeguard, the Safeguard ABM could not provide adequate protection for our Minutemen missiles. I am further disturbed because the assumptions of a future Chinese nuclear ICBM capability is predicated upon the belief that the Chinese could not develop ICBM's with enough decoys that could exhaust our ABM missile contingent. If the Chinese get this capability to have the ICBM's and the decoys, they could exhaust our ABM system.

There are questions that I have raised in the past in regard to the ABM and I have yet to receive satisfactory answers to them.

Even if the ABM system should work—a big "if"—will not the result pollution of an interdicted Soviet first strike against our Minutemen missiles result in widespread death and pollution within the United States because of nuclear fallout?

What will be the final cost of the ABM? Safeguard was to cost only \$10 billion in 1969, and now the projected cost for the same Safeguard system is \$12 billion.

Are the Safeguard radars, MSR, invulnerable to attack or sabotage? If they are not, would this then incapacitate the entire ABM system?

Mr. Chairman, nothing has changed. I am voting against this bill because Safeguard ABM is a nonworking, extravagant Maginot line.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the military construction authorization for fiscal year 1971. In a year when the budget is tight, when labor, health, and education programs are woefully underfinanced, when the key criteria for funding programs are supposedly "cost-effectiveness" and "performance," and, most of all, when the need for reordering our national priorities is more urgent than ever, I find it impossible to vote for such desirable but deferrable facilities as theaters, expensive commissary quarters, and men's clubs for the military.

Some glaring specific shortcomings have also induced me to object to this legislation. The Safeguard missile program, I am convinced, is ineptly planned, unnecessary, and counterproductive as it is a dangerous provocation in our international relations. If we grant the \$325.2 million this bill requests, these funds will simply disappear into the insatiable maw of the omnivorous military industrial complex which has been so unreliable, and what is worse, unaccountable in the past decade.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 17604

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 land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following acquisition and construction.

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND

(First Army)

- Fort Belvoir, Virginia, \$2,200,000.
- Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, \$503,000.
- Fort Dix, New Jersey, \$11,671,000.
- Fort Eustis, Virginia, \$260,000.
- Fort Hamilton, New York \$575,000.
- Fort Lee, Virginia, \$98,000.
- Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, \$257,000.

(Third Army)

- Fort Benning, Georgia, \$2,855,000.
- Fort Campbell, Kentucky, \$497,000.
- Fort Gordon, Georgia, \$31,447,000.
- Fort Jackson, South Carolina, \$506,000.
- Fort Rucker, Alabama, \$1,435,000.
- Fort Stewart, Georgia, \$1,534,000.

(Fourth Army)

- Fort Sam Houston, Texas, \$15,496,000.
- Fort Sill, Oklahoma, \$581,000.

(Fifth Army)

- Fort Carson, Colorado, \$623,000.
- Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, \$523,000.
- Fort Riley, Kansas, \$7,515,000.
- Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, \$1,946,000.

(Sixth Army)

- Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation, California, \$2,915,000.
- Fort Lewis, Washington, \$1,567,000.
- Presidio of Monterey, California, \$2,635,000.
- Fort Ord, California, \$3,497,000.
- Presidio of San Francisco, California, \$7,004,000.

(Military District of Washington)

- Fort Myer, Virginia, \$525,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

- Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Texas, \$3,738,000.
- Alabama Army Ammunition Plant, Alabama, \$117,000.
- Anniston Army Depot, Alabama, \$915,000.
- Atlanta Army Depot, Georgia, \$117,000.
- Badger Army Ammunition Plant, Wisconsin, \$1,604,000.
- Burlington Army Ammunition Plant, New Jersey, \$384,000.
- Charleston Army Depot, South Carolina, \$67,000.
- Cornhusker Army Ammunition Plant, Nebraska, \$650,000.
- Harry Diamond Laboratory, Maryland, \$14,020,000.

Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland, \$990,000.
 Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, Iowa, \$300,000.
 Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania, \$410,000.
 Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, \$2,757,000.
 New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania, \$99,000.
 Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, \$752,000.
 Radford Arsenal, Virginia, \$2,333,000.
 Ridgewood Army Weapons Plant, Ohio, \$120,000.
 Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, \$2,750,000.
 Sierra Army Depot, California, \$369,000.
 Tobyhanna Army Depot, Pennsylvania, \$115,000.
 Tooele Army Depot, Utah, \$249,000.
 Watervliet Arsenal, New York, \$1,362,000.
 White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, \$2,261,000.
 Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona, \$1,798,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, \$2,383,000.
 Fort Ritchie, Maryland, \$876,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, \$8,519,000.

ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT

Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia, \$10,216,000.

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND TERMINAL SERVICE

Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, New Jersey, \$3,440,000.

Oakland Army Base, California, \$1,458,000.

SAFEGUARD SYSTEMS COMMAND

Safeguard, \$322,000,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, HAWAII

Schofield Barracks, \$2,955,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY, PACIFIC

Korea, Various Locations, \$6,190,000.
 Vietnam, Various Locations, \$25,000,000.

SAFEGUARD SYSTEMS COMMAND

Kwajalein Missile Range, \$3,760,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY

Various Locations, \$2,476,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE

Germany, Various Locations, \$4,852,000.

Various Locations: For the United States share of the cost of multilateral programs for the acquisition or construction of military facilities and installations, including international military headquarters, for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area, \$50,000,000: *Provided*, That, within thirty days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of the Army shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services and on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a description of obligations incurred as the United States share of such multilateral programs.

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 \$2,000,000

Sec. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with constructions 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 Construc-

tion 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 Committee 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, 1971, 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. Within the amounts of the authorizations for military construction for Safeguard, the Secretary of the Army or his designee is authorized to provide for, under such terms and conditions as he may determine, two hundred and twenty-five units of temporary family housing for occupancy on a rental basis by military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense and their dependents at each Safeguard site in connection with any military construction and installation and checkout of system equipment which is or may hereafter be authorized at a Safeguard site: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army or his designee determines that such temporary housing is necessary in order to perform the construction and installation and checkout of system equipment, and that temporary housing is not otherwise available under reasonable terms and conditions.

Sec. 105. (a) Public Law 88-174, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101, as follows:

With respect to "Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland", strike out "\$4,065,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,826,000".

(b) Public Law 88-174, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "\$155,919,000" and "\$200,788,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$156,180,000" and "\$201,049,000", respectively.

Sec. 106. (a) Public Law 88-390, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

With respect to "Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland," strike out "\$6,843,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,405,000."

(b) Public Law 88-390, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "\$256,536,000" and "\$307,597,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$257,098,000" and "\$308,159,000", respectively.

Sec. 107. (a) Public Law 89-188, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101, as follows:

(1) With respect to "Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland", strike out "\$3,419,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,874,000".

(2) With respect to "Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois", strike out "826,000" and insert in place thereof "\$835,000".

(b) Public Law 89-188, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "\$261,135,000" and "\$317,996,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$261,599,000" and "\$318,460,000" respectively.

Sec. 108. (a) Public Law 89-568, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101, as follows:

With respect to "Fort Jackson, South Carolina", strike out "\$5,565,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,928,000".

(b) Public Law 89-568, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "\$59,352,000" and "\$134,067,000" and

inserting in place thereof "\$59,715,000" and "\$134,430,000", respectively.

Sec. 109. (a) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101, as follows:

"With respect to United States Military Academy, West Point, New York", strike out "\$15,495,000" and insert in place thereof "\$18,077,000".

(b) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 802 "\$284,625,000" and "\$388,018,000", and inserting in place "\$287,207,000" and "\$390,600,000", respectively.

Sec. 110. (a) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) With respect to "Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana," strike out "\$4,590,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,200,000".

(2) With respect to "Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas", strike out "\$169,000" and insert in place thereof "\$253,000".

(b) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of Section 802 "\$363,805,000" and "\$450,957,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$366,499,000" and "\$453,651,000", respectively.

Mr. RIVERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title I be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PIKE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PIKE: On page 5, strike lines 2 and 3, which read:

"SAFEGUARD SYSTEMS COMMAND
 "Safeguard, \$322,000,000."

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, when I showed this amendment to one of the members of the committee, one of my good friends, he said, "What again?"

And the answer is, "Yes, again," because there is not going to be any end ever to spending money on the Safeguard ABM system.

First, it will not work.

To hear some of our colleagues talk during the procurement debate, you might get the impression that ABM's have been knocking off target warheads right and left over the test ranges. In fact, no Safeguard ABM has even been fired at a target. When we talk about a "successful test," all we are saying is the thing got off the pad and went in the general direction we wanted it to go without blowing up first.

But this is a minor point; I do not doubt that Safeguard will eventually be able to work in a test situation. But this is an entirely different thing from a combat situation.

To begin with, the entire system is dependent on 12 missile site radars. These radars have a blast resistance of 25 to 30 pounds per square inch, which is about the same as a human being has. Let me repeat that: A blast strong enough to kill you will also kill a missile site radar.

If the Russians wanted to, they could probably have a saboteur knock out the radar with a satchel charge or bazooka.

Or they could target their first ICBM's against the radars. Probably they will do both. And once they have knocked out the radars, the whole system is useless.

The new small radars will improve this situation, but not enough.

So by spending a few hundred million on antiradar measures, the Russians will be able to neutralize our entire Safeguard investment of more than \$12 billion. And we should be in no doubt that the Soviets will take these steps; they are not going to watch us build Safeguard while they sit by and do nothing.

What we have here is the most ineffective and cost-ineffective weapons system in history.

Second, we do not need it.

One mission of Safeguard is to protect an additional 225 Minuteman ICBM's; \$12 billion to protect 225 missiles comes to more than \$53 million per missile. For the \$12 billion we could double the size of our ICBM force, or we could nearly double the size of our Polaris-Poseidon force.

And what is going to protect us from a Chinese, Russian, or any other attack using means other than missiles? What is to prevent them from making a hundred-megaton bomb—or a thousand-megaton bomb—putting it in the hold of a freighter with a neutral flag, or maybe a submarine, and detonating it off our coast? This would kill millions of people by tidal wave and fallout. For that matter, what is to stop them from sailing one of these ships right into New York Harbor? These big bombs are easy and cheap to make if you do not care about size and weight. One of these ships could be sailing into New York Harbor this very minute, and what could we do about it? How would Safeguard help us?

Let us face reality: Our only defense against China is our deterrent. They know they can take out a few of our cities, but they also know that, if they do, we will retaliate by wiping their country off the map. The Chinese talk nasty, but they are not stupid enough to commit national suicide.

Third, the cost of missile defense is literally infinite.

It is hard to imagine this today, but only 4 years ago, in the fiscal 1967 bill, we were talking about buying the Sentinel ABM for less than \$4 billion. Today we are up to \$12 billion and still climbing like a Saturn rocket. The fact is, the ABM will never be finished. Every time we expand or augment our defense, the Soviets will expand their offense to match, and at much less cost, and we will have to expand the ABM again. So let us not talk about the final cost of Safeguard being \$12 billion, or \$24 billion, or \$120 billion. It has no finite cost. As long as this project is alive, we will have three choices:

We can continue to put money into it; we can keep expanding it forever.

We can stop expanding it at some point, knowing we have an inadequate system and having wasted billions.

Or we can scrap the whole idea and turn the money to cost-effective military programs to constructive civilian programs.

Gentleman, our two basic responsibilities are to protect our society from

outside aggression and, even more important, to keep that society worth protecting. Both considerations demand that we abandon this unwise, infinitely expensive and unworkable ABM.

Mr. HORTON, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17604, the military construction authorization bill for fiscal 1971, with one important exception. I intend to support the amendment offered to delete construction funds, in the amount of \$325 million, for Safeguard, or anti-ballistic-missile sites.

Last year, Congress carefully scrutinized requested military outlays for the first time in nearly a decade, thus ending the era when any military request was automatically approved, almost without review. I think this is healthy, and that it has had beneficial effect. I am particularly pleased with what the Secretary of Defense, our former colleague, Mr. Laird, has been able to do in paring down the initial budget requests for military items.

The cutbacks Secretary Laird has announced indicate that some very careful reviewing and questioning of the need for several categories of military expenditures is beginning to take place in the Pentagon. I am hopeful that this trend will continue to progress, and progress faster, to a point where our domestic and military budget priorities are in better balance.

I support this bill, in general, because I feel it is irresponsible to assume a one-sided view of the priorities question, as between defense and domestic needs. There is no question that the position we have in the world demands a strong, a modern and responsive military.

There are many items in this military construction authorization bill which will contribute to insuring that our defense structure stays modern and responsive.

There is one item of expenditure, however, and a substantial one, which I believe should not be authorized at this time. I refer to the \$325 million item for construction of ABM sites.

I have consistently supported expenditures for research and development of antimissile defense systems, including the antiballistic missile. I have just as consistently opposed any spending for deployment of such a weapon until there is more certainty that it will serve a viable defense purpose.

There have been several thoughtful and well-founded questions raised about the workability of the Safeguard system as it is presently offered, and there have been even further questions raised about the possible obsolescence of the system if and when it becomes operational.

Little has been offered by the advocates of ABM deployment to show its applicability or effectiveness against multiwarhead Soviet missiles currently being tested. Nor has the system been justified solely on the basis of its necessity as a defense against any future Red Chinese ICBM threat. Further, we are told by the Defense Department that the U.S. MIRV system, applied to both land and submarine based ICBM's is such an advanced offensive system, that it serves as a deterrent defense.

With all of these open questions, the

SALT talks are now in progress. They could, and hopefully, with good-faith bargaining on both sides, they will change the whole perspective of the need for and development of new strategic offensive and defensive weapons.

Thus, I cannot at this time support over a quarter billion dollars for Safeguard deployment. I would continue to support research and development funds until the crucial questions I have cited above are sufficiently answered.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes. This has been studied year after year. I think the decision has been made by the House and Senate in spite of the position of the gentleman from New York and others who have argued against the deployment of this weapon.

I still find myself convinced by the logic of the arguments of the gentleman from New York (Mr. PRICE). I think his statement today is an excellent summary of why again we should not go to the expenditure of these funds for deployment of a system I do not think will add to the safety of the United States.

Mr. CLANCY, Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in announcing his decision to proceed with a ballistic missile defense system last year, President Nixon referred to a Safeguard program to be developed in a phased, orderly manner toward certain modified defense objectives. He also stated that the program would "be reviewed annually from the point of view of technical developments, the threat, and the diplomatic context including any talks on arms limitation." Additionally, he promised last year that each phase of the deployment, as the program moves forward, "will be reviewed to insure that we are doing as much as necessary, but not more than that required by the threat existing at that time."

The commitment was made and, as the Secretary of Defense stated when presenting the Defense budget to the Congress on March 2, 1970, in accordance with it, "information was developed on various alternative courses for consideration, and a thorough review was accomplished."

A measured and orderly deployment of Safeguard, taking only those steps necessary to preserve the ability to meet the threat as it evolves, is the most prudent and the most economical course of action that can be pursued.

In other words, it is the intent of the Department of Defense in compliance with the commitment of a yearly review, to recommend as it has this year, a move forward with Safeguard a step at a time after careful analysis of the current situation. Each subsequent step—or phase—will be calculated to combine with the former in such a way so that one supports the other in a logical, timely manner.

In support of this concept, the Department of Defense submitted in its defense budget for fiscal year 1971 a Safeguard request which your committee considers to be well within the bounds of the minimum funds necessary to carry on the program through modified phase

II. A failure to provide authorization now for a third site will result in delays which we can ill afford for our own protection. The authorization requested which provide basically for continued work on construction of the two phase I sites, construction for one additional site, construction in support of R. & D. at Kwajalein Missile Range, and advance preparation at five other sites have been carefully scrutinized. There is no extra fat on the bones. This is all muscle and necessary muscle, if we are to support the Administration in providing this much needed tool of protection which, in the long run, will help control escalation in the arms race.

One important point, which is worth mentioning here, concerns the administration's intended phasing of Safeguard. Considerable discussion concerning Safeguard R. & D. activity extended into phase I took place last year during testimony presented to the Congress. On May 13, 1969, Secretary Packard in explaining the need to deploy phase I sites, stressed the verification of the system as a whole. He said:

I want to emphasize that one of the reasons why we think it is important to do this is so that we can put the complete set of equipment together, do the shakedown work, get the computer programming checked out, and do all of those things which cannot be done in the laboratory and have to be done on an actual operational installation.

In further amplification of the need for phase I as an extension of research and development, Dr. Foster, on May 13, 1969, stated:

A great deal will be learned in extension of the R&D tests at Kwajalein and other test sites as the tactical system is deployed in Phase I. Because we will not rely alone on the R&D testing to establish the performance level of the system, the Phase I deployment will be exercised and tested continuously to realistically assess the performance of all major systems functioning as an entity.

He went on to explain the various tests to be conducted and ended this thought on these points with:

Thus, in Phase I, we will extend the testing begun in the R&D program and be able to give greater attention to operational factors and the performance of men in the Safeguard system.

However, it must be noted that the administration did not say, nor was it intended, that each phase be separate or that one be completed prior to the beginning of the next. The plain fact is that the opposite is true. Of necessity, in the development and deployment of a complex system such as Safeguard, planning must be far-reaching in scope. Decisions must be made and congressional authorization and appropriated funds must be available and construction completed in sufficient time to preclude gaps from forming in the program of deployment which could cost unnecessary loss of time and money. I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can arrive at some agreement on time for this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was about to put the question on the amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. First, Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I want the Members to know that this amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York would knock out phases I and II.

The scientists who are working on this system tell us it is going to work. I do not know who better to ask. So if Members want to kill the whole business, when Russia has its own ABM system, and we have nothing at all, they can vote for this amendment.

We have already authorized this ABM. This implements it and puts it into place. It authorizes construction at the new base in Missouri and at the Grand Forks, N. Dak., and Malmstrom, Mont., sites. We have already debated this. But this amendment would stop the whole business, phases 1 and 2.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of this amendment to strike \$322 million from this authorization bill which would be spent on the ABM installation.

Grave doubt remains as to the effectiveness and need for this program.

With reports coming from the Bureau of the Budget on the grave condition of our economy, we can no longer tolerate any questionable expenditures which may prove wasteful.

The only way I can effectively protest this spending policy is to vote against this measure.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support the amendment offered by my friend and colleague from California. This is, of course, consistent with my position against the deployment of new weapon systems until some new diplomatic incentives on arms reduction are undertaken by the Administration.

Moreover in my mind, the expenditure of \$325.2 million for more unproductive military hardware of this kind is a further gross distortion of our national priorities. While the administration is cutting funds for vitally essential and necessary programs, such as medical school training and research and needed educational programs in our cities, we are being asked to support expenditures of this kind. This is plainly crazy. There is simply no other way to describe it.

Mr. Chairman, at this time in the country with the unwarranted and tragic events that have occurred recently at Kent State, Augusta, Ga., and Jackson, Miss. in mind, all of us in this House must simply rededicate ourselves to putting human needs first. I submit we must simply start to eliminate this kind of military expenditure which is leading the country down the wrong road. I shall vote for the Leggett amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PIKE) there were—ayes 11, noes 42.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers, and pending that, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Fifty-six 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. 129]

Abbutt	Dent	Murphy, N.Y.
Adair	Dickinson	Nix
Addabbo	Diggs	Ottinger
Anderson,	Dwyer	Pepper
Tenn.	Edwards, Calif.	Pollock
Ashley	Flynt	Powell
Ayres	Fraser	Price, Tex.
Baring	Gibbons	Rallsback
Bingham	Green, Oreg.	Reid, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Gubser	Reifel
Brown, Mich.	Hansen, Wash.	Roberts
Brown, Ohio	Hays	Rogers, Colo.
Bush	Jacobs	Roudebush
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, Ala.	Scheuer
Celler	Kee	Schneebell
Chisholm	Keith	Smith, Calif.
Clark	Kirwan	Smith, Iowa
Clay	Kuykendall	Smith, N.Y.
Cohelan	McCarthy	Stokes
Colmer	McMillan	Stubblefield
Davis, Ga.	Miller, Calif.	Stuckey
Dawson	Moorhead	Teague, Tex.
de la Garza	Morse	Tunney
Denney	Morton	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having resumed the chair, Mr. STEED, chairman of the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 17604, and find itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 359 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. When the point of order of no quorum was made there was pending a demand for tellers on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE).

Tellers were ordered.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RIVERS. A vote of "aye" on this amendment is to kill the ABM and a vote of "no" is to maintain the strength of our defenses.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reread for the benefit of the House.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair appoints as tellers the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS).

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes, 76, noes 146.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any more amendments to title I of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RIVERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIVERS: Page 2, after line 8, insert: "Fort Knox, Kentucky, \$8,249,000."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered to cure an error which was made through an omission in the final draft of the subcommittee bill to the committee bill. That is all it is. It is to insert "Fort Knox, Kentucky", and it cures an omission made through an error in the final draft of the bill. That is all that the amendment does.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend, Mr. RIVERS, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, for yielding to me at this time.

The amendment just offered to the bill, H.R. 17604, which provides the sum of \$8,249,000 for Fort Knox, Ky., should be adopted. The projects involved are important projects not only to Fort Knox but to our country generally. They are essential and necessary at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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 land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

FIRST NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, \$5,685,000.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island, \$2,409,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Newport, Rhode Island, \$644,000.

Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island, \$4,390,000.

THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, \$6,652,000.

FOURTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Navy Ships Parts Control Center, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, \$697,000.

Naval Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$4,342,000.

Navy Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$790,000.

Naval Publications and Forms Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$250,000.

NAVAL DISTRICT, WASHINGTON

Bolling/Anacostia, Washington, District of Columbia, \$16,200,000.

Naval Air Facility, Washington, District of Columbia, \$57,000.

Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, District of Columbia, \$2,628,000.

Naval Station, Washington, District of Columbia, \$573,000.

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, \$10,000,000.

Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head, Maryland, \$692,000.

Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, Virginia, \$530,000.

FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia, \$4,408,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, \$1,120,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Norfolk, Virginia, \$2,070,000.

Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia, \$5,216,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia, \$55,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, \$1,886,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia, \$1,221,000.

SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida, \$470,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Jacksonville, Florida, \$3,869,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, \$519,000.

Naval Training Device Center, Orlando, Florida, \$1,665,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, \$8,444,000.

Naval Air Station, Saufley Field, Florida, \$457,000.

Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, \$2,782,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport, Mississippi, \$1,721,000.

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina, \$6,884,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, \$2,448,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina, \$5,180,000.

EIGHTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas, \$2,957,000.

Naval Inactive Ship Maintenance Facility, Orange, Texas, \$146,000.

NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Navy Public Works Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, \$12,525,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, \$3,537,000.

Naval Hospital Corps School, Great Lakes, Illinois, \$2,992,000.

ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Observatory Flagstaff Station, Flagstaff, Arizona, \$286,000.

Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, California, \$1,805,000.

Naval Dental Clinic, Long Beach, California, \$1,163,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, \$8,371,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California, \$2,929,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California, \$3,225,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, California, \$405,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, \$3,100,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California, \$1,122,000.

Naval Station, San Diego, California, \$1,909,000.

TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, \$3,973,000.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California, \$3,023,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Concord, California, \$455,000.

Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California, \$48,000.

Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California, \$195,000.

Naval Shipyard, Hunters Point, San Francisco, California, \$5,058,000.

Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, Vallejo, California, \$4,246,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, \$2,222,000.

THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington, \$70,000.

Naval Radio Station T, Jim Creek, Oso, Washington, \$159,000.

Naval Shipyard, Puget Sound, Bremerton, Washington, \$4,914,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, \$2,541,000.

FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii, \$4,123,000.

Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii, \$1,258,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii, \$220,000.

Naval Dental Clinic, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii, \$1,752,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii, \$529,000.

Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Oahu, Hawaii, \$2,480,000.

OMEGA Navigation Station, Haiku, Oahu, Hawaii, \$3,162,000.

Naval Communication Station, Honolulu, Wahiawa Oahu, Hawaii, \$200,000.

SEVENTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska, \$4,781,000.

Naval Arctic Research Laboratory, Barrow, Alaska, \$2,638,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Barracks, Washington, District of Columbia, including special relocation costs, \$700,000.

Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia, \$5,283,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, \$1,384,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, \$6,516,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina, \$112,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, \$332,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California, \$75,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, \$5,344,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Santa Ana, California, \$1,050,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Landing Field, Camp Pendleton, California, \$1,570,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, \$9,294,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, \$1,605,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, \$343,000.

ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, \$10,613,000.

Naval Facility, Argentia, Newfoundland, \$1,580,000.

EUROPEAN AREA

Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily, Italy, \$582,000.

Naval Radio Station, Thurso, Scotland, \$282,000.

PACIFIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Communication Station, Harold E. Holt, Exmouth, Australia, \$747,000.

Naval Magazine, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$3,287,000.

Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$1,464,000.

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$740,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$2,363,000.

Sec. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified Navy 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 amount of \$974,000.

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 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, 1971, 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. 204. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to acquire, under such terms as he deems appropriate, such aviation, flight clearance, and other easements over privately owned property contiguous to the south approach to Runway 34R of the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, as he considers necessary for sale and efficient operations at that Station. Acquisition of such easements shall be effected by the exchange of such excess lands or interests in land of approximately equal value as the Secretary of Defense may determine to be available for the purpose. If the fair market value of the easement interests to be acquired is less than the fair market value of the Government property to be exchanged therefor, the owner of the property covered by the easement shall pay to the Government an amount equal to such deficiency.

Sec. 205. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to acquire, under such terms as he deems appropriate, land or interests in land (including easements) in approximately four hundred eighteen acres of privately owned property contiguous to the western approach to Runway 06-24 of the Marine Corps Air Station, Santa Ana, California, as he considers necessary for safe and efficient operations at that Station. Acquisition of such land or interests in land shall be effected by the exchange of such excess land or interests in land of approximately equal value, as the Secretary of Defense may determine to be available for the purpose. If the fair market value of the land or interests in land to be acquired is less than the fair market value of the Government property to be exchanged, the amount of such deficiency shall be paid to the Government.

Sec. 206. (a) Public Law 89-568, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

(1) With respect to Naval Submarine Medical Center, New London, Connecticut, strike out "\$6,101,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,846,000".

(b) Public Law 89-568, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "\$119,164,000" and "\$143,327,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$123,909,000" and "\$148,072,000" respectively.

Sec. 207. (a) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

(1) With respect to Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey, strike out "\$1,284,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,448,000".

(2) With respect to Naval School, Underwater Swimmers, Key West, Florida, strike out "\$100,000" and insert in place thereof "\$175,000".

(3) With respect to Navy Training Publications Center, Memphis, Tennessee, strike out "\$289,000" and insert in place thereof "\$413,000".

(4) With respect to Naval Weapons Station, Concord, California, strike out "\$95,000" and insert in place thereof "\$650,000".

(5) With respect to Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington, strike out "\$1,640,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,102,000".

(6) With respect to Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, strike out "\$1,838,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,040,000".

(7) With respect to Naval Hospital, Corpus Christi, Texas, strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,900,000".

(b) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 802 "\$234,900,000" and "\$241,765,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$239,082,000" and "\$245,947,000" respectively.

Sec. 208. (a) Public Law 91-142 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

(1) With respect to Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida, strike out "\$1,135,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,288,000".

(2) With respect to Naval Undersea Warfare Center, San Diego, California, strike out "\$6,400,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,736,000".

(3) With respect to Naval Hospital, Camp Pendleton, California, strike out "\$19,805,000" and insert in place thereof "\$24,100,000".

(b) Public Law 91-142 is amended in clause (2) of section 702 by striking out "\$271,251,000" and "\$306,305,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$276,035,000" and "\$311,089,000" respectively.

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 land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

Logan Field, Billings, Montana, \$32,000.
Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts, \$81,000.
Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado, \$5,189,000.
Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida, \$1,584,000.

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Gentile Air Force Station, Dayton, Ohio, \$240,000.
Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York, \$8,615,000.
Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, \$2,090,000.
Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$17,095,000.
Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia, \$5,551,000.
Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, \$2,727,000.
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, \$1,159,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee, \$5,082,000.
Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$2,414,000.
Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California, \$214,000.
Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida, \$6,456,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico, \$650,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico, \$1,263,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts, \$1,228,000.

Satellite Tracking Facilities, \$869,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois, \$8,504,000.
Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi, \$372,000.
Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama, \$1,510,000.
Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi, \$8,057,000.
Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$342,000.
Laredo Air Force Base, Laredo, Texas, \$627,000.
Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas, \$310,000.
Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado, \$6,002,000.
Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia, \$2,227,000.
Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$1,297,000.
Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas, \$1,047,000.
Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas, \$6,251,000.
Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma, \$1,901,000.
Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas, \$349,000.
Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona, \$4,199,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, \$677,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska, \$2,309,000.
Various Locations, \$4,886,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland, \$4,273,000.
Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, District of Columbia, \$2,300,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma, \$590,000.
Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina, \$7,136,000.
Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware, \$8,327,000.
McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington, \$619,000.
Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California, \$2,308,000.
Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois, \$3,879,000.
Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California, \$696,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii, \$1,984,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana, \$354,000.
Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas, \$213,000.
Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California, \$82,000.
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona, \$3,304,000.
Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas, \$150,000.
Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota, \$196,000.
Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming, \$178,000.
Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota, \$991,000.
K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan, \$483,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine, \$515,000.
 March Air Force Base, Riverside, California, \$209,000.
 McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida, \$139,000.
 Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, \$134,000.
 Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, \$593,000.
 Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, \$488,000.
 Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California, \$3,158,000.
 Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts, \$1,992,000.
 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan, \$663,000.
 Various Locations, \$430,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas, \$262,000.
 Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico, \$645,000.
 England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana, \$726,000.
 Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas, \$415,000.
 George Air Force Base, Victorville, California, \$962,000.
 Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida, \$856,000.
 Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia, \$4,792,000.
 Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas, \$425,000.
 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio, \$518,000.
 Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona, \$12,247,000.
 MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida, \$240,000.
 McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas, \$148,000.
 Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, \$813,000.
 Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada, \$2,082,000.
 Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina, \$1,353,000.
 Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina, \$2,548,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado, \$700,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various Locations, \$704,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Texas, \$1,216,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Eastern Test Range, \$243,000.
 Satellite Tracking Facilities, \$1,455,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Wake Island Air Force Station, Wake Island, \$1,330,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Various Locations, \$6,607,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, \$2,273,000.
 Goose Air Base, Canada, \$862,000.
 Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico, \$406,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Germany, \$5,255,000.
 United Kingdom, \$11,504,000.
 Various Locations, \$59,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Various Locations, \$644,000.

Sec. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or in-

stalling permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$22,712,000.

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 developments, (c) need 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, 1971, 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 89-188, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301 as follows:

(1) With respect to Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland, strike out "\$2,923,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,081,000."

(b) Public Law 89-188, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 "\$216,360,000" and "\$340,106,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$216,518,000" and "\$340,264,000", respectively.

Sec. 305. (a) Public Law 90-408, as amended is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301 as follows:

(1) With respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma, strike out "\$164,000" and insert in place thereof "\$280,000."

(2) With respect to Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts, strike out "\$150,000" and insert in place thereof "\$220,000."

(3) With respect to Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia, strike out "\$537,000" and insert in place thereof "\$631,000."

(4) With respect to Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina, strike out "\$99,000" and insert in place thereof "\$173,000."

(5) With respect to Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina, strike out "\$614,000" and insert in place thereof "\$707,000."

(b) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 802 "\$121,917,000" and "\$193,572,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$122,363,000" and "\$194,018,000", 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 land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for defense agencies for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE ATOMIC SUPPORT AGENCY

Bossier Base, Louisiana, \$170,000.
 Sandia Base, New Mexico, \$1,090,000.

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY

Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio, \$942,000.
 Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah, \$98,000.
 Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$3,570,000.
 Defense Depot, Tracy, California, \$1,813,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort Meade, Maryland, \$917,000.

Sec. 402. 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 \$35,000,000: *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 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 Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. If agreement cannot be reached with respect to the availability of adequate private housing at any location, the Secretary of Defense 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—

(1) The Department of the Army, one thousand seven hundred units, \$40,632,000:
 Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, two hundred units.
 Fort Huachuca, Arizona, one hundred units.
 Sacramento Army Depot, California, one unit.
 Sharpe Army Depot, California, one unit.
 Fort Carson, Colorado, two hundred twenty units.
 U.S. Army Installations, Oahu, Hawaii, three hundred units.
 Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, forty units.
 Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, one hundred fifty units.
 Natick Laboratories, Massachusetts, twenty-eight units.
 Malmstrom ABM Site, Montana, two hundred units.
 Grand Forks ABM Site, North Dakota, two hundred units.
 New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania, twenty units.
 Fort Jackson, South Carolina, two hundred forty units.
 (2) The Department of the Navy, three thousand five hundred units, \$87,312,000:
 Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, three hundred units.
 Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, two hundred fifty units.
 Naval Complex, San Diego, California, nine hundred units.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, three hundred units.

Naval Complex, Pensacola, Florida, two hundred units.

U.S. Naval Installations, Oahu, Hawaii, three hundred units.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, one hundred fifty units.

Naval Complex, Newport, Rhode Island, two hundred units.

Naval Complex, Norfolk, Virginia, six hundred units.

Naval Station, Guam, three hundred units.

(3) The Department of the Air Force, two thousand eight hundred units, \$68,075,000: Williams Air Force Base, Arizona, two hundred units.

Castle Air Force Base, California, two hundred fifty units.

Norton Air Force Base, California, two hundred fifty units.

Homestead Air Force Base, Florida, two hundred units, and additional real estate.

Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, two hundred units.

Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, two hundred units.

U.S. Air Force Installations, Oahu, Hawaii, two hundred units.

Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, four hundred units.

Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, four hundred units.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, North Carolina, two hundred units.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, three hundred units.

(b) Trailer court facilities—

(1) The Department of the Navy, fifty spaces, \$150,000.

(2) The Department of the Air Force, three hundred eighty-nine spaces, \$1,050,000.

Sec. 502. Authorization for the construction of family housing provided in this Act shall be subject, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, to the following limitations on cost, which shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and all other installed equipment and fixtures:

(a) The average unit cost for each military department for all units of family housing constructed in the United States (other than Hawaii and Alaska) and Puerto Rico shall not exceed \$24,000 including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(b) No family housing unit in the areas listed in subsection (a) shall be constructed at a total cost exceeding \$40,000 including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(c) When family housing units are constructed in areas other than those listed in subsection (a) the average cost of all such units shall not exceed \$32,000 and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$40,000. The cost limitations of this subsection shall include the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation and installation of facilities.

Sec. 503. Notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior Military Construction Authorization Acts on cost of construction of family housing, the limitations contained in section 502 of this Act shall apply to all prior authorizations for construction of family housing not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been executed by date of enactment of this Act.

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, \$5,170,000.

(b) for the Department of the Navy, \$6,300,000.

(c) for the Department of the Air Force, \$7,400,000.

(d) for the Defense Agencies, \$326,000.

Sec. 505. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, or otherwise acquire, two hundred family housing units in foreign countries at a total cost not to exceed \$5,523,000. This authority shall be funded by the use of excess foreign currencies, when so provided in Department of Defense Appropriation Acts, except that appropriation of \$488,000 is authorized for purchase of United States manufactured equipment in support of the housing.

Sec. 506. Section 515 of Public Law 84-161 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 515. During fiscal years 1971 and 1972, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge, at or near any military installation in the United States, Puerto Rico or Guam if the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, finds that there is a lack of adequate housing at or near such military installation and that (1) there has been a recent substantial increase in military strength and such increase is temporary, or (2) the permanent military strength is to be substantially reduced in the near future, or (3) the number of military personnel assigned is so small as to make the construction of family housing uneconomical, or (4) family housing is required for personnel attending service school academic courses on permanent change of station orders, or (5) family housing has been authorized but is not yet completed or a family housing authorization request is in a pending military construction authorization bill. Such housing facilities may be leased on an individual unit basis and not more than seven thousand five hundred such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may not exceed an average of \$190 per month for each military department, nor the amount of \$250 per month for any one unit, including the cost of utilities and maintenance and operation."

Sec. 507. Section 507 of Public Law 88-174 (77 Stat. 307, 326), as amended, is amended by striking out "1970 and 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "1971 and 1972."

Sec. 508. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to relocate family housing units from locations where they exceed requirements to 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. 509. 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, relocation of family housing, rental guarantee payments, construction and acquisition of trailer court facilities, and planning, an amount not to exceed \$219,502,000, and

(b) for support of military family housing, including operating expenses, leasing, maintenance of real property, payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred, payment 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 \$588,636,000.

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, \$488,789,000 outside the United States, \$92,278,000; section 102, \$2,000,000; or a total of \$583,067,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$234,738,000; outside the United States, \$21,001,000; section 202, \$974,000; or a total of \$256,713,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$191,442,000; outside the United States, \$30,638,000; section 302, \$22,712,000; or a total of \$244,792,000.

(4) for title IV: A total of \$43,600,000.

(5) for title V: Military family housing, \$308,138,000.

Sec. 603. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), any of the amounts specified in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum when inside the United States (other than Hawaii and Alaska), and by 10 per centum when outside the United States or in Hawaii and Alaska, if he determines that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such estimate was submitted to the Congress. However, the total cost of all construction and acquisition in each such title may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated in that title.

(b) When the amount named for any construction or acquisition in title I, II, or IV of this Act involves only one project at any military installation and the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines that the amount authorized must be increased by more than the applicable percentage prescribed in subsection (a), the Secretary concerned may proceed with such construction or acquisition if the amount of the increase does not exceed by more than 25 per centum the amount named for such project by the Congress.

(c) Subject to the limitations contained in subsection (a), no individual project authorized under title I, II, III, or IV of this Act for any specifically listed military installation may be placed under contract if—

(1) the estimated cost of such project is \$250,000 or more, and

(2) the current working estimate of the Department of Defense, based on bids received, for the construction of such project exceeds by more than 25 per centum the amount authorized for such project by the Congress, until after the expiration of thirty days from the date on which a written report of the facts relating to the increased cost of such project, including a statement of the reasons for such increase has been submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(d) The Secretary of Defense shall submit an annual report to the Congress identifying each individual project which has been placed under contract in the preceding twelve-month period and with respect to which the then current working estimate of the Department of Defense based upon bids received for such project exceeded the amount authorized by the Congress for that project by more than 25 per centum. The Secretary shall also include in such report each individual project with respect to which the scope was reduced in order to permit contract award within the available authorization for such project. Such report shall include all pertinent cost information for each individual project, including the amount in dollars and percentage by which the current working estimate based on the contract price for the project exceeded the amount authorized for such project by the Congress.

Sec. 604. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States and its possessions under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, or such other department or Government agency as the Secretaries of the military departments recommended and the Secretary of Defense approved to assure the most efficient, expeditious and cost-effective accomplishment of the construction herein authorized. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report annually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a breakdown of the dollar value of construction contracts completed by each of the several construction agencies selected, together with the design, construction, supervision, and overhead fees charged by each of the several agents in the execution of the assigned construction. Further, such contracts 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. 605. (a) As of October 1, 1971, 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 titles I, II, III, and IV of the Act of December 5, 1969, Public Law 91-142 (83 Stat. 293), and all such authorizations contained in Acts approved before December 6, 1969, 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) authorizations 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, 1971, and authorizations for appropriations therefor; and

(3) notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 705(a) of the Act of December 5, 1969, Public Law 91-142 (83 Stat. 293, 315), all authorizations for military public works (other than family housing), contained in titles I, II, III, IV, and V of the Act of July 21, 1968, Public Law 90-408 (82 Stat. 367), and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, and not superseded or otherwise modified, are hereby continued and shall remain in full force and effect until October 1, 1971.

(b) Effective fifteen months from the date of enactment of this Act, all authorizations for construction of family housing, including trailer court facilities, all authorizations to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions to existing family housing, and all authorizations for related facilities projects, which are contained in this or any previous Act, are hereby repealed, except—

(1) authorizations 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; and

(2) authorizations to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions to existing family housing, and authorizations for related facilities projects, as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts before such date.

Sec. 606. None of the authority contained in title I, II, III, and IV of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction projects inside the United States in excess of a unit cost to be determined in proportion to the appropriate area construction cost index, based on the following unit cost limitations where the area construction cost index is 1.0:

(1) \$41 per square foot for cold storage warehousing;

(2) \$11 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) \$3,200 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) \$11,000 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. *Provided*, That notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior Military Construction Authorization Acts on unit costs, the limitations on such costs contained in this section shall apply to all prior authorizations for such construction not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been awarded by the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 607. Chapter 159 of title 10, United States Code, is amended:

(1) By striking out the figure "\$200,000" in the item relating to section 2674 in the analysis and inserting "\$300,000" in place thereof.

(2) By striking out the figure "\$200,000" in the catchline of section 2674 and inserting "\$300,000" in place thereof.

(3) By striking out the figures "\$200,000", "\$50,000", and "\$25,000" in section 2674(b) and inserting "\$300,000", "\$100,000", and "\$50,000", respectively, in place thereof.

(4) By striking out the figure "\$25,000" in sections 2674 (a) and (e) and inserting "\$50,000" in place thereof.

Sec. 608. Section 2675 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by (1) inserting "(a)" before "Notwithstanding", and by (2) adding the following new subsections:

"(b) A lease may not be entered into under this section if the average estimated annual rental during the term of the lease is more than \$250,000 until after the expiration of thirty days from the date upon which a report of the facts concerning the proposed lease is submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

"(c) A statement in a lease that the requirements of this section have been met, or that the lease is not subject to this section, is conclusive."

Sec. 609. Section 709 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1970 (83 Stat. 317), is amended by (1) deleting from the first sentence thereof "1971" and inserting in its place "1972"; and (2) deleting from the last sentence thereof "\$750,000" and inserting in its place "\$3,000,000".

Sec. 610. Notwithstanding any other law, the Bolling/Anacostia Elementary School authorized under the heading "HEADQUARTERS COMMAND" in title III of this Act shall be operated by the Department of Defense for the exclusive use of dependents of members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps residing in the Bellevue, Wilburn, and Bolling family housing areas.

Sec. 611. Titles I, II, III, IV, V, and VI of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1971."

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 the Department of the Army:
(a) Air National Guard of the United States, \$13,700,000.

(b) Army Reserve, \$9,300,000.

(2) For the Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$4,500,000.

(3) For the Department of the Air Force:
(a) Army National Guard of the United States, \$6,500,000.

(b) Air Force Reserve, \$3,500,000.

Sec. 702. 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 lands 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. 703. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act, 1971."

Mr. RIVERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOWARD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOWARD: Page 4, line 1; delete the entire line and substitute the following:

"Fort Monmouth, N.J., \$4,157,000; *Provided*, That \$1,400,000 of that amount shall be utilized for participation in the sanitary sewer system program of the Northeast Monmouth County Regional Sewerage Authority."

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will give the congressional authority for the military installation at Fort Monmouth, N.J., to participate with various surrounding communities in the establishment of the proposed Northeast Monmouth County Regional Sewerage Authority.

Mr. Chairman, for several years central New Jersey has attempted to clear up the pollution of its waters. One of the most important aspects in this effort has

been the need for the military installation at Fort Monmouth to join with the local communities in a regional sewerage authority. In order to do this it must have the authorization of both Houses of the Congress as well as the small appropriation of \$1.4 million.

The State has urged that the military take part in this authority, and the local communities have made all the necessary arrangements as well as the tax increase so that they will meet their responsibilities. I believe it is urgent that the Federal Government cooperate in this project.

The President made a very fine statement recently wherein he requested the Federal Government and its agencies to take the lead in eliminating pollution from the streams of our country. I believe this will be a proper step in that direction. I would urge the House to authorize such participation by Fort Monmouth in this regional sewerage authority.

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

Mr. HOWARD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of such areas in the country which are similar to this. However, this bill does not contain any one of these projects. None of them are budgeted.

But I will say this to the gentleman, if I am here next year, we are going to try to get the Department of Defense to request funds for all of these projects and bring them up.

I think the gentleman would be wise, since it would not be funded, if he would withdraw his amendment. He has my word if I am here next year, I will do my best to get this included with others, which are being held up under similar conditions. We recognize this situation.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, since I have such great faith that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS) will be here next year as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and I am very grateful for his remarks, I ask unanimous consent in consideration of his statement, that the amendment be withdrawn.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. CRAMER: On page 12 between lines 20 and 21 insert the following:

"Naval Training Center, Orlando, Fla., \$11,327,000."

Strike out in clause (2) of section 602 "\$234,738,000" and "\$256,713,000" and insert in place thereof "\$246,065,000" and "\$268,040,000", respectively.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, to briefly explain my proposed amendment, its purpose is to reinstate \$11,327,000 of the \$16,013,000 total reduction made by the House Committee on Armed Services for the Naval Training Center at Orlando, Fla.—service school command. The \$11,327,000 represents funds needed to provide for bachelor enlisted quarters with mess, \$8,892,000; and for utilities, \$2,435,000. The total reduction recommended by the House committee—page 18 of House Report 91-1098—would result in the deferment of both of these projects, as well as the academic training building and the technical training building.

While I would prefer to have the entire \$16,013,000 amount reinstated, the quarters and the utilities are the immediate need items. I am further assuming that the other items, the academic and the technical training buildings, will be included as the need arises, and no later than the next fiscal year. The fact that the bachelor enlisted quarters are estimated to require more time for construction, approximately 6 additional months, provides further logic to the agreement to temporarily delay the two training buildings.

The decision to establish the Orlando Naval Training Center was made in 1965 and included the planned relocation of the Service School Command from Bainbridge, Md., to Orlando. The primary justification for this relocation was and is economy.

Cost studies on where to locate the Naval Training Center indicate development at Orlando would save \$0.6 million annually in operation and maintenance funds, plus a one-time cost avoidance of \$13 million in military construction. At least 75 percent of the graduating recruits go directly to service school; therefore, location of service schools contiguous to recruit training facilities conserves transportation time and funds. This savings would amount to an additional \$2.5 million annually.

The majority of the recruit training facilities for the Orlando Training Center have been authorized and funds appropriated in previous military construction programs. In order to start reaping the benefits of collocated service schools, the first authorization of funds for the barracks and utilities is needed now. Approval of these items is essential in order to provide basic facilities for housing and messing of service school students, with approval of the two training school buildings at the earliest date possible required to prevent separation of the interdependent facilities.

It would be false economy to defer authorization of the Orlando barracks and mess hall and utilities programs at this time. Such deferment would disrupt the orderly development of the Orlando plan and would delay the transfer of those facilities at Bainbridge, Md., and Newport, R.I., which are to be relocated at the Orlando Center.

The operation of these service schools at locations widely separated from the associated recruit training results in excessive transportation costs and inefficiencies

which will be eliminated by the planned development of the Service School Command at the Orlando National Training Center. If budgetary curtailments dictate a current reduction in the funds provided for the development of the Orlando Center, I implore my colleagues to support my amendment to reinstate at least \$11,327,000 of the reduction, believing this action is not only necessary for the orderly and efficient relocation of these facilities at the Orlando Center, but it is also a move toward long-range, sound future economy in our military construction program.

I respectfully urge the Members of this House to support my proposed amendment.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Orlando.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, first I want to commend my colleague and fellow Florida Congressman, BILL CRAMER, for his excellent presentation on behalf of the amendment. It has been my privilege to represent the district in Florida which includes the Naval Training Center, even though I was not a Member of this distinguished body when the decision was made to construct the Nation's third naval training center in Orlando. On November 25, 1965, Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance approved the memo from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics concurring in the Navy's need for a third training center to eliminate the severe overcrowding at the existing Great Lakes and San Diego Centers. Seven locations throughout the eastern United States were carefully studied as possible sites for the third training center. On December 6, 1966, Mr. Vance wrote to the chairmen of respective committees of the House and Senate reconfirming the Navy's position that Orlando was the proper location for a naval training center.

May I point out to my colleagues that the primary justification for this selection was economy. Results of comparison studies between Orlando and the only other site determined to be acceptable indicated approximately \$0.6 million annually in operations and maintenance and \$13 million in military construction. The functions at the Orlando Center were to include recruit training, service schools, WAVE recruit training, a nuclear power school and supporting units.

To date, Congress has provided \$46.5 million in funds for construction of the facilities necessary to provide recruit training for 8,000 men. At Orlando, these facilities are now under construction and will be completed in the near future so that the overcrowding at the San Diego and Great Lakes Centers can be eliminated.

As of January 29, 1970, the total capacity at the three centers was 18,722 while the number of recruits on board totaled 24,303. In other words, the centers were overcrowded to the extent of 5,581 recruits. Presently the capacity at the Orlando Center is 3,752, and I think you can see what it will mean when the full 8,000 recruits can be accommodated.

I have personally visited the center on a number of occasions and it is a facility of which we can all be proud, not like the training centers many of us went through which gave us our first impression of life in the Navy. As has been pointed out, at least 75 percent of the graduating recruits go directly to service school and the location of these schools at the same sites where recruit training takes place conserves transportation time and funds. This is presently the situation at Great Lakes and San Diego, and approximately \$2.5 million annually will be saved when service school facilities are located in Orlando. The full \$16 million recommended in the Defense Department's military construction budget for fiscal 1971 is needed to effect the substantial savings in operating expenses indicated by the Navy's economic analysis. I am hopeful this amendment of \$11,327,000 for bachelor enlisted barracks with mess facilities will be adopted so we can at least begin to provide the first facilities for this development. I hope the academic training building and the technical training building will be included as the need arises and no later than the next fiscal year. Only when the complex is fully completed will we realize the full savings possible.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, we have found out that these projects which the gentleman has included in his amendment for Orlando are high priority projects. We asked the Navy about them. As far as I am concerned, I accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman has called this matter to our attention. I am in complete agreement with the chairman of the committee that this is a thing we should do. This amendment should be adopted.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, a member of the committee.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support the amendment offered by my colleague from Florida. The House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, has found that the items included in the amendment at the new Naval Training Center at Orlando, Fla., are of high priority. This addition to the military construction bill—\$11,327,000 for bachelor enlisted quarters with mess and for utilities—will provide for an orderly and economical relocation of the Navy facilities to Orlando from Bainbridge, Md., and Newport, R.I. I hope the amendment will pass.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy that the situation on additional needed facilities for Orlando has been

worked out favorably. I recently was privileged to visit the Naval Training Center there, and I am highly impressed with the outstanding work which is being done there. The Naval Training Center is one of the most pleasing bases in appearance that I have seen, and much more important, the attitude of the trainees is outstanding and their morale is high.

Nevertheless, it is very clear that the additional facilities are needed. The workload is increasing, and I can state that the facilities which are included in the amendment offered by our distinguished colleague from Florida are essential. They should be provided at the very earliest moment. I am glad the chairman of the committee has concurred in the amendment. It is meritorious and should be approved.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the distinguished leader for his remarks. Recently he received the Chamber of Commerce award in Orlando.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. A ranking member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Military Construction, I too agree that this amendment is important. I had some serious concern when I noticed that it was not in the authorization bill, and I am delighted now that it is going to be in there. I believe that we should go ahead with this naval training station, and it is essential that the authorization be made.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. As the Members of the House know, I do not offer such amendments lightly.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to delay action on this bill, but I want to say that I object to the authorizations that are provided to expand and improve military facilities in West Germany and in Japan.

Right now before the Ways and Means Committee we are considering a very, very important trade program. Time and time again before our committee we are told about the remarkable economic recovery of both Japan and West Germany. These two nations have indeed had a remarkable economic recovery. They are trading giants, and they are killing us in the world marketplaces. One reason is that we assume for them a tremendous cost of their national security and defense. This creates a special burden for all American production and all American labor. In the world markets, we have an overhanging defense cost of \$72 billion on everything we produce. This includes what we spend to defend countries that ought to be building up their own defenses by this time.

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

Mr. VANIK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILBERT. I would like to compliment the gentleman for his statement. As a member of the Ways and Means Com-

mittee, I can say we have been having hearings in trade and tariffs, and the gentleman raised the point during the testimony we received this morning. I think it is a very valid point. I agree with him completely and thoroughly.

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

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I want to tell the gentleman that about 2 months ago I was in Germany as chairman of a subcommittee studying the withdrawal of troops from NATO. In Germany the individual that I spoke with when I asked that they contribute toward the maintenance of our 310,000 soldiers in NATO said to me, "Well, I don't know. We are not going to do anything." He refused to say that they would give any assistance toward the cost of maintaining our troops in Europe. I do not think there is anything that we should do today in the way of expending our funds in order to assist them any further when they absolutely refuse to come to the aid of the United States in the maintenance of our troops in Europe.

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

Mr. VANIK. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. RIVERS. Of course, the gentleman does not object to our providing for the comfort and the protection of our own troops so long as they are in foreign countries.

So far as Germany is concerned, Germany has paid hundreds of millions of dollars for the maintenance of our troops. Furthermore, they have equipped themselves with our tanks and other equipment. Germany has paid many times what the other NATO allies have.

So far as Japan is concerned, I appreciate what the gentleman is talking about, but we have troops over there. We have them in both countries. But this is for the comfort of our own flesh and blood, whom we compel to serve overseas. That is all this is.

Mr. VANIK. I want to bring them home, I want to reduce these expenditures. I want to make American goods competitive in the world. The only way we can do that is by taking off our backs this tremendous expenditure which is added to the cost of everything we sell in the markets of the world.

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

Mr. VANIK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from Ohio suggesting that we bring our troops home from everywhere in the wide world? It sounds as if the gentleman is moving in the direction of isolationism, which may be the case. I do not know.

Mr. VANIK. I am suggesting we shift the defense burdens to those countries which are capable of handling their own defense expenditures. I do not think that these economically strong countries should rely on us for defense and use their released energies and resources to take over our own world markets. I do not think that is fair competition.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can arrive at some agreement on a time limitation.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 2 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 Michigan (Mr. NEDZI).

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of announcing to the House that when we go back into the House it is my intention to ask for a vote on the previous question following the motion to recommit. This is for the purpose, if the previous question is voted down, of amending the motion to recommit in line with the Pike amendment, to provide for the striking of funds for construction of Safeguard facilities.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN).

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to embellish the statement I made a moment ago. We spend about \$12 billion a year to maintain our troops in Europe. In the course of my travels, I could not get the admission of any nation's defense minister to agree to pick up the burden of the cost of the defense of our troops there. I said our priorities are such that they must pick up the cost of our troops. I could not get the consent of anyone. Why we should pay the costs to maintain our troops which protect them is beyond me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FISHER).

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I spent several hours at Kelly Air Force Base. There I was briefed on operations and plans, which brings me to a provision I desire to discuss.

The Air Force proposes to construct a modern depot engine overhaul facility for \$15.7 million at Kelly Air Force Base in San Antonio, Tex. This plant will pay for itself within the first year of operation. In fact, the Air Force, in anticipating the beneficial use of this building by July of 1972, has already reduced its request for engine procurement this year by \$10 million. Engines to be overhauled in this new plant include those used in the F-4, the C-130, and the C-5A aircraft. The facilities presently being used for the overhaul of engines at Kelly Air Force Base were built in World War I as truck repair shops, and in World War II as wooden warehouses. These buildings, even if repaired and modified, would be completely inadequate for efficiently overhauling modern jet engines. Nearly \$2 million would be required to repair and modify these old buildings if this new plant were not constructed.

Currently, work force productivity is limited by the conditions within the existing buildings. These limitations are due to poor environmental control and material flow patterns made necessary by adapting the job to the facility. The

dispersed location of these buildings also creates an equivalent engine overhaul flow distance of 37 miles.

The proposed facility will provide a modern highly productive engine overhaul plant which will allow for a 10 or more percent productivity increase. Engine overhaul flow distance will be reduced by 80 percent. This increased productivity and decreased flow distances will, in turn, effect considerable inventory reductions.

The labor, inventory, and other savings to be achieved make this a most worthy and wise investment at this time.

My colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), has been very actively interested in this project.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment and yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS).

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time so we can get moving.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER).

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. RIVERS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments to title III.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. RIVERS: Page 23, after line 4, insert:

"McClellan AFB, Sacramento, California, \$4,615,000."

On page 25, after line 22, insert:

"Beale AFB, Marysville, California, \$1,364,000."

Mr. RIVERS. Beale Air Force Base and McClellan Air Force Base are in the same category, Mr. Chairman. We required the Air Force to certify to us the need for these projects, because we got information that certain of these installations were going to be curtailed, particularly in the case of McClellan. McClellan is the largest air materiel base on the west coast. It has approximately 22,000 civilians.

We do not want to see it closed. We want it to remain open. It has a logistics requirement which is needed, and we do not believe it should be tampered with.

There are a lot of people who think that with the "longlegged" aircraft like the C-5A, of which we have only a few, we do not need these air materiel bases. We wanted the Air Force to certify the need and they did. That is the reason why we restored these.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. I want to extend to the distinguished chairman my appreciation for the cooperation extended to me and to my colleagues representing this area during the past few days, and also for the cooperation of the staff of the committee. I recognize this is a very complicated and difficult piece of legislation. I

appreciate the amendment the gentleman has offered to correct what had been put forward.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman. I should like to say, just about anything we deferred is needed. It was merely deferred. We could put in 10 times as much.

We do not think there ought to be any cutback. Last year there was about an \$800 million deferral. We do not want any of this bill held back. I hope it will not be.

We want these people to tell us things on which we can depend to make future plans. That is the reason.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, they have satisfactorily explained this.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to thank the chairman and the ranking minority Member of the great Committee on Armed Services for the consideration given to McClellan Air Force Base and to Beale Air Force Base. They are very worthy facilities, located in the West. They do a very good job in supplying our people in the area of Southeast Asia.

We are happy the committee has seen fit to restore the items.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask someone what this new Pentagon, or Pentagon auxiliary, to be constructed at Bolling Air Force Base, is going to cost?

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

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

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted the gentleman asked that. We own property over at Bolling-Anacostia which is invaluable.

Mr. GROSS. I understand.

Mr. RIVERS. We have over 200 projects in the District of Columbia, Northern Virginia, and Maryland, where we pay rent, which goes up into many millions of dollars each year. We asked Secretary McNamara to go over and utilize the ground we have there, to centralize our defense activities. Secretary Laird is the first person who seems to comprehend.

This is the beginning of what I hope will be the utilization of valuable land, where we can put all of the installations in the District of Columbia, Northern Virginia, and Maryland into one area. This is the beginning of it.

Mr. GROSS. As I understand it, this building starts off in this bill at \$16.2 million?

Mr. RIVERS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. What I am trying to ascertain is the estimated total cost.

Mr. RIVERS. How much will it cost?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS. It will cost \$75 million or \$100 million.

Mr. GROSS. How much?

Mr. RIVERS. \$75 million or \$100 million.

Mr. GROSS. Is it anticipated that

those who are now being moved out to facilities such as Crystal City will later be located in this new building?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. RIVERS. In this one building alone there will be approximately 10,000 employees.

Mr. GROSS. It is not proposed to abandon the Pentagon, sometimes known as "Fort Fumble", is it?

Mr. RIVERS. As the gentleman knows, I am in the same business he is in. I believe we ought to try to save money. The only way we can do it is to have as many facilities as possible on our own ground. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent. This is the beginning. We have to save the taxpayers' money.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RIVERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIVERS: On page 37, line 16, delete "facilities" and insert "utilities."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, in the haste to get this bill printed they printed the word "facilities" when they should have printed "utilities." That is all this corrects there.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RIVERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIVERS: On page 41, lines 22 and 23, strike the figure "\$488,789,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$497,038,000"; and on line 24, strike the figure "\$583,067,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$591,316,000"; and on page 42, lines 4 and 5, strike the figure "\$191,442,000" and in lieu thereof insert "\$197,421,000"; and on line 6, strike the figure "\$244,792,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$250,771,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. This amendment just corrects the totals and the grand totals under the proper titles. That is all it does.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RIVERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIVERS: on page 50, line 9, delete "Air" and insert in place thereof "Army."

On page 50, line 15, delete "Army" and insert in place thereof "Air."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, all this does is correct a printer's error.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SIKES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES: On page 22, lines 22 and 23, strike out "\$1,584,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,853,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered to correct an error by the Air Force in tabulating the costs of the projects for Tyndall Air Force Base in Florida that are covered in this bill and for no other purpose. I have cleared the amendment with the distinguished chairman and the distinguished ranking minority leader. I am most appreciative to them and to the committee for their action in approving these needed facilities, but the dollar amount listed is wrong and I hope to correct it here.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BENNETT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT: On page 51, after line 9, insert the following:

"Sec. 801(a). There is hereby created for use by the Secretary of Defense the Defense Facilities Replacement Fund, hereinafter referred to as the 'Fund,' which shall be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses authorized in accordance with section 803 of this Act.

"(b) The fund shall be credited with (1) the net proceeds, as defined in the last sentence of 40 U.S.C. 485(c), hereafter received from the handling and the disposal of real and related personal property of the Department of Defense as authorized by section 802 hereof, exclusive of family housing, and (2) such funds as may hereafter be appropriated by the Congress for the purpose to provide adequate capital for the fund.

"Sec. 802. Whenever the Secretary of Defense determines that it is in the public interest or is necessary for national defense purposes to relocate or replace an existing military installation or facility, including family housing, in whole or in part, he may authorize the disposal of all or part of the real and related personal property which comprises such installation or facility. The General Services Administration shall act as the disposal agent in accordance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended: *Provided, however,* That any property reported by the Department of Defense to the General Services Administration for disposal pursuant to this Act must be either sold for fair market value as determined by the Administrator, General Services Administration with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense or exchanged for other property acceptable to the Secretary of Defense for use as a replacement installation or facility: *And provided further,* That disposals pursuant to this section shall be upon such terms and conditions together with such reservations, exceptions, covenants and restrictions as the Secretary

of Defense determines to be necessary in the public interest or for the national defense.

"Sec. 803. Appropriations, to be derived from the fund, are authorized to be made for the purpose of: (1) defraying expenses of acquiring, constructing, converting, expanding, rehabilitating, repairing or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment which are necessary to establish or develop military installations or facilities for those to be disposed of in accordance with section 802, (2) defraying expenses of supervision, overhead, planning, design and inspection and related expenses incident to the establishment of such military installations and facilities; and (3) defraying the expenses incurred in connection with the transfer of activities to the new location.

"Sec. 804. Section 501(b) of Public Law 87-554 (76 Stat. 223, 237) as amended, is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and adding the following new clause: 'and (4) for the purpose of acquiring or constructing family housing units at installations or facilities to be established or developed in accordance with the Defense Facility Replacement Fund Act and for the purpose of debt service as provided in this section: proceeds of the handling and the disposal of family housing of the Department of Defense at installations or facilities to be relocated or replaced in accordance with the Defense Facility Replacement Fund Act, including related land and improvements, whether handled or disposed of by the Department of Defense or any other Federal Agency, but less those expenses payable pursuant to section 204(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 485 (b)); and such funds which may be transferred by the Secretary of Defense from the Defense Facility Replacement Fund; to remain available until expended.'

"Sec. 805(a). No military installation or facility, or any part thereof, may be disposed of pursuant to the authority contained in section 802 of this Act, and no expenditures may be made from the fund for relocating or replacing an installation or facility to be disposed of unless such a project is specifically authorized by law.

"(b) This section is not applicable to the disposal or exchange of real property or the acquisition or construction of facilities which may be otherwise authorized.

"Sec. 806. This title may be cited as the 'Defense Facilities Replacement Fund Act.'

Mr. RIVERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be considered as read so that the distinguished gentleman who is acting for the committee can explain just exactly what this amendment proposes to do.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, such a long amendment really has a very brief purpose.

There are some places in the United States where the military are occupying pieces of land where they are being almost involuntarily forced out of this land because of the nature of the areas. There is just not enough over-flight space and the various communities have a hard time living with it. It is more expensive land than the Government should use for the use now made of it. However, under present circumstances there is no way, really, as the law now stands, without this amendment, where-by the Government can get out of this

land and get into less expensive land and land that they can use better.

The sole purpose of this amendment is to provide a means whereby funds which are developed as a result of the disposal of lands in these congested areas would be applied toward the removal of a particular base to another area.

Any action taken under this amendment will have to be reported back to the legislative Committees on Armed Services of both the House and the Senate and the two Committees on Appropriations. Thereby, we will have plenty of oversight as well as further oversight by the Real Estate Subcommittees of both the House and the Senate. There will be three oversights before both the House and Senate before anything is actually done as a result of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the adoption of this amendment will allow the military where it has been encompassed by construction in metropolitan areas to remove its operations to a more remote area.

We have been looking for a solution to this problem for a long time. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Real Estate I am glad that we have come up with a workable system in order to accomplish this.

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

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

Mr. CAREY. Not having seen the amendment nor the wording of it, I have this fear: Would this amendment do anything to change the distribution of surplus property and disposal funds that would take those funds away from their present purposes, some of which are for recreation and some of which are for education and health priorities in the local areas? Would it change these?

Mr. BENNETT. It would change the format of the existing law, but as a practical matter you cannot lose any money for this particular objective because the military is not about to move out of these bases without the aid of this amendment.

Mr. CAREY. Well, if the military does not move out of the base, how will the base be sold?

Mr. BENNETT. The base just will not be sold at all.

Mr. CAREY. Let us talk about the Brooklyn Navy Shipyard. Say they sold that base and moved the facilities to Charleston, S.C.; What would happen with the funds they received for the sale of the Brooklyn Navy Yard?

Mr. BENNETT. Of course, the gentleman is suggesting this in the context of a particular move. Any such move would have to be approved in the authorizing committees.

Mr. CAREY. I do not think they would have much trouble getting approval from the authorizing committees to move it to South Carolina.

Mr. BENNETT. On the contrary, I think they would have difficulty.

Mr. CAREY. Well, they did not, and that is exactly what happened.

Mr. BENNETT. What happened? We did not make a move from the Brooklyn Navy Yard to Charleston, S.C.

Mr. CAREY. My dear colleague, I re-

gret to say it, but we lost everything in Brooklyn.

Mr. BENNETT. To Charleston, S.C.?

Mr. CAREY. It went somewhere.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not think it is accurate to say that it went to Charleston, S.C.

Mr. CAREY. Then let us say that it went to Philadelphia and Norfolk. It certainly left Brooklyn, and the funds for that facility now are converted into funds for recreation and certain other purposes, for the acquisition of open space and parkland.

Mr. BENNETT. I get the point the gentleman is making, and I am yielding because I think I can make the point very clear, I believe the gentleman is. It is true that the funds that accrue from the sale of this land would be involved only in the movement of this particular base or some other base under similar circumstances; and that is the purpose of this legislation. Unless you pass this amendment we will just continue to carry on just like we have in the past.

We must have priorities, but there are some priorities which are not proper priorities in this country. For example, we find that we have the military occupying land which really ought to be going for high rise apartments or something else. For instance, we find that such valuable land is being used for rifle training purposes, and for people going up in helicopters, much to the concern of people living in those areas; and they are protesting such uses, and as a consequence naturally the Federal Government is leaving itself wide open for suits because of these lawsuits from overflights.

If you resist this amendment you would just leave things as they are. These communities are insisting that the military get out, but the Federal Government cannot afford to get out, because the moneys simply are not there to move these facilities. When it does, it has to spend a tremendous amount of money to move, or it has to spend a tremendous amount of money to provide new facilities. If it does not move it opens itself up to judgments and things like that because of overflights.

And bear in mind that each one of such moves would have a triple oversight in both Houses, Congress would have six times in which to look it over before it could happen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let us talk for a moment about the volunteer army for our military services. There is but one way that you are going to be able to talk people into joining a volunteer military force, and that is if you are going to provide adequate accommodations and conveniences. For example, we have people living up in New York at Camp Drum, N.Y., who are living in World War II housing, housing that does not even have the proper protection against the cold in the winter months, they have no weather stripping, "no nothing."

When we sell a piece of valuable property, it will be placed in escrow to provide proper accommodations at a new

location. We are tens of thousands of houses short for our military. This will permit us to maintain orderly planning.

As it is now, the money is taken and placed into the Treasury and other use is made of it. However, this way it will be held in escrow. We will know where it is, and its use will be considered by the proper committees of the Congress.

As of now we have so many priorities—all sorts of priorities, and frequently our military funds are the source that they are looking to, because they always look to the military to get something. We have had cases where surplus property has been turned over to the cities and they have made many millions of dollars out of it. Why should we not utilize some of this money?

Secretary Laird is the first person who has comprehended this situation. We have begged them to do this, so that they could orderly plan for the use of the money. There will be plenty of restrictions, plenty of oversight, plenty of opportunity for the proper committees who have cognizance of these matters to look into these matters.

That is why it was turned over to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) and he had hearings on it and that is why it is here.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NEDZI. I do not know whether I support this amendment or not. Here is an amendment that is three pages long.

The question I have, Mr. Chairman, is why this did not come up before the Committee on Armed Services. It seems to me rather unusual to bring an amendment of this length and so complicated before the House at this point.

Mr. RIVERS. It did come before the Committee on Armed Services and it was turned over to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) and he had hearings.

Mr. NEDZI. Why was it not reported to the committee?

Mr. RIVERS. It is being reported right now. I am telling the gentleman. The last hearings were held last week by the subcommittee.

Mr. NEDZI. The full committee never had any knowledge of this.

Mr. RIVERS. That was subsequent to the last date of the full committee hearings, and that is why, if the amendment had come before the full committee, it would have been acted upon as a part of this bill.

Mr. NEDZI. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VANIK. As I understand it, these funds that are accumulated through the sale of real estate and other things that belong to the various portions of the Defense Establishment can then only be used by the Department of Defense for such purposes as they might determine wise. Would there be any reappropriation of these funds?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) to answer the gentleman.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, this

only applies where there has been pressure on a military installation to remove from an area because of overflights and for whatever other reason—but does not apply generally speaking.

This particular situation relates only to places where the military has been involuntarily forced out of an area.

Mr. VANIK. And this money would not have to be reappropriated?

Mr. BENNETT. Oh, yes, it would have to be reappropriated.

Mr. VANIK. Out of the escrow funds?

Mr. BENNETT. They would first have to go before the committee, the authorization committee for a line item. Then there would have to be an appropriation for it as well.

Mr. VANIK. Can the gentleman tell me that it would have to be reappropriated? That is all I want to know.

Mr. BENNETT. It would have to be reappropriated.

Mr. VANIK. The gentleman can reassure me as to that?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, I can.

This was unanimously passed out of our subcommittee by both Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the years that I have been privileged to be a Member of the House of Representatives, I have always supported the Armed Services Committee and their legislation which they have presented to the House of Representatives, and I intend to support the present bill, but the amendment which was offered by our colleague from Florida strikes at the very heart of several other pieces of legislation now on our statute books and I must, therefore, oppose the amendment. The chairman of the Government Operations Committee and the chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee have not been consulted in this matter.

I have been astounded at the statements made by members of the Committee on Armed Services that when military property is declared surplus and disposed of by the General Services Administration that the moneys derived therefrom go into the general fund of the Treasury.

This is not a correct statement of fact. When property is declared surplus by the military and handled in the manner provided for the disposal of surplus property, the proceeds thereof go into the land and water conservation fund. The money in the land and water conservation fund is then appropriated by the Appropriations Committee to the various agencies of the Federal Government and to the States for the acquisition and construction of recreational areas. If any funds from the sale of military surplus are not appropriated within a 5-year period from the date of their being covered into the fund, then and then only does it go into the General Fund of the Treasury of the United States.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT. I agree with you. I never said anything to the contrary.

Mr. SAYLOR. No, you did not say so, but some other people did.

The change in the manner of disposition and the funds received from the sale of surplus military property was agreed to by the Honorable Carl Vinson when he was chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. Mr. Vinson heartily endorsed the establishment of the land and water conservation fund and felt that it was proper that the funds of the sale of surplus military property should go into that fund, and remain there to be appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations. It was at his insistence that the 5-year provision was placed in the land and water legislation in order to prevent funds languishing in the land and water conservation fund or creating a surplus for that fund as this amendment proposes to do for the military.

Now very frankly, there has been no recommendation that I know of by any prior administration or this administration that has ever changed that position. The position of the prior administrations and this administration is that this land and water conservation fund be increased. The fact of the matter is there is now pending before the Committee on Rules a bill increasing from \$200 million a year to \$300 million a year, the amount that goes into the land and water conservation fund.

If you adopt this amendment and if you adopt this approach for the military, then you are completely negating what the Congress has said they want to do with the land and water conservation fund.

It is that simple. Now I am happy to yield to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee for any comment that he desires to make.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, if the money is not expended, it ends up in the general revenue. But when military property, defense surplus, is cataloged through the military, it then goes to GSA.

Mr. SAYLOR. It goes to the General Services Administration.

Mr. RIVERS. I am not talking about the Surplus Property Act. Once the property is sold, the military has no control over the money. It makes no difference where it goes. The gentleman has stated that now it goes into the land and water conservation fund. I accept that statement. What I want, and what the amendment seeks to provide, is that when we have a piece of property that is owned by the military, we can dispose of it and use the money received to further the interests of the military. That is all the amendment would do.

There is a great deal of property which would not be handled in that fashion. Lots of property would be allowed to go the other way. But when we have an out-and-out business deal, that is what this amendment would be applicable to.

Mr. SAYLOR. The net effect of this amendment will be that \$50 million a year or more received from the sale of surplus military property will not go into the land and water conservation fund.

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

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

Mr. KING. If the gentleman will read

section 802, at the end of the line, the second line, he will see the following language: "For purposes of relocating or replacing existing military installation or facility."

This provision would not interfere with any sale of surplus property, real or personal, except, for example, in a situation such as that which exists at El Torro, Calif., where I understand the community wants to get us out of there. We have to replace that base. We want to take the money received from the sale of that valuable property and use it to build and install another base in order to provide the same facility.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. RIVERS. The New York Port Authority might desire to use McGuire Air Force Base. If it is so needed by them, and we can sell it, we still need the McGuire Base or some such base as that facility provides. Under this amendment we can proceed to replace it. That is all the amendment would do.

I have a high respect for the gentleman's ability. I do not question what the gentleman says about the land and water conservation fund because I know he knows what he is talking about. But this amendment would take care of a business deal in such cases as those referred to. We may not want to be in a metropolitan area. A base is a base to us. We may not want such a base in a congested area. The gentleman from New York has spoken about a base in California. We have a city which has grown up at the end of the runway.

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. BENNETT. Briefly, I merely wish to emphasize that I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in speaking, did misunderstand the purpose of the amendment. If he will read it carefully, he will see that this is so. Actually, I seriously doubt that a single penny would not find its way into the land and water conservation fund, or any other such meritorious fund, if we passed this legislation. I have been chairman of the Subcommittee on Real Estate I do not know how many years now, a long number of years, and the most frustrating thing that I see in this committee is the fact that the Federal Government, in the military, is occupying some extremely expensive land. It is not in accord with the proper priorities of this country to have the Federal Government, through the military, occupy this land. It is expensive land. The people who live in the area do not want the military there, and the military do not want particularly to be there. But they do not have the money to move out. For instance, we might have a \$50 million base, and if the base would be moved 50 miles west or something like that, it could be built on land that would be valued at \$5 million. So I say the military should not be discouraged from moving out and giving proper priorities to that land. Under this

they could move away and the project could be financed.

Then they can move away and finance the project. As it now is, they are just not going to move. The Federal Government is not going to give up a military base it now has and needs for military purposes just because it sits on an expensive piece of land.

This has been one of the frustrating and difficult things for my committee to meet. Then the Department came up with this proposal. It seemed a good one. We held hearings. There was not a dissenting vote in the committee. We made some change in it as it came to us. They were not extensive changes.

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

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, was anyone from the conservation people in to testify before the gentleman's committee?

Mr. BENNETT. The conservation people would not have very much interest in going before our committee. Except in a very few cases these are not places involving the conservation people. They are not places the conservation people would be interested in. For the most part they are urban, downtown areas.

Mr. MEEDS. The money from the sale of surplus property will go into the Land and Water Conservation Act?

Mr. BENNETT. The gentleman must not have listened to what I said. I said there was not going to be any amount of money coming to that fund from this operation.

The Government is just not going to move. It has the property it needs, and it needs the property. It ought to be getting out of that property and going to less expensive types of land.

The House can defeat this if it wants to, but it will not add one penny to the conservation purposes. Then we will have the Federal Government sitting on land which has potential better use, which is not being used to the extent it should be, and we are really fighting against the priorities of this country if we fight this amendment.

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

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I want the committee to absolutely understand what is involved here. The Defense Department has testified to our committee that the release of those pieces of land in the amendment is needed because cities are growing up around them. If they cannot dispose of these bases and get a better deal somewhere else in the same area, such as in California, they are not going to move. This is not surplus property. They will stay there if they have to, but they want to move under an orderly process, and this is the only way they can do it, as we see it now.

That is what this is all about. This is not surplus property. This is not water conservation property, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania said. It is property such as McGuire in New York and one in California, where they would like to

build a new base if they can sell their present property at a price which would justify their removal. Otherwise they will stay there as long as they have to. That will not be declared surplus, I can guarantee that.

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

(On request of Mr. RIVERS and by unanimous consent, Mr. BENNETT was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. RIVERS. This is not the reason for having this in here. We want it so we can plan in an orderly manner. That is all it does. There is not any hocus-pocus. We do not do business in this way.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, does not this amendment simply permit the Army to sell parcel A, so to speak, and take the money for the sale and with it buy parcel B?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct—with thorough scrutiny by the Congress in the process.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. And if they get more money for the parcel A than they have to pay for parcel B, the money goes into escrow to buy parcel C.

Mr. BENNETT. That is right. It is to encourage the Government to move off property where they should not be.

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

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, in the example given where they want to move from a property in town, if they get \$105 million for that, and they have to pay \$60 million for another property, and they have a surplus of \$45 million, what happens to that surplus?

Mr. BENNETT. It goes into an account to be used for similar moves.

Mr. TIERNAN. That \$45 million should go into the land and water conservation program.

Mr. BENNETT. When the proposal first came to us, it had a proposal for funding of \$50 million immediately, so it would have more flexibility.

At my motion we took that out. I said, "Well, you ought to have enough, because you are going to have this money coming back, which you mentioned. That is all we are going to give you. We will let you have that money which comes that way."

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

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I should like to ask the gentleman from Florida to answer a question. What effect will this amendment have, if any, on the disposal of surplus military property for school purposes, fire stations, and that kind of thing?

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

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

Mr. BENNETT. It will have no effect as a practical matter as to anybody getting any money for any purpose, because the military, as the chairman

pointed out, is not going to move from these bases without this legislation. It is not going to diminish one penny for other purposes because the military has no intention of moving unless this passes. These are only bases they need. These bases are not being closed for a diminution of military need. These military bases have been encompassed by cities. The property has become valuable.

They should be moved into a lower type of land use, allowing housing to be built, and that type of thing.

There will not actually be any money going to the water conservation fund or to the general treasury or to anybody if we do not pass the amendment. If we do pass the amendment the Government will be moving the military off the higher priority type land onto lower priority type land. That is the purpose of the proposed legislation.

Mr. NEDZI. I believe it is quite apparent that the amendment raises a great many questions. It would have been completely in order to have this amendment heard by the full Committee on Armed Services.

As I stated before in my question to the chairman, this matter did not come up before the full committee. To me it is a matter of great importance, and certainly it should have.

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

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

Mr. RIVERS. It did come before the full committee. I asked the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) to have a hearing on it. It was before the full committee, and it was not offered to the full committee because the subcommittee hearings were held subsequent to the last full committee hearings.

Mr. NEDZI. The committee did not have the benefit of hearings.

Mr. RIVERS. It did come before the Committee on Armed Services.

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

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

Mr. BENNETT. When this matter came up the chairman announced what it was. The policy was announced to the full committee. My committee was given the responsibility of drafting the precise language. Thus the issue had already been settled.

I did not dream up this procedure. It was a question of doing it in the speedy time it needed to be done. This was done in my subcommittee, which was directed at the command of the chairman in a full committee meeting to find precise language which would accomplish the objective. So in a sense it was before the full committee.

Mr. NEDZI. In a sense.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I would respectfully direct some questions to the gentleman from Florida, Mr. BENNETT.

The first question I believe can be answered rather briefly. Is it the contemplation of the committee that this arrangement would apply to three, four, five or six specific cases which they have in mind, or would it be a long-range policy?

Mr. BENNETT. Well, it certainly would apply to three facilities that are in mind at the present time in the Department of Defense. One of them, I believe, is El Toro in California.

Mr. KYL. The second question also requires only a brief answer.

Does this language of this amendment in any respect involve exchanges of land?

Mr. BENNETT. I presume it could be done, but it was not the real purpose of the proposed legislation. I presume there is that general power in the Government to do that. If there is not, this does not add it.

Mr. KYL. Does the amendment in any way relate by language to exchanges of land?

Mr. BENNETT. This does not add to any such power the Government might have in that.

I do not know whether that power exists in the Government at the present time or not, but this legislation does not add to that power and does not create the power.

Mr. KYL. The third question is: Is there any provision in this amendment which would permit the sale of present military property for less than fair market value or at less than fair value for any consideration such as schools, hospitals, recreation, and so forth?

Mr. BENNETT. There is no provision in this legislation to do what you suggest.

Mr. KYL. Am I correct, then, in assuming that the price at which this property would be sold would be on an appraised fair market value or by bid?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. KYL. But in no case would it be less than fair market value?

Mr. BENNETT. In no case would it be less than fair market value.

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

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. That is the present law. It has to be fair market value.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes. He was asking about the law.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am probably not as well informed on the meaning of this amendment as I should be, but I submit that it is far-reaching in its effect.

Now, I do not appear in the well of the House as an antagonist to the military program of this country. As the chairman of the committee knows, I have supported the military program. But, as I understand it—and I speak as the author of the Federal Property and Administrative Act of 1949 that set up the General Services Administration and set up a formula for the disposition of federally owned property. In the disposition of this property there are three categories. First, there is the category that if the property is not needed by the Federal agency, it is circulated among the other Federal agencies. Secondly, if the other Federal agencies do not need it, then it is declared surplus.

At first it is excess to the agency's need that happens to be occupying the property. For example, if the Air Force is occupying it and it is excess to their need, all of the other agencies of the

Government, both civilian and military, are circulated as to their need for it. Then, if no one claims it from the other Government agencies, it is declared surplus. At that time there are certain well-defined provisions in the Surplus Property Act which say that that property can be claimed by State or local political subdivisions for education or hospitals at a nominal cost. The taxpayers paid for it and the taxpayers are supposed to be allowed to use it.

In the third category it is for recreation, parks and that sort of thing. The local entity is allowed to buy it as 50 percent of its appraised market value. This is not what the Government paid for it. The Government may pay \$1 for it, but it may be worth \$1 million. I have in my district an Air Force base of 400 acres that was ceded to the Government for \$2—two different parcels for \$2. That property today is worth \$100,000 an acre. If it were sold by the Federal Government, it would bring \$100,000 an acre, because it is 4 miles from downtown Los Angeles and is in the center of a very high-priced industrial district. If that property is sold, then the money goes into the General Treasury.

Now, if I understand the gentleman's amendment correctly, this says, for instance, that if the Presidio in San Francisco were to be declared surplus—and I would not even attempt to say what it is worth, although I would say it is worth maybe \$1 billion because it is very valuable land—if that property were sold—and it ought to be sold, I believe, because the Government, right across the bay from it, around Vallejo, has several thousand acres, or they did the last time I knew anything about it, which is relatively cheap land. Letterman's Hospital—and other facilities could be moved to Government-owned land across San Francisco Bay—land which is relatively cheap. The homes of the generals and admirals who live on the Presidio property could very easily be moved there.

If it is sold for \$1 billion and then the money remains in a revolving fund in the military, the Congress loses control over it. The Appropriations Committee loses control of the appropriations—and in my opinion it sets up backdoor financing about which we have heard so much.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RIVERS. Not under this. This would be under the cognizance of the committee having jurisdiction.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Well, the committee having jurisdiction is the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RIVERS. The Armed Services Committee and the Congress. It would have to be authorized by law.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The chairman has jurisdiction over the Presidio at this time and if the Presidio is sold, the jurisdiction would go, under the formula for the disposal of excess property, into the Treasury and then the gentleman if he wanted to use any of that money would go and justify it in a regular routine way.

But, I submit, as I understand the amendment, and if I do not, I would like to have it explained to me, under the gentleman's amendment—and it is quite ambiguous; I have looked at it and it is not clear—his answer to one of the questions posed by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL) was not a clear answer when it was stated that it would not be sold for less than its market value. There is nothing in the amendment that says it has to be sold for fair market value.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the general law.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That it would be general but in the category of general law the 1949 Property and Administrative Act provides a present formula which Congress has approved and which has stood the test of time.

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

(By unanimous consent Mr. HOLIFIELD was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Under existing law that money goes into the general fund and is not available as a pool for the Defense Department to use, without proper congressional control.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will support every justifiable appropriation that is asked for by the Armed Services Committee and have done so in the past. I have supported it because I believe that they know their business and they know what they are doing. But I submit to you as I understand this amendment, it sets up a completely different method of disposing of military property. It takes land just like the Presidio or any other lands that have increased tremendously in value and it gives to the military a tremendous fund which has not been appropriated by the Congress nor specified for certain purposes.

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

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

Mr. KYL. Is not this the difference? This amendment proposes that if the military has plot A and wants plot B, they sell plot A and buy plot B and if there is a surplus it is held in escrow?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The surplus is held in a revolving fund in the control of the military for such uses as they may use it to acquire other properties without congressional consent and without the screening through the Congress.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes.

Mr. KYL. This then as the gentleman describes the intent of the amendment, under the present system if the Government holds plot A and wants to move to plot B, they buy plot B and declare plot A surplus?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right. And, if the amount is greater for the selling of A, the difference—the amount of money involved may be considered by the Appropriations Committee as an offset, probably, by the Appropriations Committee for the purchase of plot B.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes, I yield further to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. RIVERS. Let us take the case of the Presidio for a moment. Now, if you are located near a city and the city has grown up around a base and it is declared surplus, the procedure follows the course of the Surplus Property Act. Then you can build a new base and authorize the money and if someone holds it up, you will never get the property.

It does not make a continental to me if you adopt this amendment or not. It is a good idea. But in view of the confusion, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida be permitted to withdraw this amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I do not find it a happy instance to oppose this amendment, but I do so because it was sprung on me suddenly, and I feel that in justification as the acting chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, that we are changing a procedure under the Federal Administration and Property Act of 1949 and I, as acting chairman, would like to come before the gentleman's committee and testify at length on this.

Mr. RIVERS. If the gentleman would yield, I would say, why, certainly.

But, Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from California, that this has no reference to a particular base here or there, but it is to take care of those bases where we are being driven out, the city fathers and the county fathers, and the other local people want the property for civilian purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we have gotten so much misinformation on this subject here this afternoon, I think that perhaps the gentleman from Florida might be willing to withdraw his amendment, and that would be best under the circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) be permitted to withdraw his amendment.

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to say that if I withdraw this amendment, that the amendment, as has been expressed many times here before, is strictly designed for the purpose of seeing to it that expensive land which should have a better priority for some of our urban needs today can be utilized for that purpose, and to encourage the military to move off of such land.

I think it is a well-drafted amendment. I did not originally draft the amendment myself, so I have no pride of authorship, but I think it is a good amendment, and I think the colloquy that has taken place here today shows that it would be a good thing for somebody to introduce it as a bill. I do not plan to introduce it as a bill myself at this time.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, if we decide to bring it up later may I say that we will invite all of these gentlemen to testify. We do not sail under false colors, and again I say that this legislation is not for the purpose of getting rid of any particular base. It is not directed at what the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania had to say about it, but, in view of the colloquy today let us withdraw the amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I make the reservation, Mr. Chairman, simply for the purpose of clearing up the colloquy that I had with the distinguished gentleman from Florida and the distinguished chairman of the committee, during which time we discussed the movement of the Brooklyn Naval Shipyard, and at one point I mentioned Charleston, S.C., and I did so merely for the purpose of example. I want to say to the chairman that he knows as well as I do that he did work very hard to keep that base open, and that it was the then Secretary of Defense who had it closed.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would simply like to add, in addition to the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the committee, that everybody should be given an opportunity to be heard on such an amendment as this. Such an amendment definitely should be considered carefully as legislation by introduction of a bill. It should have careful consideration in committee where all people can be given the opportunity to be heard, rather than for the Members to be suddenly confronted with such an amendment on the floor, without notice and without opportunity for study.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I join in the unanimous consent request of the gentleman from South Carolina that my amendment be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) be withdrawn?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLLIER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLLIER: On page 51, after line 9, add "Sec. 704" and the following:

"The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to report to Congress as soon as practicable on the economic feasibility of the disestablishment of any naval ordnance plant or until such time as such report is made and the Congress takes action thereon. None of the funds authorized under this act may be used for the construction of facilities at any such plant to which activities are transferred from any plant to be disestablished or deactivated until the report on the economic feasibility is submitted to the Congress."

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment—

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I did not see a copy of this amendment.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I wrote

the amendment out in longhand, and I have only one copy of the amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the right to a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from South Carolina making a point of order against the amendment?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina reserves a point of order on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER).

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the distinguished chairman of the committee that this is the sum and substance of the amendment that I offered to the procurement bill a couple of weeks ago. It is a simple and sensible amendment that everyone can and should support, because it merely says that where the Department of Defense has ordered the deactivation or disestablishment of a naval ordnance plant on the ground that it is an economy move, that the Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office make a study and report back to the Congress on the economic feasibility.

Certainly, no one in this Chamber wants a defense activity that is not being closed—and I repeat—not being closed, but its functions and activities merely being transferred, to be done, unless it is economically feasible. It is just that simple.

So, I would say that every Member of the House could support this in very good conscience because it merely guarantees that no such move will be made until it is economically feasible, until a report to that effect is made to the Congress by the General Accounting Office. That is all it does.

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

Mr. COLLIER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Does the amendment cover naval ammunition depots or just an ordnance plant?

Mr. COLLIER. It would basically cover an ordnance plant. However, if the gentleman would like to amend the amendment to include a depot, I see nothing wrong. If this application of good commonsense and fiscal judgment is applicable to a naval ordnance plant, I see no reason why it should not be.

Mr. PELLY. I know of a naval ammunition depot, which is not in my congressional district, which I believe had the lowest cost of handling ammunition of any ammunition depot in the country. It is being deactivated and its program and work transferred. This work will be done in California where it is necessary to lighter ammunition and they have double handling. I know it is not economically feasible or in the interest of economy to transfer the loading of ammunition from Bangor Ammunition Depot near Puget Sound naval shipyard to any other naval installation.

Mr. COLLIER. Let me say to the gentleman, I have experienced the same sit-

uation and I can be very sympathetic with him. To avoid the reoccurrence of any such situation as this, all that is necessary is to adopt this amendment. It is in the best interest of the defense program in terms of higher efficiency and lower costs.

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

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. The amendment provides:

The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to report to Congress as soon as practicable on the economic feasibility of the disestablishment of any naval ordnance plant or until such time as such report is made and the Congress takes action thereon. None of the funds authorized under this Act may be used for the construction of facilities at any such plant to which activities are transferred from any plant to be disestablished or deactivated until the report or the economic feasibility is submitted to the Congress.

Under this amendment, you could not do anything. What if the report was never submitted—you would not have any kind of facility and it would create an impractical situation that you just could not cope with.

Mr. COLLIER. I might suggest to the distinguished chairman that the deactivation or disestablishment of an industrial plant of this type is not done on a decision made on Tuesday and followed out on the following Friday.

Usually, as the gentleman knows, and much better than I do, this is a year or a year and a half operation and during this time it seems to me where there is a great disparity in the figures of the Department of Defense and cost accountants' figures, it is the responsibility of the General Accounting Office to move in and determine whether this move is economically feasible. Otherwise the taxpayers have absolutely no protection.

Mr. RIVERS. If the gentleman will yield, I just do not know how you can keep the Department of Defense from closing up a facility. They can transfer all the people. It is something over which they have the management and we have no control as to that.

While I would like to help the gentleman, I just plain do not know how to do it. We have looked into this before.

Take the Pentagon over here, for example, they move people all the time. I just do not know how you are going to stop it.

Mr. COLLIER. I have the greatest respect, as the chairman knows, for him and his committee. I repeat, however, that this amendment will do nothing more than to insure and assure that any move of this nature contemplated by DOD would be in the best interests of the defense posture of the country on the one hand and the taxpayers on the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT),

having resumed the chair, Mr. STEED, 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. 17604), to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1030, 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY

MR. TALCOTT

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TALCOTT moves to recommit the bill H.R. 17604 to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 251, nays 133, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—251

Abernethy	Bray	Clawson, Del.
Albert	Brinkley	Collier
Alexander	Brock	Collins
Anderson, Ill.	Brooks	Conable
Andrews, Ala.	Broomfield	Corbett
Andrews,	Brotzman	Cowger
N. Dak.	Broyhill, N.C.	Cramer
Annunzio	Broyhill, Va.	Crane
Arends	Buchanan	Cunningham
Ashbrook	Burke, Fla.	Daniel, Va.
Aspinall	Burke, Mass.	Davis, Ga.
Baring	Burleson, Tex.	Davis, Wis.
Beall, Md.	Burton, Utah	de la Garza
Belcher	Byrnes, Wis.	Delaney
Bell, Calif.	Cabell	Dellenback
Bennett	Caffery	Denny
Berry	Camp	Dennis
Betts	Carter	Devine
Bevill	Casey	Dickinson
Biaggi	Cederberg	Dingell
Blackburn	Chamberlain	Dorn
Blanton	Chappell	Dowdy
Boggs	Clancy	Downing
Bow	Clark	Duncan

Dwyer	Lennon	Rogers, Fla.
Edmondson	Lloyd	Rooney, N.Y.
Edwards, Ala.	Long, La.	Rostenkowski
Edwards, La.	Lukens	Roth
Erlenborn	McClory	Ruth
Eshleman	McClure	Sandman
Evins, Tenn.	McCulloch	Satterfield
Fallon	McDade	Saylor
Findley	McEwen	Schadeberg
Fisher	McFall	Scherle
Flood	McKneally	Scott
Flowers	MacGregor	Sebelius
Ford, Gerald R.	Mahon	Shriver
Foreman	Mailliard	Sikes
Fountain	Mann	Sisk
Frelinghuysen	Marsh	Skubitz
Frey	Martin	Slack
Fuqua	Mathias	Smith, Calif.
Galifianakis	May	Smith, N.Y.
Garmatz	Mayne	Snyder
Gettys	Meskill	Springer
Goldwater	Michel	Staggers
Gonzalez	Mills	Stanton
Goodling	Minshall	Steed
Gray	Mize	Steiger, Ariz.
Griffin	Mizell	Steiger, Wis.
Gross	Mollohan	Stephens
Grover	Montgomery	Stratton
Hagan	Morgan	Taft
Haley	Morton	Talcott
Hall	Moss	Taylor
Hammer-	Murphy, Ill.	Teague, Calif.
schmidt	Myers	Teague, Tex.
Hansen, Idaho	Natcher	Thompson, Ga.
Harsha	Nelsen	Thomson, Wis.
Harvey	Nichols	Waggonner
Hastings	O'Konski	Wampler
Hébert	O'Neal, Ga.	Watkins
Henderson	Passman	Watson
Hogan	Patman	Watts
Holifield	Pelly	Whalley
Hosmer	Pepper	White
Hull	Perkins	Whitburn
Hunt	Pettis	Whitten
Hutchinson	Philbin	Widnall
Ichord	Pirnie	Wiggins
Jarman	Poage	Williams
Johnson, Calif.	Poff	Wilson, Bob
Johnson, Pa.	Preyer, N.C.	Wilson,
Jonas	Price, Ill.	Charles H.
Jones, N.C.	Price, Tex.	Winn
Jones, Tenn.	Pucinski	Wold
Kazen	Purcell	Wright
King	Quie	Wyatt
Kleppe	Quillen	Wylie
Kluczynski	Randall	Wyman
Kuykendall	Rarick	Young
Kyl	Reid, Ill.	Zablocki
Landrum	Rhodes	Zion
Langen	Rivers	Zwach
Latta		

NAYS—133

Adams	Friedel	Meeds
Addabbo	Fulton, Pa.	Melcher
Anderson,	Fulton, Tenn.	Mikva
Calif.	Gallagher	Miller, Ohio
Ashley	Gaydos	Minish
Barrett	Giamo	Mink
Blester	Gibbons	Monagan
Blatnik	Gilbert	Mosher
Boland	Green, Pa.	Nedzi
Bolling	Griffiths	Nix
Brademas	Gude	Obey
Brasco	Halpern	O'Hara
Burlison, Mo.	Hamilton	Olsen
Burton, Calif.	Hanley	O'Neill, Mass.
Button	Hanna	Patten
Carey	Hansen, Wash.	Pike
Celler	Harrington	Podell
Cleveland	Hathaway	Powell
Cohelan	Hawkins	Pryor, Ark.
Conte	Hechler, W. Va.	Rees
Conyers	Heckler, Mass.	Reid, N.Y.
Corman	Helstoski	Reuss
Coughlin	Hicks	Riegle
Culver	Horton	Robison
Daddario	Howard	Rodino
Daniels, N.J.	Hungate	Roe
Dent	Kastenmeier	Rooney, Pa.
Derwinski	Keith	Rosenthal
Diggs	Koch	Royal
Donohue	Kyros	Ruppe
Dulski	Leggett	Ryan
Eckhardt	Long, Md.	St Germain
Eilberg	Lowenstein	Scheuer
Evans, Colo.	Lujan	Schwengel
Farbstein	McCloskey	Shibley
Fascell	McDonald,	Stafford
Fish	Mich.	Sullivan
Foley	Macdonald,	Symington
Ford,	Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
William D.	Madden	Tierman
Fraser	Matsunaga	Udall
		Ullman

Van Deerlin Waldie Wydler
Vander Jagt Weicker Yates
Vanik Whalen Yatron
Vigorito Wolf

NOT VOTING—45

Abbitt Dawson Morse
Adair Edwards, Calif. Murphy, N.Y.
Anderson, Feighan Ottinger
Tenn. Flynt Pollock
Ayres Green, Oreg. Railsback
Bingham Gubser Reifel
Brown, Calif. Hays Roberts
Brown, Mich. Jacobs Rogers, Colo.
Brown, Ohio Jones, Ala. Roudebush
Bush Kee Schneebeli
Byrne, Pa. Kirwan Smith, Iowa
Chisholm Landgrebe Stokes
Clausen, McCarthy Stubblefield
Don H. McMillan Stuckey
Clay Miller, Calif. Tunney
Colmer Moorhead

So the previous question was ordered.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Byrnes of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Flynt for, with Mr. Tunney against.
Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Stokes against.
Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Edwards of California against.
Mr. Abbitt for, with Mr. Bingham against.
Mr. Stubblefield for, with Mr. Brown of California against.
Mr. Miller of California for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee for, with Mr. Clay against.
Mr. Jones of Alabama for, with Mr. Morse against.
Mr. Roberts for, with Mrs. Green of Oregon against.
Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Jacobs against.
Mr. Gubser for, with Mr. McCarthy against.
Mr. Smith of Iowa for, with Mr. Moorhead against.
Mr. Stuckey for, with Mr. Ottinger against.
Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Rogers of Colorado against.
Mr. Landgrebe for, with Mr. Feighan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Kee with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Pollock with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Roudebush with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Reifel with Mr. Coughlin.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 335, nays 47, answered "present" 2, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—335

Abernethy Anderson, Ill.
Adams Andrews, Ala.
Addabbo Andrews,
Albert N. Dak.
Alexander Annunzio
Anderson, Arends
Calif. Ashbrook

Aspinall Baring
Barrett Beall, Md.
Belcher Bell, Calif.
Bennett

Berry Gibbons
Betts Gibbons
Bevill Goldwater
Biaggi Gonzalez
Biester Goodling
Blackburn Gray
Blanton Griffin
Blatnik Griffiths
Boggs Gross
Boland Grover
Bow Hagan
Brademas Haley
Bray Hall
Brinkley Hamilton
Brock Hammer-
Brooks schmidt
Broomfield Hanley
Hanna Hanna
Broyhill, N.C. Hansen, Idaho
Broyhill, Va. Hansen, Wash.
Buchanan Harsha
Harvey Harvey
Burke, Mass. Hastings
Burleson, Tex. Hathaway
Burlison, Mo. Hébert
Burton, Utah Heckler, Mass.
Byrnes, Wis. Henderson
Cabell Hicks
Caffery Hogan
Camp Holifield
Carter Horton
Casey Hosmer
Cederberg Howard
Chamberlain Hull
Chappell Hungate
Clancy Hunt
Clark Hutchinson
Clawson, Del Ichord
Cleveland Jarman
Collier Johnson, Calif.
Collins Johnson, Pa.
Conable Jonas
Conte Jones, N.C.
Corbett Jones, Tenn.
Corman Kazen
Coughlin Keith
Cowger King
Cramer Kleppe
Culver Kluczynski
Cunningham Kuykendall
Daddario Kyl
Daniel, Va. Kyros
Daniels, N.J. Landrum
Davis, Wis. Langen
de la Garza Latta
Delaney Leggett
Delleneb Lennon
Denny Lloyd
Dennis Long, La.
Dent Long, Md.
Derwinski Lujan
Devine Lukens
Dickinson McClure
Diggs McCulloch
Dingell McDade
Donohue McDonald,
Dorn Mich.
Dowdy McEwen
Downing McFall
Dulski McKneally
Duncan MacGregor
Dwyer Madden
Edmondson Mahon
Edwards, Ala. Mailliard
Edwards, La. Mann
Eilberg Marsh
Erlenborn Martin
Esch Mathias
Eshleman Matsunaga
Evans, Colo. May
Evens, Tenn. Mayne
Fallon Meeds
Fascell Melcher
Feighan Meskill
Findley Michel
Fish Mills
Fisher Minish
Flood Mink
Flowers Minshall
Foley Mize
Ford, Gerald R. Mizell
Ford, William D. Mollohan
Foreman Monagan
Fountain Montgomery
Frelinghuysen Moorhead
Frey Morgan
Friedel Morton
Fulton, Pa. Moss
Fulton, Tenn. Murphy, Ill.
Fuqua Myers
Galifianakis Natcher
Gallagher Nelsen
Garmatz Nichols
Gaydos Obey
Gettys O'Hara
Olsen

O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Fassman
Fattman
Fatten
Felly
Fepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Cohelan
Conyers
Eckhardt
Farbstein
Fraser
Gilbert
Green, Pa.
Gude
Halpern

NAYS—47

Ashley Harrington O'Konski
Bolling Hawkins Podell
Brasco Hechler, W. Va. Powell
Burton, Calif. Helstoski Rees
Button Karth Reid, N.Y.
Carey Kastenmeier Reuss
Celler Koch Rosenthal
Cohelan Lowenstein Roybal
Conyers McCloskey Ryan
Eckhardt Macdonald, Scheuer
Farbstein Mass. Thompson, N.J.
Fraser Mikva Vanik
Gilbert Miller, Ohio Waldie
Green, Pa. Mosher Whalen
Gude Nedzi Wolf
Halpern Nix Yates

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Riegle Talcott
NOT VOTING—45
Abbitt Davis, Ga. Murphy, N.Y.
Adair Dawson Ottinger
Anderson, Edwards, Calif. Pollock
Tenn. Flynt Railsback
Ayres Green, Oreg. Reifel
Bingham Gubser Roberts
Brown, Calif. Hays Rogers, Colo.
Brown, Mich. Jacobs Roudebush
Brown, Ohio Jones, Ala. Schneebeli
Bush Kee Smith, Iowa
Byrne, Pa. Kirwan Stokes
Chisholm Landgrebe Stubblefield
Clausen, McCarthy Stuckey
Don H. McMillan Symington
Clay Miller, Calif. Tunney
Colmer Morse

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Talcott against.
Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Brown of California against.
Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Bingham against.
Mr. Roberts for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.
Mr. Stubblefield for, with Mr. Edwards of California against.
Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Ottinger against.
Mr. Flynt for, with Mr. Stokes against.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado for, with Mr. McCarty against.
Mr. Davis of Georgia for, with Mr. Clay against.
Mr. Abbitt for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. O'KONSKI changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR). If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their

remarks on the bill H.R. 17604, just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the speech given earlier today by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) on Cuban independence.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY IN RESPECT TO LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if there are other matters pending before the House this afternoon?

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that there are two rules to be called up, in connection with legislation that will be considered by the House tomorrow.

Mr. PICKLE. It was my understanding, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the matter of the amending of the Social Security Act that that legislation was scheduled on the calendar for tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. This relates solely to the rule providing for consideration of the legislation and not to the legislation itself.

Mr. PICKLE. I understood that, Mr. Speaker. Would it therefore be in order to consider the rule this afternoon?

The SPEAKER. Yes, both rules could be brought up and then the bills will be considered tomorrow.

Mr. PICKLE. As the Speaker knows, there is some concern about the rule on the social security measure and I know that the entire House would want to be apprised of the fact that this rule is pending. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if consideration of the rule might be put over so that we might act on the rule tomorrow instead of today?

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that an agreement has been worked out with the leadership on both sides and members of the Committee on Rules on both sides that both rules would be called up today but not to consider either one of the bills today.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Maryland and others who wanted to be sure that we could finish both bills on the program tomorrow, we had hoped to come in at 11 o'clock. But we found that that would interfere with the operation of some of the committees. It was then the

hope, in the interest of expediting the business of the House that we might adopt the rules and I agreed to that.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there is opposition to the rule on the social security bill, and I understand there is opposition to it, but I did not know of it at the time, I would suggest that we put that rule over and we take up the rule on the merchant marine and fisheries bill.

Mr. PICKLE. I thank the gentleman.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 15424, TO AMEND THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, and on behalf of the distinguished Chairman (Mr. COLMER), I call up House Resolution 1029 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1029

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. 15424) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. 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 amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a 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.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) pending which I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1029 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 15424 to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The resolution also provides that it shall be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The purpose of H.R. 15424 is to provide for a long-range merchant shipbuilding program of 300 ships in the next 10 years, a general lessening of dependence on operating-differential subsidy for the liner carriers, and the buildup of our bulk commercial carrier fleet in the foreign commerce of the United States.

Our flag fleet today consists of 967 ships, only 650 of which are engaged in foreign trade. Our fleet now ranks fifth

in the world on a tonnage basis. The present fleet will decline to 310 by 1980 unless new ships are built.

Worn out World War II ships constitute the largest segment of the foreign trade fleet and continued operation of these ships after 1974 cannot be expected and the fleet will be reduced to 272 ships by that time.

An additional 51 ships will become overage in the period 1974-80, which would drop the fleet to 221 ships by 1980.

It is particularly important to note that the 650 ships in operation now are the equivalent in carrying capacity of only 228 modern ships.

While our fleet has been declining dramatically, our trade with the world has been steadily growing and the continued growth of our foreign trade depends on efficient and reasonably priced ocean transportation. We must rebuild our merchant fleet if continued access to such transportation is to be assured.

The number of seafaring job opportunities will decrease from the present 56,700 to 22,300 by 1980 if the fleet is not augmented.

If the proposed program is carried out, the fleet in 1980 will be equivalent to 344 modern ships and seafaring job opportunities will be restored.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1029 in order that H.R. 15424 may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, House Resolution 1029 provides an open rule with 2 hours of debate for the consideration of H.R. 15424, the merchant marine program.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is made in order as an original bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time a major revision has been made in the maritime law since 1936. At the close of World War II, the U.S. merchant fleet of 3,696 ships was the largest in the world and the pride of this Nation. In the intervening 24 years, however, the U.S.-flag fleet steadily decreased. The present foreign trade fleet of but 650 ranks fifth in the world, and in 1974, balancing present rates of obsolescence and construction, our fleet will dwindle to 272 ships.

In 1968, the value of U.S. exports and imports was \$67 billion, one-third of the world's trade. Yet, only 6 percent of the total tonnage of that trade was carried by American-flag ships. Understandably, with the growth of U.S. trade dependent upon efficient and reasonably priced ocean transportation and the security of the Nation contingent upon the mobility of the men and supplies, the American shipping and shipbuilding record must be improved drastically.

The bill, H.R. 15424, calls for:

An increase in the level of subsidized ship construction from the present 10 ships per year to 30 ships per year for a period of 10 years;

A gradual reduction in the maximum construction differential subsidy;

Payment of the subsidy directly to the shipyard rather than to the ship operator;

Extension to shipbuilding of a multi-year procurement system;

An increase in the present \$1 billion ceiling on mortgage and loan insurance to \$3 billion;

Emphasis upon construction differential subsidies to bulk carriers;

Creation of a commission to review the status of the American shipbuilding industry;

Computation of wage subsidies on an index system for the purpose of operating differential assistance;

Elimination of the operating differential subsidy recapture provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936;

A new direct operating subsidy for bulk carriers; and

Extension of the tax deferment system now permitted for subsidized operators to all qualified ship operators in foreign, Great Lakes and domestic noncontiguous trade, and the fisheries.

Passage of these proposed amendments to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 will start to revitalize our merchant marine, reverse the sharp decline of our flag fleet, and provide the immediate and substantial aid required to meet the goals of national policy.

A comprehensive maritime program is required by H.R. 15424.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE 68TH ANNIVERSARY OF CUBAN INDEPENDENCE: "INDEPENDENCE" IN FIDEL CASTRO'S CUBA

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 20, 1902, Tomás Estrada Palma began his term as the first constitutionally elected President of a newly sovereign Cuban Republic, and a free and independent Cuban nation came into being. For the Cuban people, this event marked the culmination of years of struggle and sacrifice as they sought to rid themselves of Spanish colonial rule and establish a government of their own choice, based on democracy, respect for individual rights, and social justice.

On January 1, 1959, another struggle for freedom was culminated, and another Cuban independence was celebrated—this time the victor was a young revolutionary, Fidel Castro. Four months later, the new Cuban Premier, Fidel Castro, stated:

We wish to free man from fear, we want to free man from dogmas, to free him socially and economically, without dictatorship of any kind. . . . I know that the Cuban people and the Latin American people understand what a revolution is that satisfies man's material necessities without sacrificing his liberties. . . . And here we . . . are going to achieve a revolution with democratic methods. . . . If we achieve this the Cuban Revolution will become a classic revolution throughout the world because it will have

achieved the objectives which people seek. . . . after having respected their rights and the liberties of man.

Thus did Fidel Castro declare a new era of independence for the Cuban people. These were the promises which led students, labor leaders, the press, the ordinary citizens, and the statesmen within and outside of Cuba to acclaim Dr. Castro as a new figure on the American scene, one who was genuinely interested in the welfare of his people, who was dedicated to a program of democracy and economic betterment, and who would faithfully adhere to the ideals and philosophies revered by free men everywhere.

Eleven years later, what has happened to Castro's "independent" Cuba and to his pledges of "freedom from fear and dogma," of "revolution by democracy," and of "respect for the rights and liberties of man"?

As early as 1953, in his famous manifesto of purposes for taking up arms against Batista, Castro publicly proclaimed—as he continued until after his assumption of power to vigorously ensure—that his government would "restore sovereignty to the people," that it would be a "government of popular election," and that the rights guaranteed in the 1940 Constitution would be restored and strictly enforced, including the "absolute guarantees" of freedom of information, press, and all individual and political rights guaranteed therein. On many occasions, he gave his "formal promise" that his provisional government would within 1 year, hold honest general elections open to participation by freely functioning political parties, to ensure the Cuban people a "genuine representative government." In his "Unity Manifesto" of July 1958, Castro proposed a governmental system based on minimal governmental interference whose primary motivation would be to guarantee the rights of all of the people and to ensure their peace and freedom and their economic, social, and political progress.

What Castro has actually done is to create a harsh Communist political and military apparatus which, in the name of its "high revolutionary objectives," tolerates no significant dissent. In Cuba today, revolutionary committees control the public, the party controls the committees, the regime controls the party, and the regime is controlled by Castro. The price of Castro's plan for so-called Cuban "independence" has been total suppression of political liberty and the annihilation of the quality of Cuban life.

Castro has ridiculed elections. He has denied the existence of any public representative body or legislature. He has fostered a press and communications media which is wholly controlled by the state. He has presided over wholesale confiscation and socialization. He has blatantly ignored any semblance of civil rights and any exercise of political liberty. He has seized and imprisoned close to 40,000 Cubans whose crime was to criticize a government which Castro himself had pledged to be a government "of the people, to the people and with the people," a government that sought the

Cuban people's support on the promise of free elections, free press, and free speech. He has structured a vigilance system—the Committee for the Defense of the Revolution—which is stationed on every city block and in every Cuban hamlet. The express duty of these "revolutionary control centers" is to keep track of every aspect of the life of each Cuban citizen; even the armed forces and police are held in check by watchdog groups to insure their continued "dedication" to the ideals of the revolution.

In short, Castro's brand of "independence" for Cuba has meant the substitution of one dictatorship for another, and the perpetuation of a drab and fearful life for 6 million Cubans. The watchwords of Castro's Cuban revolution were "bread and liberty." But 11 years later, Castro has failed to supply his people with sufficient food, and has never offered the Cuban people liberty. Cuba in 1970 is a drab, regimented, oppressive society where, as William Attwood, editor-in-chief of *Look* magazine, described it last month:

Waiting in line is a national pastime and cutting sugarcane an obligatory hobby, and where the atmosphere varies between that of a permanent Community Chest Drive and a gigantic military stockade.

If you were a member of Castro's Cuban society today, you would live by standards like the following. Your home or apartment, property, and business would not be your own possession, but rather the property of the Communist state. If you wanted to read a paper or listen to a radio to get news of events in your own country or the outside world, you would read *Granma* and other Government-dominated publications, and you would listen only to Government-sanctioned radio stations. If you were a laborer, you would find yourself stripped of your prerevolutionary rights and benefits guaranteed by free unions and legislation, and compelled to work long hours "voluntarily" on your job and on the state agricultural farms, for the "good" of the revolution. If you were a cane-cutter or a butcher, you would have to accept that status for the rest of your life, because the state controls all conditions of labor. If you were a housewife, you would be facing the overwhelming task of juggling myriad ration cards in an attempt to provide your family with basic food staples, clothing, soap, and other essential items. If you were a student, you would enjoy a virtually free education—provided that you proved your zeal for the revolution—but your studies would consist more of propaganda than of scholarly pursuits and your instructors would be inexperienced people whose primary qualification is their knowledge of and devotion to Marxist philosophy.

Such is a sample of the life which Castro has carved out of the revolution for his people. How has he fared in other aspects of that revolution?

In the area of social amelioration, one of the most vitally needed changes in the social and economic life of Cuba has been agrarian reform. Reform of the agricultural structure was one of Castro's primary objectives. His first agrarian re-

form law, written in October 1958 while he was still waging revolution in the Sierra Maestra, called for redistribution of the land to the peasants and small farms based on the principal that "those who cultivate the land should own it." On October 2, 1963, he proclaimed the second agrarian reform, a dictum which legalized full-scale arbitrary seizures of the Cuban farmers' privately-owned land with no thought of compensation. Through this law, landownership was changed from a ratio of 40 percent state owned to 60 percent privately owned land, to 70 percent state-owned land and 30 percent privately owned. Instead of small farms worked and managed by the peasants, the Cuban agricultural structure was transformed into large granjas, state farms. Today, virtually no land in Cuba is privately owned and managed. Moreover, agricultural production has been considerably cut partly as a consequence of opposition to these procedures, contributing even more to crucial shortages and resulting in ever greater rationing. And this is Castro's answer to his people's profound yearning simply to own land upon which they worked.

Tragically, Fidel Castro has betrayed all of his glowing promises for a better social, economic, and political life for Cuba. He has betrayed the people who believed so eagerly in him as their liberator.

Hundreds of thousands of Cuban people, despairing of a system which they feel powerless to change and yet are unwilling to endure have fled their beloved homeland. Some of them have escaped at great peril, some of them have died trying to be free. Thirty-five hundred Cubans are still leaving on the airlift to Miami every month, and many more thousands remain on waiting lists. Many of these sorrowing people have come to the United States in search of peace, freedom, and a future for themselves and their children. Their feelings about Castro were well summed up by one arriving refugee who sadly stated, "Freedom under Castro is no freedom at all."

More than a decade ago we watched with regret and sympathy for our Cuban neighbors as Castro began this forced march toward oppression. In January of 1960 I said that the Castro pattern was "old, simple, brutal, and effective. As conditions get worse in Cuba the speeches will become more abusive; the Americans will be blamed for everything; one violent act will follow another; and turmoil will not subside in Cuba." Events have tragically followed this story line.

On that early day in 1960 it appeared to me:

The doctor intends to operate at once without anesthesia for the United States. Anesthesia for Cuba will be planned anti-American vilifications and tirades to cover up harsh and illegal acts.

Our good friends, the Cuban people, are clearly being driven down a blind alley. One act of this play calls for Dr. Castro to become a martyr. The U.S. must be taunted into taking retaliatory military or economic action. This will then justify to the Cuban people and the world, Castro's right to seek help and assistance from the real friends of Cuba—the Communists.

He can then proceed with the completion of the people's revolution and the establish-

ment of the new order—the classless society. The hated foreigner and property-owner would be gone. In fact, all property owners would be gone. The campesino workers are then armed and become mighty rulers. This idyllic play then comes to a screaming climax when the ruler and the ruling group of this classless society is properly rewarded.

This play sounded familiar then as it does now. It should. It is as old as Marx and Lenin. But with each passing day the Cuban people saw that the revolution had not terminated.

Mr. Speaker, on this 68th anniversary of Cuban independence, I am sure we all deplore the tragic situation in Cuba, and the monstrous crimes against the Cuban people committed by Fidel Castro in the name of Cuban "independence." Such blatant tyranny over the hearts and minds of men cannot endure—and I say that it will not endure. I have faith that the revolutionary spirit of the Cuban people—a spirit which has been deeply ingrained in the Cuban soul since their first great struggle for independence—will someday succeed in putting an end to the long and tragic nightmare of Fidel Castro.

On this Cuban independence day, let us pay tribute to the Cuban people, with whom we have always shared a warm and close affection and deepest esteem, and to the spirit of freedom, of independence, and of justice which dwells within them.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I am pleased indeed that my distinguished colleague from Florida is giving the House the facts on Cuba. I congratulate him, and I wish to associate myself with his remarks. We must not forget that Castroism and communism are strangling Cuba and that we in American can help to free the Cuban people.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate his observations.

CONGRESSMAN YATES WILL OFFER AMENDMENT TO STRIKE FUNDS FOR SST

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday next the Committee on Appropriations will consider the bill to make appropriations for the Department of Transportation, including an appropriation for the SST. I intend at that time to offer an amendment which will strike out all funds for the SST. I do not know whether my amendment will be successful. If it is not, I shall offer the following separate views to the report of the committee in which I will request the House to reverse the action of the committee approving funds for the SST:

SEPARATE VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE SIDNEY R. YATES ON THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

I. INTRODUCTION

The great naturalist, Charles Darwin, was once a house guest of a friend whose two small boys decided to play a joke on him. They took a centipede and glued to it a beetle's head, a butterfly's wing and a grass-

hopper's legs. Then, showing it to Darwin, they asked innocently: "Mr. Darwin, what kind of bug is this?" Darwin looked at it solemnly. "Did it hum when you caught it, boys?" he inquired. Scarcely able to conceal their mirth, the boys replied, "Yes, sir, it did." "That's it!" said Darwin triumphantly. "It's a humbug!"

Some may say the word "humbug" is too strong to apply to the SST, but the fact is that only now Congress becoming fully aware of the truth surrounding the SST program.

It now appears that the costs to the government may escalate to \$5 billion (shades of the C5A) if the contractor cannot obtain financing for production. Compare this with President Kennedy's promise when he approved the program in 1962 that the SST would not cost the government more than \$750 million.

And certainly the plane, if and when built, will not hum. It will roar . . . and such a roar! The eminent physicist, Dr. Richard L. Garwin, a member of the President's Science Advisory Council, told a congressional subcommittee recently that the SST would produce as much noise as fifty 747 "jumbo jets" taking off at once!

Dr. Garwin was not referring to sonic boom. That's another matter and another supersonic handicap. He was talking about engine noise, noise that builds up as engines are gunned for takeoff. The Anglo-French supersonic plane, the Concorde, is just as noisy. There is a good possibility that the harassed, noise-sensitive airport authorities will not permit the ear-splitting supersonics to use their facilities because the angry reaction of the surrounding residents would be immediate and strong.

I have not raised the issue of sonic boom in this report, not because it is not important, but rather because the administration insists there will be no supersonic flights which generate sonic boom over the United States. I am willing to accept that pledge for the time being, even though I am concerned that the pledge may be rescinded if the SST comes into existence. At such time the pressures to permit supersonic flight with sonic boom may become so great as to be irresistible because it is exceedingly doubtful that the SST can achieve economic viability as long as it is required to fly subsonically over populated areas. The American people must not overlook the statement of Major General Jewel E. Maxwell, who was previously the head of the SST program. General Maxwell said:

"We believe that people in time will come to accept the sonic boom as they have the rather unpleasant side effects which have accompanied other advances in transportation."

I suspect that in time a huge propaganda campaign will be undertaken to woo the American people with some slogan about "the wonderful world of the SST" and for them to stop worrying and learn to love the boom. But no matter how attractive the sales pitch, or how enticing the advertising, the fact will be that the sonic boom will constitute a major degradation of man's environment and cannot be accepted.

II. THE SST WILL CONTRIBUTE SIGNIFICANTLY TO POLLUTION OF OUR ENVIRONMENT

A. Airport Noise

A few weeks ago the entire nation observed "Earth Day." Meetings were held all over the country to take stock of the defilement of our environment through the polluting of our lakes and streams, the fouling of the atmosphere and the increasing bedlam of noise dinning our ears. The SST will be an instrument for further deterioration of our environment and it is incredible that the Federal government should be financing its development.

Aviation Week and Space Technology, a respected trade publication which editorially

supports the SST, stated in its January 5, 1970 issue:

"The noise-limiting factor in the airplane's introduction will be a sideline noise emanating from the airplane's massive 67,000-pound thrust turbojets. It is a characteristic already accepted in the design of the aircraft. FAA has strong hopes solutions will be found by the time the airplane enters service in 1978. But currently there are no proven technological methods of substantially cutting the noise without severely reducing engine performance."

It is true that the SST will create less community noise along its flight path than present subsonic aircraft. It is less noisy in its approach, too. However, and this is most important, it generates a noise called "sideline noise," which is much greater than any subsonic jet like the 707 or the 747. In terms of the noise limits issued by the FAA, the SST will be three or four times louder than such standards permit. Its sideline noise will be 4 or 5 times louder than the 747.

The day is past when we must accept such penalties as the price of "progress." The condition of our environment is in great measure attributable to the unheeding pressure of industrial advances. If Earth Day meant anything, it signifies that the people of this country are determined to assess the impact of scientific advances in terms of their possible degradation of the environment. The SST must be weighed by that standard.

Mr. Russell Train, the Chairman of President Nixon's Council on Environmental Quality, has expressed similar fears before a Senate subcommittee:

"At present the most significant unresolved environmental problem I see for the supersonic transport is the high level of noise in the vicinity of airports. Because of its relatively steep degree of climb, the SST will actually create less community noise in the direction of its flight path than present subsonic jet aircraft. The SST also generates less noise on approach. However, the current design of the U.S. supersonic transport and of the Concorde leads to a noise field radiated perpendicular to the runway, called "sideline noise," than that of the conventional subsonic jets. In terms of the measures used by the Federal Aviation Administration to assess annoyance, the SST would be three to four times louder than current FAA sideline noise standards and four to five times louder than the 747. In terms of noise pressure, the sideline noise level would also be substantially higher than that of subsonic jets meeting FAA requirements."

Additionally, Dr. Raymond Bisplinghoff, Dean of the MIT School of Engineering and Chairman of the SST Technical Evaluation Committee formed last year by FAA to review the plane, said much the same thing before our committee last year.

"Although the community noise generated by the SST is no greater than contemporary subsonic transport airplanes, the sideline noise is appreciably greater. There is very little prospect of bringing the sideline noise down to subsonic transport levels by any practical methods known at the present time."

And this year, Dr. Garwin told our committee:

"It should be emphasized that at 125 PNdB of airport noise, the SST will produce as much noise as the simultaneous takeoff of 50 jumbo jets satisfying the 108 PNdB subsonic requirement."

In its passage of P.L. 90-411, Congress moved to limit the aircraft noise. Pursuant to the authority granted by law, the FAA has established proposed maximum limits for subsonic aircraft. The limits established for supersonics should be within the same levels, or else communities and air facilities in the United States which have become accustomed to lower noise levels will suffer a very great increase in perceived noise.

The whole purpose of environmental protection is to act before the problem appears. The Department of Transportation seems to be tailoring noise restrictions on the SST according to what can be achieved by the manufacturer rather than what is necessary to protect the public. The inescapable result of such a policy would be further deterioration of the environment.

B. By Modifying the World's Climate

At first glance the notion that the SST could produce changes in the world's weather seems to be implausible in the extreme. When I first heard, several months ago, of the concern of meteorologists about the effects of SST flight on the stratosphere, I was skeptical. But any doubts I might have had about the reality of their objections were laid to rest by Mr. Russell Train, the Chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality.

Mr. Train is extremely well qualified to make an informed judgment about all matters relating to the environment. This is what he says about SST's and the weather:

"I now turn to a potential problem which has not received the attention it deserves. The supersonic transport will fly at an altitude between 60,000 to 70,000 feet. It will place into this part of the atmosphere large quantities of water, carbon dioxide, nitrogen oxides and particulate matter. This part of the atmosphere is to a substantial extent isolated from the rest of the atmosphere. For example, on the average, 18 months are required for a water molecule introduced into the atmosphere at 65,000 feet to find its way to the lower atmosphere. A fleet of 500 American SST's and Concordes flying in this region of the atmosphere could, over a period of years, increase the water content by as much as 50 to 100 percent. This could be very significant because observations indicate that the water vapor content of the stratosphere has already increased about 50 percent over the last five years due presumably to natural processes, although there is a possibility which should be researched that subsonic jets have been contributing to this increase.

"Water in this part of the atmosphere can have two effects of practical significance. First, it would affect the balance of heat in the entire atmosphere leading to a warmer average surface temperature. Calculations on the magnitude of this increased temperature are most uncertain but probably it would be on the order of .2 to .3°F. Secondly, water vapor would react so as to destroy some fraction of the ozone that is resident in this part of the atmosphere. The practical consequences of such a destruction could be that the shielding capacity of the atmosphere to penetrating and potentially highly dangerous ultraviolet radiation is decreased. As in the case of surface temperature, we do not have adequate knowledge on which to make secure judgments as to the practical significance of the effect of water on the ozone. Finally, the increased water content coupled with the natural increase could lead in a few years to a sun shielding cloud cover with serious consequences on climate.

"Clearly the effects of supersonics on the atmosphere are of importance to the whole world. Any attempt to predict those effects is necessarily highly speculative at this time. The effects should be thoroughly understood before any country proceeds with a massive introduction of supersonic transports."

III. THE SST HAS BEGUN TO MOVE ALONG THE OVERRUN ROAD

The most important new fact is that the SST has experienced a \$76 million cost overrun over the last 6 months, \$57 million of which must be assumed by the government. In the hearings of the Transportation Subcommittee, James Beggs, Undersecretary of the Department of Transportation, blamed the overrun on Congress and the Bureau of

the Budget. His reasoning goes like this, and I quote from our hearings:

"The estimate we gave the committee last year was predicated on a schedule which was given to you at that time.

"Since that testimony was given, the program has slipped. It slipped because, as you know, there was some \$11 million taken out of the appropriation last year. This year the Bureau of the Budget cut the projected appropriation which we had for this year of \$315 million, back to \$290 million. The result of these two actions has been a slip in the program of about four months in the completion of the prototype phase.

"This has meant that necessarily, because we are incurring costs in this period, that those 4 months cost us money. It turns out they cost about \$76 million."

The lesson Mr. Beggs would seem to have us draw from the overrun is that Congress had better provide the entire appropriation request every time his department asks for it, or we will end up paying more for the prototype airplanes. He would have us believe that overruns are not the responsibility of the contractor or the Department of Transportation, but of the Congress and of the Bureau of the Budget.

Needless to say, Mr. Beggs' reasoning overlooks the recent history of overruns in military weapons systems procurement in which Congressional scrutiny and restraint provides virtually the only hedge against cost growth.

This overrun can only be the first example of the results of technical difficulties encountered by the contractor. That it has experienced trouble is indicated by the action of the Department of Transportation in relaxing a number of contract requirements that the Boeing Company has been unable to meet in the original performance specifications of the contract within the cost targets set in the production schedule. Technical problems in development programs such as the SST result in some combination of time stretchouts, degraded performance characteristics, and increased costs.

It makes no sense at all to go ahead with the SST program until we have some way of knowing what its long-range environmental impact will be. We cannot ignore warnings such as that offered by Mr. Train and hope to preserve the environment.

C. The Department of Transportation has not complied with the Requirements of the Environmental Policy Act

The Environmental Policy Act of 1969 requires that all agencies of the Federal government include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a detailed statement by the responsible official on—

- (i) the environmental impact of the proposed action;
- (ii) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented;
- (iii) alternatives to the proposed action;
- (iv) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity; and
- (v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

Additionally, the law provides that prior to making any detailed statement, the responsible Federal official shall consult with and obtain the comments of any Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved.

It is inconceivable that the Congress could appropriate another cent, much less \$290 million, until the Environmental Policy Act is complied with. The Department of Trans-

portation has had ample time to comply with the provisions of the Act, but has not supplied the information required. Their present plans are to submit their environmental statement "before the end of the calendar year," by which time we will have spent another \$290 million on a plane that can only contribute to further deterioration of our environment.

Until now, the DOT has chosen to degrade performance characteristics and the primary means of dealing with technical problems. But they cannot realistically degrade the performance of the SST much more without losing what little credibility remains for their aircraft. Since there is no margin left in performance standards and since stretch-outs in the program inevitably cut into the projected market, future technical problems are likely to cost still more cash.

It is reasonable to expect that this year's overrun is only the first of many which will plague the prototype program should it proceed. It was stated in the subcommittee hearings that \$60 million in additional overruns were avoided only by a substantial cut in Boeing's overhead. The cost pressures on the development program are clearly mounting, and Mr. Beggs was unable to give any assurance that there will not be further overruns.

IV. THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT PLANE NOW ENVISIONED INVOLVES MUCH GREATER RISKS AND EXPENDITURES FOR THE GOVERNMENT

The original contract for the supersonic transport provided performance requirements which, if met, might have produced a plane with some chance for financial success. It was on that basis that the program was originally approved and funded by the Congress. However, as the development program has progressed and design difficulties have been encountered, performance requirements for the SST have been successively downgraded to the point that the plane now planned for production has virtually no chance for satisfactory commercial operation.

The Department of Transportation has consistently accommodated Boeing's failure to meet technical specifications for the SST by modifying the original contract. The prototypes now planned are inferior in many important respects from the production aircraft first planned, but the Department of Transportation continues to use the original contract provisions in making its optimistic market predictions. In the table which follows, column 1 lists the performance requirements specified in the original contract; column 2 lists the performance expectations of the prototype aircraft:

Characteristics	Original contract (1)	Prototype (2)
Takeoff field length (feet).....	6,800-700	10,300
Landing field length (feet).....	6,200-600	8,250
Approach speed (knots).....	135	158
Lift-off speed (knots).....	162	197
Airport noise (PNdB)*.....	116	122-129
Takeoff noise (PNdB).....	93	110
Approach noise (PNdB).....	109	112

*PNdB—Perceived noise decibels.

The greatly extended takeoff field length means that very few airports, either in the United States or abroad, will be able to accommodate the SST, and its economic utility will be greatly diminished. If it is allowed to fly, the SST will require new huge, expensive airports even more remote from communities than those being built today. The federal government will foot a large part of the multi-billion dollar bill for the larger airports.

Most aircraft accidents take place on takeoff and landing. The faster takeoff and landing speeds of the present SST configuration significantly increase the risk of a crash. The

increased risk of a crash on takeoff and landing, along with the great number of unknowns about supersonic passenger flight generally, combine to make the SST even less attractive as a commercial venture.

The tremendous racket created by the SST engines further compromises the financial prospects of the plane. Unless the United States decides to throw its recently established airport noise standards out the window, the SST will not be able to operate from our airports, thereby eliminating any possibility that the plane could operate at all. Alternatively, if the FAA does renege on its current noise standards, local airports will bar the plane on an individual basis rather than be subjected to its enormous racket. In any case, the airport noise caused by the plane will force it to operate from fields located at a considerable distance from the urban areas the plane is to serve, thereby reducing the time saving which is the SST's sole reason for being.

The prototype plane as it is now envisioned, with its noisy engines, long runway requirements, and design shortcomings, is not the kind of aircraft which will attract private financing. Certainly, it should not attract government financing, either.

Dr. Garwin told our committee he thought "the contract should have been terminated for default before April 15, 1969. . . ."

He explained the changes in SST contract objectives in this way:

"The development contract by Boeing on the basis of the swing-wing design and requiring the prototype to be very close to the actual production version as well as to have outstanding takeoff and landing characteristics, has been successively modified to the point at which it is problematical whether the SST will fit on existing airfields, and to a point at which the airport noise is far beyond the maximum considered acceptable for jet aircraft now."

The Department of Transportation has always insisted that government participation in the funding of the SST development program will terminate upon completion of the prototype phase, but they have not produced a single shred of evidence that private financing will be available for the certification and production phases of the program.

The assumption that production of the original aircraft envisioned in the SST contract could be financed with private capital was excessively hopeful. The assumption that the plane now planned can attract private capital is nothing short of preposterous. That the Department of Transportation continues to insist that phases IV and V of the development program will be privately financed is evidence of excessive and misplaced optimism in presenting the SST to the Congress.

Even the Boeing Company is concerned that it may not be able to obtain production money. H. W. Withington, Boeing Vice President and Manager of its SST division, confirmed Boeing's post prototype financial dilemma in his April 29 press conference. According to the *National Journal* for May 2, he is reported to have said:

"But the hard fact is that we've got to pick up \$1.5 to \$2 billion dollars somewhere to move into the production phase. Since Boeing's net worth is only about \$800 million, it is doubtful we could raise that amount by ourselves. I don't rule it out, but under the current situation, it's hard to see how we can get that kind of money up."

Withington said that the financial position of the airlines will be a major factor in financing the production of the SST's. "If they don't get out of the financial bind they are in now," he said, "there is no sense worrying about this program because they won't be able to buy anything."

The Congress must be concerned, therefore, that the nearly \$700 million in Federal funds which has already been plowed

into the SST program is merely the tip of a multi-million dollar iceberg. The Congress should be aware of possible costs now rather than waiting another 5 years and spending hundreds of millions of dollars. The Department of Transportation still has not required Boeing to fulfill its contractual obligations and provide a credible plan to show how the certification and production phase will be financed.

CONCLUSION

It is essential that the Congress act on the basis of the merits of the SST program as it exists at the present time, rather than on the basis of past support or opposition to the plane. It is important that the Congress this year take a new look at the SST with the understanding that the development we are being asked to fund is fundamentally different from the program which was originally proposed and has had congressional support in the past.

It is impossible to look at our nation today and not be deeply troubled by the disaffection of large numbers of our citizens from their government. Millions of Americans today believe that their elected representatives are not listening to them. The SST is a classic case study of why they feel that way.

The Federal government has never before used its funds to develop a commercial plane. This is the first time. Should the taxpayers' money be used to develop and produce a plane aimed at "snob appeal."

That was the phrase used by Chairman Secor Browne of the Civil Aeronautics Board in testimony before our Appropriations Subcommittee. This dialogue appears on page 1149 of our hearings:

"Mr. BROWNE. So if you consider the Concorde as an all first-class airplane, it will not only appeal to the businessman but it will have a distinct snob appeal. Whether we approve of that or not, it is a real economic fact.

"Mr. YATES. Do you think the United States ought to spend \$4.5 billion to develop snob appeal in an SST?"

"Mr. BROWNE. Because the ladies' garment trade is largely snob appeal, and you get your money back with a return on investment, and since I believe the \$4.5 billion will come home with all sorts of benefits which have been expounded to you many times in the way of return on investment, I say, yes, the same as cosmetics or ladies' garments.

"Mr. YATES. You do not find any distinction between ladies' garments and cosmetics and the SST paid for by the Government?"

"Mr. BROWNE. We are not paying for it.

"Mr. YATES. We are paying for it in the first instance.

"Mr. BROWNE. I consider it a sound investment."

There is no popular support for the SST. Even the airlines are less than enthusiastic about buying it. Every opinion poll that has ever been taken on the issue indicates that the American people do not want their money spent on a plane that provides so little for so few. For every American who gains a few hours time on a flight to Europe or Asia there will be hundreds more who are disturbed by the racket caused by the SST engines.

The Department of Transportation asks us to accept this kind of unacceptable trade-off as the price of propping up the aerospace industry.

In a budget in which only \$106 million is requested for air pollution control, \$80 million for mass transit and inadequate amounts for health research, hospital modernization, medical education, primary and secondary education, it is shocking that almost \$300 million is allocated for the SST this year. It must be remembered, too, that another \$225 million must be appropriated next year.

I ask the House to reject the appropriation for the SST and allow the government to get on with the business of serving all its citizens, not just the favored few who would use the plane.

Yesterday the President announced that the budget surpluses he had predicted earlier this year for this fiscal year and the next have evaporated and that there will be budget deficits. Ask yourselves: does the SST deserve top priority at this time?

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD RETAIN COMMERCIAL AIR SUPERIORITY

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) announced that tomorrow morning in the full Committee on Appropriations he intends to offer an amendment to strike out funds for the SST. Of course, it is no news here that the gentleman from Illinois is in favor of a move which would result in the United States losing its supremacy in the air transportation field.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that the civil aviation minister of the Soviet Union has said that the TU-144 has flown 1,240 miles an hour and will be in commercial service by 1973. Meanwhile France's Concorde prototype reached speeds of 1,240 miles an hour, also.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Members of this House will not contribute to seeing this country's technological superiority lost so that the United States reverts to a so-called horse-and-buggy technology.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose any attempt to strike funds for development of a civilian supersonic airplane.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO LAUDS \$1 MILLION GIFT OF MARBLE FROM ITALY FOR THE KENNEDY CENTER

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives that the last piece of marble was put into place at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts here in the Nation's Capital on March 9, thus bringing to completion a gift from the Government of Italy valued at more than \$1 million.

Italy has donated the Center's entire requirement for marble, about 3,500 tons from the quarries near Carrara, Italy, including marble from one of the quarries used by Michelangelo for his statues. This represents the largest gift to the Center from a foreign nation, and was pledged by former President Antonio Segni of Italy during President Kennedy's visit to Italy in 1963.

The marble from the Carrara quarries was cut to specification for both interior

and exterior use at the Center, and was transported directly to the United States from the port of Leghorn, Italy. The rare stone from this northern Italian town has long been regarded by architects and sculptors as just about the finest quality marble available in the world. Its donation by the Italian people to the American people is a token of the love and admiration which Italians hold in their hearts for the late President Kennedy.

With the final placement of Carrara marble in its exterior wall, the Kennedy Center is drawing noticeably closer to completion. When complete, the Center will house under one roof an opera house a concert hall, a theater for drama, and a film theater. The official opening is scheduled for September 1971 and it is anticipated that the Center will attract millions of visitors from all over the United States and the world.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of the original sponsors in 1965 of the bill to establish a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities, and have long advocated the promotion of progress in the arts and humanities.

Today, we regard ourselves as a great Nation and have assumed the economic, political, and military leadership of the entire free world. If we are to play out this role with honor and acclaim on the stage of history, we must also offer the world a great civilization which will have a lasting impact on the world through the ideals it fosters, the truths it upholds, and the works of beauty in art and music that it produces.

The Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts will make a major contribution toward achieving this objective by recognizing the finest achievements in music, drama, dance, opera, poetry, and film, and will encourage national and international exchange of talent in the performing arts.

The \$1 million gift from Italy brings closer the day when this international exchange will be a reality, and through this exchange of art and music, which are the universal languages of mankind, the peoples of the world will be drawn closer together and will achieve a better understanding of each other's problems.

As an American of Italian descent, I am proud that such a magnificent gift has been donated to America by the Government of Italy in order to foster creativity in the world of art and music. I know that more than 25 million Italo-Americans—the largest ethnic group in the United States—share my pride and pleasure in this generous contribution.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I would like to include a brief history of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, which follows:

BRIEF HISTORY OF A LIVING MEMORIAL

"Behind the storm of daily conflict and crisis, the dramatic confrontations, the tumult of political struggle, the poet, the artist, the musician, continues the quiet work of the centuries, building bridges of experience between peoples, reminding man of the universality of his feelings and desires and despairs, and reminding him that the forces that unite are deeper than those that divide."—President John F. Kennedy, November 29, 1962.

The short history of the John F. Kennedy

Center for the Performing Arts is marked by the active support of four Presidents. President Eisenhower signed the Act of Congress which created the National Cultural Center in 1958. President Kennedy encouraged national support of the project and signed legislation extending the fund-raising deadline three years in 1963.

In January 1964, President Johnson signed the John F. Kennedy Center Act, renaming the cultural center and designating it the official memorial to President Kennedy in the nation's capital.

President Nixon has taken a personal interest in the establishment of the Center and has said, "This Center was conceived with full bi-partisan support as an effort to promote the performing arts throughout the nation. I personally pledge full support to the successful realization of this project." In October, 1969 President Nixon signed legislation which increased the Center's matching Federal grant and its borrowing authority from the United States Treasury.

Facilities for the performing arts have been woefully inadequate in the capital of the United States, particularly when compared with the capital cities of Europe.

After years of considerable public and private discussion and debate, Congress passed legislation authorizing a national center for the performing arts and provided a government-owned site on the Potomac River upstream from the Lincoln Memorial in August 1958.

In 1962 Edward Durell Stone, the Center's architect, submitted his design for a single building housing an Opera House, a Concert Hall, a Theater and a Film Theater and on December 2, 1964 President Johnson turned the first spadeful of earth at the Center's ground breaking ceremony. Construction was begun in 1966 and completion of the building is expected in 1971.

The Kennedy Center will provide a national stage for the finest in classical and contemporary music, opera, drama, dance, film and poetry from this nation and from nations abroad. The Center will sponsor various performing arts projects, such as the American College Theatre Festival initiated in 1969 to provide opportunities for the growth and experience of young performers and young audiences, and for other age groups as well. Through its programs, and through telecasts and broadcasts, the Kennedy Center will seek to influence and invigorate the performing arts throughout the nation.

FUNDING THE KENNEDY CENTER

Although the original legislation for the national center for the performing arts specified that fund-raising was the responsibility of the American people, the John F. Kennedy Center Act authorized a Federal grant of \$15.5 million for construction provided that this amount could be matched with voluntary contributions. At the same time, Congress authorized a \$15.4 million United States Treasury loan to finance underground parking facilities.

In 1969 the matching Federal grant was increased to \$23 million and the Treasury loan to \$20.4 million by Congress to meet the meteoric rise in construction costs.

Gifts to the Kennedy Center from individuals, foundations, industry and the governments and peoples of eight foreign nations have totaled over \$20 million qualifying the Center for an equal amount of the matching Federal grant. The Trustees are currently seeking about \$2.5 million to qualify for the remaining Federal funds and welcome support from all sectors of the general public.

ROGERS WARNS AGAINST RUSSIAN ACTIVITY IN CUBA

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, each year MEMBERS of the Congress take time out on this day to make special note of the Cuban Independence Day. Today marks the 68th anniversary of that occasion.

But since Fidel Castro imposed himself as the dictator of that island, the very celebration of independence day has had a very hollow ring. This year, however, it appears that Fidel Castro has made some sort of military agreement with the Russians which will turn Cuba into a floating air and naval supply base. Since Castro took over the economy of that island has gone down hill. In the past year things have disintegrated to the point that Cuban economy could no longer stumble along on the million dollar a day handout which Russia was providing.

So Fidel Castro's price for delivering the Cuban people into bondage was hiked from a million dollars a day to approximately \$1½ million a day. But since Cuba has nothing but sugar—and most of Russia's satellite bloc countries produce sugar—and a very limited supply of beef and fish, Castro was forced to give the Russians something in return for the additional one-half million dollars a day he needs as a crutch for his faltering economy.

There is, Mr. Speaker, evidence building that indicates that Castro is literally selling Cuba's soil.

There have been TU-20 or -95—Bear—aircraft in and out of Cuba this year and presently there are seven Soviet ships using Cuban facilities. The Bear aircraft, I have been informed, are outfitted for reconnaissance rather than as bombers which the TU-95 was originally built for.

Still, this gives the Soviet Union air surveillance over the east coast of the United States which they would not otherwise have. This also allows them very complete reconnaissance of south Florida. The fact that the Bears are long distance turbo-props and have landed in Cuba, stayed over several days, indicates that Cuba now has the staging and support capabilities for these aircraft. Without Cuba as a turn-around point such reconnaissance would not be possible. I would also mention that so far as I know, this is the first time that this type of aircraft has visited Cuba since the missile crisis.

Among the Russian flotilla of ships now in Caribbean waters is a nuclear submarine, two conventional subs, a destroyer and a cruiser which is capable of carrying missiles. By using Cuba as a floating port and taking advantage of the harbor at Cienfuegos, the Soviet Union has doubled its "at sea" capabilities for offshore surveillance and, of course, this also means they need one-half as many ships for this job.

One year ago, the Soviets sent a flotilla into the Caribbean on a state visit in connection with the Soviet Minister of Defense's visit to Cuba. This year Russian ships are in the Caribbean for their "second annual visit," giving all indications that the Soviets are attempting to establish the Caribbean as part of their sphere of influence because of Cuba.

I am very concerned about this entire situation. Castro is exporting every marketable commodity on the island to the point that he is denying his own people normal food staples. It now appears that he has nothing left to sell and he is turning over Cuban soil to Russia.

Each year people coming out of Cuba have told us that the conditions have deteriorated, yet sources coming out of Cuba last week say that they are even worse than a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues in the Congress and our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere join with me in expressing our hope that Castro's betrayal of the Cuban people will soon end and we will be able to see a true celebration of Cuban independence. So long as the present regime is propped up by the Soviet Union and Fidel Castro denies free election, we can only look forward to more tyranny. I hope that at this time next year we can welcome Cuba back into the brotherhood of free nations.

RAY GALLAGHER, A GREAT AMERICAN, VFW COMMANDER

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it was with much regret to read the remarks in the other body concerning a distinguished citizen of my congressional district, who presently heads the largest overseas veterans organization in the Nation. I am referring to Ray Gallagher of Redfield, S. Dak., commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, whose recent statement in vigorous opposition to congressional action to tie the hands of the President respecting the war in Southeast Asia was the subject of harsh criticism by one of its principal sponsors and advocates, the junior Senator from my State.

First, let me point out that the Veterans of Foreign Wars is an organization of men who have served overseas in war, campaign, or expedition for which service they were awarded a badge or medal. These men left their homes and traveled all over the world to carry out the commitments and obligations of this Nation. No one will argue that these men represent an elite group in our Nation. They have made an extra sacrifice in behalf of all by their service in the Armed Forces during a war or a period of great peril.

The VFW has long demonstrated that a man who fights for his country on the battlefield will want to continue to fight to build and improve his country during peacetime. Unquestionably a veteran has earned for himself an important stake in the destiny of his Nation.

The VFW through its many programs affords a veteran, when he returns from the front, an opportunity to continue the battle for a better America. Veterans have found that when they return, there are many battles to be won on the homefront. I refer to the battles against apathy, forgetfulness of ideals and purposes, the deterioration of our moral and physical strengths, and the abuses of freedom. We all know that the VFW has engaged in campaigns for better neigh-

borhoods, healthier communities, quality schools, and a more effective and responsive Government at all levels. More basically, veterans and members of the VFW realize that the struggle for peace is a never-ending one.

Mr. Speaker, two of the great purposes of the VFW are to maintain and extend the institution of American freedom and preserve and defend the United States from all her enemies, whomsoever. In carrying out these great purposes, the VFW has dedicated itself to military preparedness without losing sight of the fact that we must work diligently to strengthen our ability to wage peace. That is why the VFW strongly supports the program of the President and the Congress to bring the Vietnam war to a prompt and successful conclusion. That is why the VFW has supported the ABM and other modern, sophisticated weapons systems capable of helping to prevent the spread of communism throughout Southeast Asia and other parts of the world. That is why the VFW advocated and now supports the President's decision to move against the sanctuaries in Cambodia as being in the best interests of our fighting men and the Nation.

On the homefront, the VFW has a long record of ferreting out Communists and other groups who are dedicated to the overthrow and destruction of the United States. The Communist Party has long been the avowed enemy of the VFW, both at home and abroad. In recent years, militant action groups, such as the SDS, have been accurately described by the VFW as representing a serious threat to the continuation of the American way of life. All Americans are indebted to the VFW for its continuing campaign against all extremist-anarchist-nihilistic groups, who want to tear this Nation down, whose way of life is violence, and seize upon every opportunity to accomplish their sinister goal.

Mr. Speaker, despite these achievements, Commander in Chief Gallagher has been singled out for criticism and attack for coming to grips with the paramount issues of our day. It should be emphasized that all of Commander in Chief Gallagher's statements regarding both foreign and domestic matters are pursuant to unanimously approved convention mandates, representing 1.5 million members. One of these mandates, by the way, is the VFW endorsement of cleaning out preferred sanctuaries of the enemy to protect our fighting men.

Commander in Chief Gallagher is to be commended for his strong support of President Nixon's move into Cambodia. Gallagher has indicated that the antiwar Senators, by their continued attacks on the United States, are helping to contribute to the student unrest in this country. Gallagher has pointed out that these same Senators who supported the Gulf of Tonkin resolution in 1964, which put American soldiers in Vietnam, never complain about the enemy. Likewise, these Senators do not criticize the invasion of the neutral countries of Southeast Asia. Gallagher's conclusion that these Senators are supporting policies which could jeopardize the lives of American servicemen in Southeast Asia is a fair and reasonable one.

Most important, I cannot emphasize too much, Mr. Speaker, that these statements of Commander in Chief Gallagher are in direct support of national convention mandates. To state that Gallagher was playing politics was not only inaccurate but unfair. He was simply carrying out convention mandates which he promised he would do when he was sworn into office in Philadelphia last August.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include as a part of my remarks the press release issued by Commander in Chief Gallagher April 14 in which he advocated the action subsequently taken by President Nixon to eliminate the sanctuaries in Cambodia, the letter to the President in support of the second phase of the ABM, and resolutions adopted by the delegates to the most recent national convention of the VFW, which was held in Philadelphia last August, which represent the official position of this great veterans organization endorsing the Cambodian action and condemning the SDS.

The material follows:

**CAMBODIAN DECISION PRAISED BY VFW
COMMANDER**

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Ray Gallagher, Redfield, South Dakota, Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, commented Thursday night that President Nixon's decision to move against sanctuaries in Cambodia is the "most sensible decision made by any President on conduct of the Vietnam war."

The President's decision to combine South Vietnamese and American military might against the nerve centers of the enemy could prove to be the key move leading to a conclusion of the war. This policy will, at last, provide the security needed for our troops.

The V.F.W. believes we should take "initiatives" calculated to hurt the enemy, weaken his will to conquer and hasten the end to this tragic conflict.

The allies can no longer sit and wait while the enemy picks and chooses. Gallagher maintained that this action is in line with the V.F.W.'s continued demand that the sanctuaries be closed to the enemy.

**LETTER TO PRESIDENT NIXON FROM VFW
COMMANDER IN CHIEF GALLAGHER**

On November 3, 1969, in your speech to the nation regarding your plans for peace in Vietnam you stated that "if the level of infiltration (by North Vietnamese troops) or our casualties increase while we are trying to scale down the fighting, it will be the result of a conscious decision by the enemy . . . If I conclude that increased enemy action jeopardizes our remaining forces in Vietnam, I shall not hesitate to take strong and effective measures to deal with the situation."

For the week ending April 4, 1970, the United States suffered more casualties, both killed and wounded, than during any previous week since mid-September, 1969. Although the enemy's list of casualties also increased during the foregoing period, it appears the enemy is now making a maximum effort to disrupt U.S. efforts to pacify and to Vietnamize the war.

Mr. President, it is our understanding that the increased enemy attacks of last week have not jeopardized the position of our remaining forces in Vietnam. Nevertheless, we recommend your strategists take a renewed and hard look at the self-imposed restrictions which have been placed on our military forces and tactical options in that war. More importantly, we urge a new look at the military restrictions which have been placed on the armed services of South Vietnam. Specifically, I can see no justification

for the territories of an aggressor nation, such as North Vietnam, to remain a privileged sanctuary while North Vietnamese troops terrorize South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. Borders should make no difference where the security of our troops and the troops of our allies are concerned.

North Vietnam does not merit "sanctuary status." It makes no sense for North Vietnam to remain free of violence, terrorist raids, and disruptive measures while the troops of that aggressor nation conduct all manner of terrorist and combat activities inside South Vietnam. On the face of it, this is a grossly unfair situation. This war should be conducted from a military point of view rather than from a political one. There would appear to be considerable room for innovative thinking and the introduction of a few elements of surprise actions, customary in war, actions which are calculated to increase the pressures, uncertainties, and difficulties against the government and homeland of North Vietnam. We are thinking of measures and actions which go beyond a renewal of the bombing.

Writing in behalf of the more than 1,500,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I urge you to reconsider all the options available to you, the full spectrum, in an effort to find new measures and methods to persuade the Communist forces of that area that international crime does not pay.

**RESOLUTION No. 338—MILITARY REASSESSMENT
IN VIETNAM**

Whereas, the military and political problems in Vietnam are related, they are not identical; and

Whereas, political efforts such as periodic calls for cease fire have been repeatedly scorned and violated by North Vietnam and the Viet Cong; and

Whereas, the political restraints on military operations such as bombing restrictions against military targets in North Vietnam have improved the military posture of enemy forces and diminished the posture of allied forces; and

Whereas, all efforts to appease the government of North Vietnam have been interpreted as allied weaknesses and have not resulted in a cessation of hostilities; and

Whereas, allied forces continue to suffer heavy casualties defending South Vietnam during peace discussions in Paris; and

Whereas, certain U.S. political and religious leaders and media writers have systematically helped the enemy forces and hurt the image and purpose of allied forces who are defending the right of self-determination for South Vietnam; now, therefore

Be it resolved, by the 70th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, that, as long as the lives of U.S. troops remain endangered and face the threat of injury and death, U.S. and allied military leaders be given sole responsibility for conducting combat operations, and that political leaders be restrained to judgments and decisions relevant to their fields of knowledge and expertise; and

Be it further resolved, that failure by the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong to seriously negotiate will cause the leaders of allied forces defending South Vietnam to reevaluate the situation with a view toward increasing the military pressures, by conventional means, to halt those aggressive acts against South Vietnam and bring peace to that country.

Adopted at the 70th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States held at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, August 15 through 22, 1969.

RESOLUTION No. 27—CONDEMNING THE STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY (SDS)

Whereas, many of our colleges and universities have been rocked by violence, riots and hostile demonstrations by students; and

Whereas, many students have left their academic pursuits to engage in lawless vigilantism involving vandalism, arson, kidnapping of university personnel, destruction of property, and the rifling of private papers; and

Whereas, these students not only have impeded the orderly operation of the college and students sincerely interested in obtaining an education from attending classes, but have tried to destroy the whole university community; and

Whereas, these students have protested the presence of military and industrial recruiters on the campus, have urged the abolition of the ROTC and, on occasions, have forcibly tried to prevent ROTC classes and parades, have attacked veterans organizations and intelligence agencies, such as the CIT and FBI, have heckled and tried to embarrass ranking government officials when they visited on campus; and

Whereas, an organization known as Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) has spearheaded this student attack against our universities, encouraging violence, violent demonstrations, and a desire to destroy the school; and

Whereas, SDS is basically an anarchistic organization which detests the American form of government, our democratic liberties and free enterprise system, and seeks to mock, scorn, belittle and destroy our freedoms; and

Whereas, these students have mutilated destroyed, spat upon, defiled and desecrated the United States flag on many occasions and in some instances substituted the flag of North Vietnam for the United States Flag; and

Whereas, the idols of the SDS and the New Left are Fidel Castro, Mao Tse-tung, Che Guevara and Ho Chi Minh and others regarded as fighters against "imperialism", the "establishment", and capitalist society; now, therefore

Be it resolved, by the 70th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, that we fully support the right of dissent, the right of students to think and study in the search of truth, but we abhor violence, strong-arm tactics and other unlawful acts of students; and

Be it further resolved, that we condemn the SDS for what it is, a group bent on anarchy which works for dissension, violence and whose ultimate goal is the destruction of the American democratic, constitutional system and that every V.F.W. member is urged to do everything in his power to expose this anarchistic group for what it is so that the American people and the American college students will realize its true purpose, which is the destruction of American society.

Adopted at the 70th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States held at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, August 15 through 22, 1969.

**TIME FOR A NEW UPRISING:
"PARENT POWER"**

(Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time this country saw a new form of uprising, what I call "parent power."

The papers have been loaded in recent weeks with a great deal about this so-called student power. It has now reached the point where 281 colleges and universities all over the country are indefinitely on strike. They have suspended all normal teaching and learning operations for an indefinite period—until the strikers' demands are met, or

the faculty and administration loses patience or until the war in Vietnam is over, or until the air and water are no longer polluted—you name it, you will find a reason to have classes closed down and normal academic life thrown into a whirling chaos.

About 30 of these schools have closed down with approval and cooperation of their faculties and administration for the rest of the academic year. This means pass/fail instead of examinations and very probably degrees being mailed to those judged worthy to receive them. The explanation given is that the year's work was almost over, anyway, and there has been no real harm to learning.

I cannot help but wonder at this last. In my college days, and in those even more recent, of my acquaintances, the faculty found something to keep a student busy up until the very last minute.

Now, every citizen ought to take part in our political process. No one faults this argument at all. It is important; current events are important; in an age of mass communication there is a lot more floating around about what is going on than in years past. Much of it is wildly out of focus, true, but that is the price we pay for a republican form of government and a free press.

However, students, like the rest of us—like their parents who are paying all or helping to pay part of their education costs, or like the taxpayers whose tax money is going for scholarship or loan programs—have work to do. Their first job is getting an education. They cannot afford to skimp on that any more than the rest of us can let our jobs slide by.

This trend is disturbing a lot of persons, and I heartily agree with a lead editorial in the Washington, D.C., Post of Tuesday, May 20, which said:

We confess to a measure of uneasiness about the closing or suspension of so many institutions of higher learning, as though education were a sort of pabulum which could be set aside in a freezer until students regained an appetite for it.

Well, I would like to suggest invoking "parent power." If the parents of a student where a college is on strike do not like it, they should by all means write the administration and tell them so. And, if their son or daughter is at a university where the administration still feels it can function as it should, they should write, again, but congratulate and compliment the administration for keeping the institution going.

For those of us who have graduated, what do we feel about what our Alma Mater is doing? Is it on strike, and are we disturbed? We should write and say so. Has the administration kept it open? Then, if we agree, let us write and say we approve.

I am convinced that a relatively small minority of noisy troublemakers has buffaloed and bulldozed and cowed subservient faculties and administrations into going along with this strike—a minority of students and rabble-rousing faculty combined. If this is allowed to go on it is going to be the devil's own calculus and the sum is not going to be at all pleasant to figure out.

So, how about some "parent power"?

Parents owe it to themselves; they owe it to their children, and let us have no nonsense about whether the child thinks so or not; it is owed to the taxpayers, and it is owed to the country. How about it?

DIRECT POLITICAL ACTION WITHIN THE ESTABLISHED DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

(Mr. RIEGLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, apparently some 281 colleges across the country are still closed in opposition to the war in Southeast Asia and the violence and bloodshed on American campuses.

I take the well—as one who is opposed to the war in Vietnam—to urge that every effort now be made to reopen our colleges and universities wherever possible. The shutdown of colleges has made its point—but events have changed—and the emphasis now must shift to direct political action within the established democratic process. Students who wish to return to their classes—and teachers who wish to teach—must be free to do so.

Reasonable and responsible end-the-war amendments are well underway in the House and Senate—and gaining increasing support. These amendments should become the focus of effort by those across the country who want to end the war.

Further, direct political action programs are being developed to insure meaningful student volunteer participation in this year's elections. Efforts like the Princeton plan—to release students to work in the fall elections—are constructive avenues now opening up to allow needed changes in national policy. It is clear that national policy will change—when election outcomes at the grassroots are changed.

With the issues now drawn, I hope we can reopen most—if not all—of our colleges and universities in the days ahead. If young people are to be persuasive in rallying broad public opinion for a reasonable end to the war—it is now urgent that the actions of young people reflect maturity, high purpose, commitment, and commonsense.

An unrepresentative handful of revolutionaries—preaching and practicing violence—cannot be allowed to continue as the most visible symbol of young people. Increasing polarization based on stereotypes can only further damage our country.

With practical political goals and targets now clear, I believe we should get our colleges and universities back in operation—a move that would strengthen the credibility of the concerned and stand that we must end the war quickly.

PROGRAM TO ASSIST RACIALLY IMPACTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, this morning

when I picked up the Washington Post, I was amazed to read a headline, "United States Slashes Aid to Schools With Special Race Problems," and the column written by Don Oberdorfer. This is completely untrue.

In the first place, you cannot slash something that does not exist, and the aid announced by President Nixon on March 24 for racially impacted schools had not even been budgeted at that time. The President announced \$500 million to be made available in fiscal year 1971 and \$1 billion in fiscal year 1972. The \$150 million which the article refers to is the amount the administration will now request of the Congress through the Appropriations Committee from existing authority in such programs as the Economic Opportunity Act, the Civil Rights Act, Cooperative Research Act, Education Professions Development Act, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

After careful consideration, the administration found that the wisest course of action would be to request new authority to fund a program to assist racially impacted school districts. In order to move more quickly than would be possible if they awaited passage of the authorization legislation, the administration has now specifically requested the initial \$150 million come from present authority, so that assurances can be made to the schools involved, before classes begin again next September. The schools we are talking about are those who are implementing plans to overcome de jure racial segregation and those that are suffering from de facto segregation.

The administration still intends to seek the additional \$350 million for fiscal year 1971 when the new authorization legislation is adopted, and their review of the budget this summer will show that request. In a nutshell the administration, in its "reordering of priorities," is asking that its 1971 budget be revised to add \$500 million to help racially impacted schools, \$150 million from existing authority, and \$350 million from new authority.

What amazes me about articles like that written by Don Oberdorfer, which I shall include at the end of this statement, is the constant effort to develop a credibility gap with this administration. A fairer reporting of administration actions certainly is called for and the Washington Post ought to correct their error.

The following is portions of the article covering the points referred to in the headline:

UNITED STATES SLASHES AID TO SCHOOLS WITH SPECIAL RACE PROBLEMS (By Don Oberdorfer)

The White House announced yesterday that the Nixon administration plans to spend only \$150 million next year to aid schools with special racial problems—not \$500 million as earlier expected.

The announcement was made by Budget Director Robert P. Mayo, who drew a sharp distinction between the half-billion-dollar special school "program" announced by President Nixon on March 24 and the \$150 million now scheduled actually to be spent under that program in the next fiscal year starting July 1.

Mayo's announcement came as a surprise to officials in the government who had been working on the special school fund. There had been no hint in Mr. Nixon's announcement on the school outlay that actual spending would be so low, and no indication of this in the briefings surrounding that announcement.

The announcement came after a three-hour Cabinet meeting on foreign and domestic matters.

In announcing the special fund for schools with racial problems in his March 24 desegregation statement, Mr. Nixon said he would ask Congress to divert \$500 million from his previously submitted budget for fiscal 1971.

White House officials told newsmen at briefings that day that the money would be taken from other domestic programs by "a reordering of priorities" and that studies already had been completed to pinpoint the source of the funds. At the same time, however, it was learned that Budget Director Mayo was informed of the \$500-million fund only hours before it was announced.

The legislative proposal is expected to call for total budget authority of \$500 million, even though actual spending next year is now estimated at \$150 million.

Mr. Nixon told lawmakers March 24 that he hoped to submit detailed legislation on the school fund by mid-April. The legislation still had not been sent to Congress yesterday.

Last week Secretary of Housing and Urban Development George Romney publicly denied reports that large portions of the \$500 million school fund would be taken from Model Cities or other urban programs. As it turned out yesterday, the \$150 million actually to be spent on the school fund exactly matches a \$150 million decline in anticipated spending for the year under the Model Cities program.

Romney said late yesterday that the Model Cities decline is merely an "estimate" based on slower than anticipated action by cities applying for the money, and that more money will be provided if the estimate proves to be too low.

White House and Budget Bureau officials said the same of the \$150 million to be spent for the special school fund. "There is no lessening of our commitment," a White House official said.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1970

(Mr. HAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over a section in the bill H.R. 17550, which I understand is coming before the House this week.

That section proposes to cut medicaid costs by \$238 million, by reducing by one-third the Federal matching funds paid to a skilled nursing home after 90 days of care of an individual.

I have received numerous communications from my district, the first district of Georgia where many of our people, including nursing home directors, are greatly distressed at this proposal.

The directors tell me that as many as 99 percent of their patients are in the nursing homes for periods far exceeding 90 days.

Furthermore, this proposal would cost the State of Georgia approximately seven and a half million dollars in additional funds and no State funds are presently available to offset this loss.

We all know the House rule under which this bill will be considered will not permit amendments from the floor, but, I sincerely hope that steps can be taken to prevent these elderly senior citizens from being put in the position of not having the proper care and comfort they have earned and need in their golden years.

BILL PROVIDING INSURANCE FOR MEMBER ACCOUNTS IN STATE-CHARTERED AND FEDERALLY CHARTERED CREDIT UNIONS

(Mr. WIDNALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today, Congressman Brock and I introduced for appropriate reference a bill to provide insurance for member accounts in State-chartered and federally chartered credit unions and for other purposes.

I think there are few people who realize that there is no share insurance covering the savings accounts of those who choose to save through federally chartered or State-chartered credit unions. We have grown accustomed to the sense of security offered by such insurance on savings deposits in commercial banks, mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations, and many of those who save through the credit union system have simply assumed that they enjoyed similar protection. Unfortunately, this is not so. It is our objective with this legislation to provide that all federally chartered credit unions avail themselves of this share insurance and that it be available on a permissive basis to State-chartered credit unions.

There are over 8½ million account holders in Federal credit unions who have less than \$500 in savings. For most of these people this represents their only savings and their only protection against a rainy day. Surely they are entitled to insurance protection for these deposits just like those who save in other institutions. While the record of credit union failures is a good one, the fact remains that whenever any one fails, there is human suffering which could be avoided by such a sound insurance program as this legislation proposes.

I urge all of my colleagues to join with me in supporting this much-needed consumer legislation.

TRIBUTE TO HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to hear my dear friend, Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK, will tell the press today of his intention to retire. It is difficult for me to contemplate the House of Representatives functioning without his wise counsel and outstanding leadership. JOHN McCORMACK is without question the preeminent legislator of the world and one of the most remarkable men ever to serve in the House of Representatives.

His vision, energy and courage have been primarily responsible for the prodigious amount of progressive legislation enacted by the Congress in the last 40 years. In addition to being one of the great statesmen in American history, he has given me the benefit of his warm personal friendship. It is impossible for me to express the depth of my affection for JOHN W. McCORMACK. I am confident, despite his retirement as announced today, that he will continue to give the Congress and the Country the benefit of his wise counsel and superior judgment for many years to come. For as long as free government remains in America, this country will reap the rewards of his great service and lasting contributions.

JOHN W. McCORMACK has been my leader ever since I became a Member of this House. He will always be my leader; he will always be my friend.

[Applause, Members rising.]

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK

(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I join, with the same degree of regret and sadness, in the remarks made by the distinguished majority leader today, in the fact that you have told us that come January you will not be in this body.

To me it is very difficult to imagine the House of Representatives without JOHN McCORMACK. I came here as a very young man. I think the man who has had the greatest influence on my life has been Speaker McCORMACK. That extends to the lives of millions of other people all over this world.

For more than 40 years you have been the great leader in passing the monumental social and economic reforms that have characterized this turbulent period in this history of our country.

While you have spent practically your whole career in Congress as a spokesman for the Democratic Party, without exception your devotion has always been first to our country.

I have never seen you flinch when you knew or felt that the interest or the security of this country at home or abroad demanded decisive, quick action.

No man is more beloved by our colleagues on both sides of the aisle. You have been a unifying force in the Democratic Party, in the Congress, and in the country.

I know that your counsel has been sought by every President since Franklin Roosevelt, and all have found your judgment to be wise, trustworthy, and prudent.

Those of us who have served with you in the leadership—and I have had the pleasure, and sometimes the burden, of being the majority whip for 8 years now—hope to work with you to achieve the broad legislative objectives now pending in the Congress so that your career will be concluded at the height of success.

Finally I should like to say, on behalf of myself and my wife, who is equally devoted to you, and my children, that we

share your deep concern over the illness of your lovely wife, and we hope that she will have a speedy recovery. We know of no man who has been a more devoted, a more steadfast or a more loving husband.

Finally let me say that your friendship has been a tower of strength to me.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK

(Mr. SMITH of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Members on our side of the aisle—this being late in the day, and many not being here—and particularly on behalf of myself in this the 14th year I have been in the House of Representatives, I should like to say to you at all times you have been 100-percent fair, cooperative, and honest in every possible way in your associations with me in my position. I am deeply grateful. I wish you the very, very best.

I will say to the distinguished majority leader that I sincerely hope an appropriate date will be set aside sometime in the future so that all of us can pay the tribute to the Speaker which he so greatly deserves.

Mr. Speaker, thank you.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure to me to serve under the Speaker of the House, Mr. McCORMACK. I have known him now more than 41 years. I have worked with him. Very few times did we ever differ on legislation.

Since I commenced my service in March 1929—the delegations from Texas and Massachusetts have always worked together in the interests of the public, to help the people.

Although our interests in our area are in large part agricultural and Mr. McCORMACK has represented a district that does not have an agricultural plant of any kind, he has always, invariably and without exception, voted in favor of the farmers of this country. He never failed. He has been with the poor people and the small business people.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take up more time, but I want to say that I have a fond remembrance of Speaker McCORMACK. I have many pleasant memories of my service with him here. He is a fair man and a just man, and he always made sure that everyone, even the newest Member who came here, received a fair deal in every way. I have often said that I have never heard Mr. McCORMACK make a speech that I did not learn something from that speech, and I can repeat that statement today. This is true whether it was a long speech or a short speech.

JOHN McCORMACK has been a great inspiration to me, because he is not only a great man individually but a great statesman.

Of course, naturally, I regret having heard him announce that he will not be a candidate for Speaker any more and that he is terminating his service in the Congress. I know that he has good reasons for that and, of course, we all wish him the very best of everything in the world.

Speaker McCORMACK is a great American who always placed his country above all else. I have served with JOHN McCORMACK in the House of Representatives for more than 41 years and I know that he will be sorely missed in the 92d Congress.

JOHN McCORMACK's singular devotion to the House of Representatives has been the bulwark of strength for many of us who have been privileged to serve with him through the years.

His love for this House and its part in our representative democracy has infected newly arriving Members, and continually sustained his colleagues.

The House of Representatives and the Nation owe JOHN McCORMACK a great debt for his dedicated service through these many Congresses.

ON THE ANNOUNCED RETIREMENT OF SPEAKER JOHN McCORMACK

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I speak for all of America's people today, Democrats, Republicans, independents, young and old, rich and poor, white and black, in expressing sorrow at the news that our very beloved and highly distinguished Speaker will not seek reelection to the House of Representatives.

There is no question that during the last 40 years, JOHN McCORMACK has left an indelible mark on every single plateau of progress this Nation has made and in every field of social endeavor. Whether it be in foreign affairs or in domestic affairs, whether in the space program, in defense, in medicare—you name it—JOHN McCORMACK was there leading the fight. This country today has reached the heights of a trillion dollar economy and it will continue to be the great hope of the world economically and otherwise. It is only because we had JOHN McCORMACK at the helm leading this great House of Representatives that we have achieved this pinnacle.

I know that he has served under seven Presidents—Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon—Democrats and Republicans, who had always looked upon him as a friend, a loyal American, and a stalwart defender of the principles of freedom for which this country stands.

Mr. McCORMACK, I want to congratulate you on the fact that after midnight next Sunday you will write another exciting chapter in your long, historic career when you will attain the record of being the Speaker of this House for the longest continuous period of time in the history of the United States. Certainly, there are many, many magnificent pages in your history of achievement and accomplishment in this Government, and the fact that you will top off this great service with the historic achievement in

Congress as Speaker, speaks for your great ability, the honor and respect that all of us have for you.

I know that every Member who has come to this House since JOHN McCORMACK has been in the leadership has felt his assistance, his aid, his leadership, his guidance, and I am sure that all of us are going to miss his advice.

Whoever takes JOHN McCORMACK's place will have to follow in footsteps hard to fill because mankind seldom has the great opportunity of seeing men like JOHN McCORMACK pass upon the world scene.

I am sure the whole Nation is going to feel the great loss of his leadership. I am sure that the whole country is saddened by learning that he will not be with us in his role of leadership next January. I wish you, Mr. Speaker, the greatest of joy and happiness in your well deserved and hard earned retirement. And I wish for your lovely wife, a speedy recovery to good health so both of you can enjoy the pleasures of your retirement.

I have a very nice wish which I hope you will grant mankind. That is that you will consent to write your memoirs as Speaker of the House and Majority Leader during the most dramatic period of American history. You owe it to American scholars and the American people to record for eternity the excitement that has surrounded you in participating in most of the momentous moments of our Nation's history. I honestly hope you will record your memoirs for the enlightenment of generations to come.

THE HONORABLE JOHN McCORMACK

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans will be saddened by the news of the decision by our beloved Speaker, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK, not to seek reelection this year as a Member of this body.

I do not know of any living American who has made a greater contribution as a legislative leader than JOHN McCORMACK of Massachusetts. The statute books of the Nation are filled with splendid legislative monuments that testify eloquently to his ability; his leadership, and his preminent statesmanship in this century.

The Speaker's decision was motivated by love and concern for his lovely wife, who has shared with him one of America's finest Washington careers. I know all of us will be wishing the best of everything in life for these two wonderful people, who have done so much to enrich all our lives and to build a better America.

THE HONORABLE JOHN McCORMACK

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I have

just a while ago heard the news that JOHN McCORMACK is retiring after 42 years of service to his constituents in Massachusetts and to the Nation. He has served well, and he deserves the thanks of all of the people of this country.

JOHN McCORMACK has been a patriarch of the U.S. House of Representatives, of the Democratic Party, and of the Nation. His list of accomplishments will fill the history books, and his biographers will have much to work with. He is a symbol of the strength, the intelligence, the aggressive honesty, and the stability of the American Government. He is living proof of the effectiveness of our constitutional democracy.

Since the Presidency of Herbert Hoover, JOHN McCORMACK has been setting the pace for Members of Congress, providing the leadership needed by Democratic Presidents, and providing loyal opposition to Republican Presidents.

As a freshman Member of Congress, Speaker McCORMACK has provided me with encouragement and support, advice and counsel, words of wisdom and, when necessary, words of caution.

The hallmark of my experiences as a freshman Member of the 91st Congress has been the opportunity and the honor to know and to work with JOHN McCORMACK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE HONORABLE JOHN McCORMACK

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the news and deeply regret that the Speaker has elected to discontinue his service at the end of this year in this great House of Representatives.

I want to say for the RECORD what has been his record but it would take too long.

In every kind of progress during the Speaker's time the gentleman from Massachusetts has been in the forefront. In every progressive step in this Government it has been achieved with his leadership. Even back during the time of the consideration of the minimum wage of 25 cents an hour, he knew how to progress, he knew how to make a progressive settlement. In my time which is very short I know that he knows how to make progressive compromise.

I greatly appreciate his progressive leadership. I am very happy that I was here to follow him. I note that Republicans join us Democrats in extolling the fairness and justness of this great Speaker, JOHN W. McCORMACK.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my words of high tribute to a great leader and a great man. As has been well pointed out, there are very few pieces of progressive legislation over the past 40 years that have not

borne the mark, the participation and the active leadership of the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK. Just mentioning one or two, as a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I want to call attention to the fact that Speaker McCORMACK is the architect of the Space Act of 1958. More recently, last year, in connection with the coal mine health and safety bill, the Speaker exerted a tremendous influence and leadership in getting this piece of legislation through the Congress—a piece of legislation for which the coal miners of this Nation will be forever grateful to the Speaker for his leadership and to those who participated in bringing this landmark law into being.

The young people of this Nation can be proud of the leadership Speaker McCORMACK has exerted. I know there are many, many Members of the House who wonder how the Speaker has the time to come out and greet all of the many groups of young people that come here to their Nation's Capital. One of the most inspiring sights and opportunities I think for young people visiting Washington is to have the chance to sit here on the floor of the House when the House is not in session and have the Speaker come out and talk with them, and answer questions.

I am proud to have served under Speaker McCORMACK's leadership, and I join with those who express sorrow at his decision to retire.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK

(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I too was greatly shocked to learn that our beloved Speaker, JOHN W. McCORMACK, has announced his retirement as of the end of this session.

Only a few days ago I was asked by an inquiring reporter as to what I thought the chances of JOHN W. McCORMACK were to be reelected as Speaker of the House of Representatives, and whether I would vote for him if he were to seek reelection. My answer was an unqualified "yes," and that I thought that without any question whatsoever, at least, in my mind, and in the minds of the overwhelming majority of the Members, JOHN W. McCORMACK would be continued as the Speaker of the House of Representatives if he chose to do so.

It is with regret, therefore, that we learned of his announcement. It is understandable that the Speaker would want to spend more time with the ailing Mrs. McCormack.

I served in the 88th Congress, which became known as the "Civil Rights Congress." I was proud to have served in that Congress. I served in the 89th Congress, which came to be known as the "Education Congress." I was proud to have served in that Congress. I served in the 90th Congress, later to be known as the "Consumers' Congress." I was proud to have served in that Congress. And all of those Congresses were led by JOHN W.

McCORMACK, the greatest progressive in the history of our Nation to sit in the Speaker's chair.

Perhaps the greatness of JOHN W. McCORMACK is best revealed in his own words, and he has said this repeatedly, "If I had a choice to be known either as a great man or a good man, I would choose to be known as a good man."

Here is a man of rarity whose goodness led him to greatness, and whose true greatness lies in his goodness. JOHN W. McCORMACK has proven to the world that a man can be good and still be great.

God bless you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK

(Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of sadness that I heard of your announcement today to retire from this great and august body, and to retire not only as Speaker of the House but also as a Member of the Congress.

I have known you, Mr. Speaker, as a close and dear friend for many, many years. No man knows you better than I do. No man understands you better than I do or loves you more dearly than I do. No man appreciates your kindnesses to him through the years more than I do.

As a youngster, I can remember the Horatio Alger stories, and how they thrilled me. I have always compared you with those great stories—the oldest son of a family whose father had died, a boy who had to leave school at 13 years of age to become the breadwinner of the family, who educated himself, and without a high school diploma and never a day in college, studied in a law office and learned law at a wage of \$3 to \$5 a week, and then became one of the outstanding trial lawyers in our section of the country; and who from there decided that he would enter the field of politics and run for the Constitutional Convention.

The year 1919 in Massachusetts was part of an era of giants, of great industrial powers, great labor leaders, and great scholars from the academic world. These were the men who were elected to this constitutional convention. Out of that convention came a shining light, a new leader, who was ultimately to become the Speaker of the House of Representatives after serving here as minority whip and as majority leader.

He knows the meaning of the Speakership. He knows the power of the gavel and the authority of the mace. And, more than anyone here today, he knows the responsibilities of that office. The Speakership is more than the second highest office in the land, it is the leadership of the people's Chamber, the House of Representatives.

Our beloved Speaker understands that office and uses it wisely.

He is a great man and because of him America has become a greater country.

So it is with sadness in my heart, Mr.

Speaker, that I contemplate the end of your service here—service that has improved and, indeed, saved the Nation. This is not a fond adieu at this time because we will see a lot of each other between now and the end of the session, but I just had to express my sincere and deep feelings about you and my appreciation in this hour when you are telling the world that you are leaving this House of Representatives. You have served the Nation, this House, and Massachusetts well. We all tend to you our devotion and love and our deep gratitude. It is with pride and honor that I call you my leader and my friend.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker—and as I utter the words, "Mr. Speaker," I am stricken with a sense of sadness and regret as I have just learned that Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK has announced plans to retire and not seek reelection to the Congress.

Speaker McCORMACK is unquestionably one of the great Speakers of all time—and history will record his greatness in deeds and performance.

Speaker McCORMACK is in the tradition of the great Speakers of the House—Speaker Sam Rayburn, his predecessor; Speaker Henry Clay, Speaker Thomas B. Reed, Speaker James K. Polk, Speaker Joe Cannon, Speaker Nicholas Longworth, and Speaker Champ Clark, among others—men whose names live forever on the roll of honor of outstanding leaders who have guided the House through challenging and momentous times.

Such a man is Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK.

Speaker McCORMACK has served ably, courageously and effectively during one of the most difficult periods in American history—one of the periods of turmoil, upheaval, and change that "try men's souls," in the words of the great patriot Thomas Paine.

Speaker McCORMACK has never wavered or vacillated in providing the strong, firm leadership needed in the House. He has been instrumental in the passage of volumes of legislation in the public interest. The 89th Congress under his leadership is regarded as perhaps the most productive legislative Congress in our history.

He has never hesitated to take strong positions and to step out in the vanguard in advocating and supporting needed and necessary legislation, always championing the public welfare and the public interest.

Speaker McCORMACK, apart from his ability and integrity and force as a leader, is a grand gentleman—a man of unfailing compassion—a thoughtful man whose acts of kindness and consideration are countless. He is not only a great man, he is a good man in the fullest meaning of the term.

He is a great leader and a great American—and the House will sorely miss his leadership and his guidance. He has made his mark as he lays down the gavel.

Speaker McCORMACK came to the Congress in the 70th Congress in 1928 and has served faithfully and effectively since that time in subsequent Con-

gresses—a period of 42 years. He became Speaker in the second session of the 87th Congress in 1962 following the death of Speaker Sam Rayburn of Texas.

Before becoming Speaker he served as majority leader and Democratic whip. Prior to coming to Congress he had an illustrious career as a member of the Massachusetts Legislature.

His vast experience and great ability have provided the House with excellent and effective leadership, and it is with deep regret that we acknowledge his decision to retire.

The lessons of history teach clearly that the greatness of a Nation lies in the greatness of its leaders.

Certainly the greatness of JOHN McCORMACK has elevated him to a prominent place in history. As a lighthouse on the foggy Massachusetts coast provides light and guidance to the mariners at sea, so JOHN McCORMACK has provided guidance and leadership necessary for the House of Representatives across the shoals and breakers to many right and just decisions for this Nation.

We shall miss JOHN McCORMACK as Speaker.

When a great man relinquishes the mantle of leadership it is always a sad occasion.

As Speaker McCORMACK ends his leadership in the House, there is pain and regret—but the footsteps he has left in the sands of time and history as Speaker will always remind us that we were privileged to walk beside one of the great and good men—a giant in history.

Certainly I want to wish Speaker McCORMACK and his beloved Mrs. McCORMACK the best of good luck and happiness as he relinquishes his duties as Speaker. He deserves rest and relaxation from the stresses and strains of leadership after many years of dedicated service. Our thoughts and prayers and best wishes will always be with Speaker McCORMACK of Massachusetts—an all-American.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of our distinguished Speaker after so many years of service in the leadership and as the Representative of Massachusetts' Ninth District takes from us a uniquely committed Congressman.

JOHN W. McCORMACK, in more than 40 years of selfless service, has given all of us an excellent example of how a Member can serve his country and his constituents. Since coming to the House in 1965 I have been repeatedly impressed by the high standards of patriotism, leadership, and public service maintained by the Speaker.

He has shown us time and again that he is not only selfless but truly committed to doing what he believes best for our country.

The wisdom he has gained through the administrations of seven Presidents has given the Speaker truly unique insights into the operation of the Congress and our Government. He has been a leader, a colleague, and a friend to all who have served with him.

I regret that the Speaker's retirement is made necessary by his wife's ill health and I can only say to the Speaker that

I wish him and Mrs. McCORMACK many more years of happiness together.

As an American I must say to JOHN W. McCORMACK: "Thank you for your exemplary service to our country."

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, you certainly deserve great credit for your decision not to seek reelection to the House. You have had an outstanding career in Congress for over 40 years and have made a record which few, if any, will be able to surpass. You will leave with your faculties unimpaired.

Throughout your career and especially in the days of the New Deal you were a prime mover in the passage of the social legislation which forms the basis of our free economic system today. In addition, you performed yeoman service in helping to prepare our Nation for its eventual involvement in World War II.

Another element in reaching your decision I am sure has been the illness of Mrs. McCORMACK who has been a support and helpmate through your entire political career.

You leave the House with the appreciation of all Democrats for the role you have played in the development of our party, but above that with the gratitude of all Members of the House and millions in the Nation as a whole for your contribution to the economic progress in American life and to the increased dignity of every individual American citizen.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened by the retirement announcement of my esteemed, beloved friend and outstanding American, Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK.

While I had some intimation recently that the Speaker was contemplating retirement, somehow I could not conceive that it could happen.

I have known the Speaker since before I came to Congress. He has been my warm, loyal friend ever since I have been privileged to serve in this great body, and he assisted me in many ways to lighten the burdens of office, and make my service here more meaningful to my district, my constituents, and our country.

Speaker McCORMACK is universally known as one of the greatest Americans who has ever served in the Congress. To my mind, he is our greatest Speaker. He is a man of great humane sensibilities, and he is endowed with a sense of dedication and inspiring loyalty to his family, his friends, his country, and the commitments of the very high office he holds with such brilliant distinction.

It is impossible here to do more than touch upon some of the facets of his character that have endeared him to so many people, and the quality of his truly extraordinary leadership that enabled him to achieve a record of unprecedented success in charting in the House the legislative accomplishments of the Congress, in war and in peace, through one of the stormiest, difficult periods of extraordinary advancement and progress that this or any other nation has ever experienced.

Speaker McCORMACK is known the country and the world over for the great-

ness of his leadership, his essential goodness as a human being, his amiable, personal qualities, the sweep and import of his memorable achievements, his unselfish labors for the country, the world and the American people. These attributes comprise a glorious chapter in the history of this House and this Government.

The fairness, impartiality and justice with which he conducts the affairs of the House—his dignity, the broadness of his vision, the high aims of his objectives, the warming generosity of his impulse, and the invariable kindness, compassion and helpfulness to others that he has shown in the discharge of his heavy responsibilities, are known to all of us who have served here with him, and are recognized by the people throughout this country and in many parts of the world.

Master of parliamentary law and procedure, skilled in legislative accomplishment, resolute, tenacious and resourceful in seeking his goal, yet always animated by respect and consideration for others, our esteemed, beloved Speaker stands out as an inspired, sagacious advocate and unyielding fighter for the things in which he believes, eager at all times to give of himself to advance the cause of human betterment, to broaden the horizons of freedom, to speed the reality of universal peace and a world governed by the principles of law, rather than the savage impediments of violence and hatred.

JOHN McCORMACK is an illustrious son of our renowned Bay State of Massachusetts, proud of his heritage and his faith, and unalterably committed to the free way of life for this Nation and all peoples who chose it. Our beloved, inspired leader has moved unfalteringly with superb skill, ability and determination to carry out the vital missions of highest responsibility for the security, well being, and ever higher aspirations and standards for this great free Nation and all its people regardless of race, creed or class and especially for the lowly and the inarticulate for whom he did so much.

The Speaker is endowed with a great mind, a great heart, and a great spirit that never gives up, never retreats, never ceases to press forward, boldly and courageously, in his quests for social justice and peace, to which years ago he so prayerfully dedicated himself to serve.

JOHN McCORMACK, humble boy from south Boston, has advanced himself step by step by his own powers, strength of character and zeal for achievement until he now ranks with the greatest leaders of our national history.

A great age has produced him to serve America; a great generation has seen him give his all to make this country, as he played such a vital part in doing, in so many respects, a better place to live in; and many generations, some yet unborn, will hail this illustrious American Speaker and statesman as a courageous, farsighted leader, who served so fearlessly and well in times of peril, in times of unprecedented prosperity, and in times of restlessness and upset, and did his great and memorable tasks to conserve, to develop, to advance and bring

to fruitful realization the powers, the great potential, and the great destiny of our country in the annals of humanity.

I am so very sorry that this great American is leaving the House he has led with such conspicuous outstanding success and unrestrained dedication, but he has earned the rest and relaxation that I hope and pray may now be his, and the opportunity to spend some time with his beloved wife, family, and friends, from whom he has been separated, in so many respects, during the long, hard years of troubles, sacrifices, and historic victories that his great service has helped so much to impress indelibly upon the official records of this House, and above all in the hearts, the gratitude, the abiding love of his colleagues, and the American people.

For JOHN McCORMACK his departure from public life will not end his interests in and his labors for the principles and the missions he has lived throughout his long, fruitful life.

The call of public service, the call of the people will come to him again and again, in other areas of service to the Nation, and the American people, that he will unselfishly and effectively perform as long as the good Lord gives him the strength and the ability to respond, and I hope and pray that will be for many years to come.

This country could never possibly thank JOHN McCORMACK for what he has done to protect, preserve, enrich, and develop this great Nation which he in his lifetime, to a large extent through his efforts and under his leadership helped become the greatest, the richest, the most powerful, and the freest nation in the history of the world.

Let all those who remain take up the torch of freedom which he passes to all those who serve here, and seek to hold it as high as he did for the House, the Nation, and the people of the country, and the world.

What our great Speaker has achieved here to build and expand the horizons of justice, compassion, and love of fellow man is an enduring inspiration. It is up to those who follow to continue this great work until all our dreams for humankind shall be realized.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine personal regret and disappointment that I heard the announcement of Speaker McCORMACK's decision to retire from Congress at the end of the current session.

A truly distinguished American and leader, he has earned the respect and gratitude of the entire Nation. His outstanding record of achievement and dedicated public service extends for more than a half century. During the 40 years he has served in Congress his legislative record in both domestic and international affairs is second to none.

Knowing of his deep affection and love for his wife, his decision was not entirely unexpected, particularly since her illness became known. Mrs. Zablocki joins me in the urgent hope and prayer that her recovery be prompt and complete.

Speaker McCORMACK's renown was already firmly established when I was first elected to Congress 22 years ago. During

those years it has been my privilege to work with the late Speaker Sam Rayburn and Speaker JOHN McCORMACK—two of the most distinguished and respected House leaders in history.

As leader and Speaker, Mr. McCORMACK was always cooperative and considerate of all Members of Congress—sometimes perhaps to a fault. His wisdom and ability will be sorely missed. My earnest hope is that even in retirement he will continue at times to share with his colleagues in the House his wisdom and counsel.

This country—a country he loves deeply—is and forever will be grateful.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks on the subject of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN SEYMOUR HALPERN OPPOSING THE USE OF LIVE AMMUNITION ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES BY NATIONAL GUARDSMEN EXCEPT WITH TRAINING OF TROOPS IN RIOT CONTROL AND THE USE OF FIREARMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUCINSKI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to express my strong opposition to the carrying of live ammunition on college campuses by National Guardsmen except when guardsmen have received proper training in riot control and the use of firearms. As the recent events at Kent State University so tragically illustrate, the use of improperly trained guardsmen to control a riot is fraught with the potential for death. We must not allow this possibility to continue to threaten a nation already divided by intense feelings of discord and disharmony.

The recent deaths of four college students at Kent State has raised a number of questions concerning the level of National Guard training. It is abundantly clear that National Guardsmen, insufficiently trained in the use of live ammunition and unsure of their response to riot situations, are likely to resort to violence at the first difficult moment. Such action can only occasion more massive confrontations on college campuses.

The Ohio adjutant general's office has informed me that one of the two units at Kent State had only the minimum level of riot control training recommended by the U.S. Army, while the other did not have even that much. Some units in other States receive three or four times the minimum level. It is obvious that the more hours of training an individual guardsman has received, the surer he will be of himself and of his response to unexpected situations.

For these reasons I am pleased to have joined the able gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN), in introducing legislation restricting the carrying of live ammunition by National Guardsmen on college campuses to situations in which there have been sufficient riot control and live ammunition training for guardsmen.

In order to prevent the future use of National Guardsmen from intensifying the level of violence on college campuses, the proposed legislation would prohibit any National Guardsmen from carrying weapons containing live ammunition on a college campus unless he has received 56 hours of riot control training and 100 hours of live firearms training. This legislation would also prohibit the carrying by guardsmen of weapons containing live ammunition unless a situation should exist in which life is imperiled and a specific order for the carrying of such ammunition has been issued. States failing to comply would lose Federal funding of National Guard training and equipment.

I am greatly concerned with the necessity for such legislation, to avoid repetition of the Kent State tragedy. Already, police at Jackson State College in Jackson, Miss., have been confronted with a situation resulting in the deaths of two students. In the interest of human concern, as well as of our national well-being, I urge all of my colleagues to give to this problem their urgent attention and careful study.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. The United States is the world's largest paper producer. In 1966 the United States produced 7,078,000 metric tons of paper—other than printing. Italy, the second-ranked nation, produced 2,116,000 metric tons.

CAMPAIGN A. & P.—A "CAMPAIGN GM" FOR THE FOOD INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today launched a campaign to make the Nation's food chains more responsible to the consumer. Called Campaign A. & P., the project is patterned after the Ralph Nader inspired Campaign GM, which reaches its culmination on Friday, May 22, in Detroit.

Like the GM effort the food chain campaign will utilize the power of the stockholder to force changes in corporate policy.

The campaign has three objectives: First, voluntary unit pricing; second, voluntary "open dating" of all foods; and third, election of at least one consumer

representative to the corporate board of directors.

These demands went out in letters to the 10 largest grocery chains in the country.

Primary emphasis will be placed on A. & P. because it is the largest retail chain in the country and because it has consistently turned up with the most consumer abuses. In recent surveys of food freshness in the District of Columbia conducted by the District of Columbia Democratic Central Committee and my staff, A. & P. stores were found to have the most stale items. Similar findings also developed in Chicago and New York.

It is about time for A. & P. to emerge into the 20th century from its Darwinian approach to the consumer. The company and the consumer do not have to be in competition for the survival of the fittest. The A. & P. stockholders meeting is scheduled for June 16 in New York City.

I have previously introduced on behalf of 50 other Members of the House and myself H.R. 17005, legislation to require the label of all perishable and semiperishable foods to contain the date—openly stated—after which the item can no longer be safely sold. Such legislation would be unnecessary if the food chains were more consumer oriented.

I have secured the stock proxies for some of the 10 companies and intend to contact foundations, labor unions, universities, members of consumer organizations, and the city of New York, all of which have large holdings in food chain stock, to request them to cast their votes for the three proposed propositions if the companies do not respond favorably to my three demands.

The 10 largest food chains in order of size are Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Inc.; A. & P.; Safeway Stores, Inc.; Kroger Co.; Food Fair Stores, Inc.; Jewel Companies, Inc.; Acme Markets, Inc.; National Tea Co.—controlled by George Weston, Ltd.; Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc.; Lucky Stores, Inc.; and Grand Union Co. In addition to these also included as targets of Campaign A. & P. are Daitch Shopwell and Key Food Supermarkets.

The text of my letter to the food chains follows:

TEXT OF LETTER TO STORES

MAY 20, 1970.

DEAR SIR: In recent years there has developed an increased questioning of the food industry and a growth of public doubts as to whether the industry is really doing all that it possibly can to bring to the consumer the safest and freshest foods. This concern has been brought about by surveys by government and private citizens which have uncovered abuses with respect to ingredients, freshness, prices which rise when the welfare checks come out, etc.

While all industries have a responsibility to the public, the responsibilities of the food industry go well beyond those of other industries. If a vacuum cleaner fails to work, one can always have it repaired. If a food item is unsafe to eat, one may be putting his health in danger. Vacuum cleaners are not basic requirements of life. Food is. No matter how rich or poor you are, how young or old, you need food.

The public concern and questioning of the food industry has brought forth a series of proposed remedies, many of them in the form

of legislation or regulations proposed at the local, state, or federal level. The discovery that the larger sized package is not necessarily cheaper brought a call for unit pricing. The discovery that food unfit for human consumption or greatly diminished in nutritional value is being sold to the public brought a call for "open dating." The discovery that prices on some items were higher in ghetto stores than in middle income stores brought a call for price uniformity. Each of these has been proposed as a government regulation or law to compel the food industry to act.

But it is not necessary for the federal, state or local government to pass a law or regulation for a food chain to adopt unit pricing, or open dating, or any of the number of other remedies which would greatly benefit the consumer. You do not need a law to enable a food chain to undertake such consumer reforms.

I am writing to ask your company to undertake these reforms voluntarily. Specifically, I am requesting you to undertake: (a) voluntary unit pricing on all items; (b) voluntary "open dating" on all foods; and (c) election of at least one consumer representative to your board of directors.

I am sure that your officers and board of directors have considered these questions before. Yet nothing relating to the foregoing has been done to date by your company. I am interested in learning and trust you have no objections to furnishing me with the following information. Did you do any studies with respect to price per size and food coding policies of your stores to see if abuses existed? Did you undertake studies as to cost of unit pricing and open dating as solutions? I am informed that more than one chain has said privately that unit pricing will not cost one cent in higher prices or lost profits to the company. If you decided against, I would appreciate your advising me of the basis for your decision. Who made the decision? What were the specific reasons? If it was your board of directors, could you please supply me with a list of those who supported and opposed each of these measures? I would ask the same questions with respect to election of consumer representatives to your board.

I ask you to consider undertaking each of these three courses of action now. Unless your officers or board of directors are favorably inclined toward the aforementioned, it would seem to me that a Campaign GM might be appropriate.

I would appreciate receiving your reply within two weeks. I would also appreciate your sending me, in any case, a list of the names and addresses of your current stockholders and biographies of the members or candidates of your board of directors.

The undertaking by your company voluntarily of these reforms would go a long way toward restoring the public image of the food industry and put your company at a competitive advantage with the aware and enlightened consumer. I certainly hope that I can expect a favorable reply from you.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
Member of Congress.

M. W. Aldredge, Chairman of the Board, W. J. Kane, President, Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

R. A. Magowan, Chairman of the Board, Quentin Reynolds, President, Safeway Stores, Incorporated, 4th and Jackson Street, Oakland, Calif. 94604.

J. E. Davis, President, Kroger Company, 1014 Vine Street, Cincinnati 1, Ohio.

Louis Stein, Chairman of the Board, Jack Friedland, President, Food Fair Stores, Inc., 3175 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Philadelphia, Pa. 19101.

G. L. Clements, Chairman of the Board, D. S. Perkins, President, Jewel Companies, Inc., 1955 West North Avenue, Melrose Park, Ill. 60160.

P. J. Cupp, Chairman of the Board, J. R. Park, President, Acme Markets, Inc., 124 North 15th Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19102.

G. C. Metcalf, Chairman of the Board, N. A. Stepalton, President, National Tea Company, 1000 North Crosby Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.

B. L. Thomas, President, Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc., 5050 Edgewood Court, Jacksonville, Fla.

G. A. Awes, Chairman of the Board, W. H. Dyer, Jr., President, Lucky Stores, Inc., 1701 Marina Blvd., San Leandro, Calif. 94577.

T. C. Butler, Chairman of the Board, C. G. Rodman, President, Grand Union Company, 100 Broadway, East Paterson, N.J.

PRECONCEIVED PLAN FOR SEA-LEVEL CANAL DESTROYED: TIME FOR ACTION ON TERMINAL LAKE-THIRD LOCKS PLAN HAS COME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the April 13 and 15, 1970, issues of the Washington Post and Baltimore Sun, respectively, there were published two highly significant articles on the current inter-oceanic canal study authorized in 1964, the final report of which to the President is due not later than December 1, 1970.

The principal facts revealed by the two articles are:

First. The Committee on Ecological Research, named by the National Academy of Science at the request of the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, opposes using nuclear explosives for constructing a canal of so-called sea level design.

Second. This committee also opposes connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by a salt water channel as in a sea level canal, because of the danger of massive extinction of marine life that would result from mingling the species of the two oceans. This is especially important for the conservation of food resources and the current emphasis being placed on ecological problems.

Third. Officials of the Atomic Energy and Canal Study Commissions now admit, after 5 years of study and the expenditure of \$22,500,000, out of a total authorization of \$24,000,000, that it will not be possible to determine the feasibility of using nuclear excavation for the construction of a new canal.

Fourth. Because of the 10 to 15 years required and cost of \$3 billion—initial estimate not including indemnity—to construct a canal of sea level design, the canal commission study officials now, at long last, acknowledge that it is not economically justified.

Fifth. Although the articles make vague reference to improvement of the present canal, both ignore the true solution of the canal problem. This solution is the Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan developed in the Panama Canal organization as the result of World War II experience, submitted to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and approved by him as a postwar project.

Mr. Speaker, the revelations in the two newspaper articles, evidently inspired by the canal study commission, discredit in advance any report that it may submit of its inquiry under Public Law 88-609, 88th Congress, approved September 22, 1964, as amended. Moreover, the apparent failure of the informants of the authors of the two articles to mention in definite terms the only practical solution of the canal problem that applies, the Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan, reveals their bias and predisposition toward prolonging past confusions of the crucial canal question.

In these general connections, I would invite attention to a major address by me on June 8, 1967, on "Panama Canal Issues and Treaty Talks: Defects and Validities" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 11, pages 15192-15207. In this address, I quoted the full text of the minority report of a special report of the Georgetown University Center for Strategic Studies. This minority report was prepared by Vice Adm. T. G. W. Settle and Dr. Donald M. Dozer, both eminent authorities in their fields. The indicated newspaper articles fully justify the views of Admiral Settle and Dr. Dozer. Also I may add that the history of the Panama Canal is a record of minority decisions and not of consensus-formed opinions, such as those expressed in the previously majority report.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of this body who were present on September 1, 1964, during the debate on S. 2701 will recall that this measure authorized an investigation to determine the feasibility and site for a canal of so-called sea level design across the American Isthmus. The special rules adopted for its consideration in the House did not allow sufficient time for adequate debate and the Congress did not have the benefit of printed hearings on this important bill. Because I had studied the canal question in depth and breadth and understood the main problems involved, rather than have my name associated with what I knew would eventually fail, I voted "No". The previously mentioned articles fully vindicate my stand.

The measure was passed by a vote of 320 to 23, and I am particularly proud of my negative vote in view of the latest information discrediting the current canal study, which was pursued on a wholly preconceived basis; and was in no wise objective.

Because of the facts now revealed, the way is open for early consideration of pending measures for the major modernization of the Panama Canal for which identical bills have been introduced in both House and Senate.

As the previously mentioned articles vindicate my 1964 and later stands on the canal question, I shall include both of them and the text of the identical bills as parts of my remarks.

When the time comes for the President to transmit the report of the current canal inquiry under Public Law 88-609 to the Congress, I trust that he, following the 1947 precedent of President Truman, will not be controlled by the ex parte recommendations of the study commission, but will support the pro-

gram for the major modernization of the existing Panama Canal as contemplated in current measures in the Congress, which do not involve the negotiation of a new treaty with Panama.

The two subject articles and the text of H.R. 3792 follow:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 13, 1970]

A-CANAL DEALT BLOW—ADVISERS FEAR RADIOACTIVITY (By Victor Cohn)

The dream of a future sea-level Atlantic-Pacific canal blasted out cheaply by nuclear explosives has been dealt a severe blow—maybe a fatal one—by a group of biological advisers to the canal study commission.

The advisers have agreed in recent months that nuclear digging would create too much dangerous radioactivity, as well as other risks to nearby populations.

They also agreed Thursday and Friday in a final set of meetings at the National Academy of Sciences that no one can say yet whether a sea-level canal, even if dug by conventional explosives, is biologically safe.

This is because it could mix Atlantic and Pacific fish and other life forms, with possible large-scale extinction of many species.

The biologists think at least 10 to 15 years of intensive research are needed. For one thing, they advise annual counts of ocean populations, like fish and shrimps, just to set base lines by which to judge a new canal's long-range effects.

A set of conclusions like these is now being drawn up as the result of the meetings here of this group—the Committee on Ecological Research for the Inter-Oceanic Canal, headed by Dr. Ernst Mayr, Agassiz professor of zoology at Harvard University. The committee was named by the National Academy of Sciences at the request of the Atlantic-Pacific Inter-Ocean Canal Study Commission, created by Congress in 1964.

The commission must tell President Nixon by Dec. 1 whether a new sea-level canal to supplement the present Panama Canal is commercially and technically a good idea; where and how it ought to be built; and how much it might cost.

Many new ships are far too large for the narrow passage of the present canal, built early in this century. Others laden with valuable cargoes are forced to delay passage because of the traffic jam in the complex series of locks.

Some authorities believe that the saturation point of the present canal will be reached in a few years, lending urgency to studies for a new canal.

The biologists were asked only to design ecological studies of a new canal's effect, not to say how or if one should be built. Their formal report thus may be more limited in scope than their actual conclusions.

All their conclusions, however, are certain to be transmitted to the administration and to the scientific community in one way or another.

Dr. Mayr declined to reveal any of the group's formal recommendations before they are made to the science academy, then to the canal commission. But another committee member said the group "definitely" opposes using nuclear explosives.

Mayr conceded that: "Giving you just my own personal opinion, I think it's rather widely agreed now that using nuclear explosives is nonsensical, especially if the canal is built near any populated areas."

"It's been established just for one thing that the world's tritium level would go up by about 50 per cent." Tritium is a form of hydrogen produced by some nuclear processes.

Several canal sites have been proposed, including some in little-populated areas that cross Colombia and Nicaragua-Costa Rica.

But those now most favored, it is learned, are two within 50 miles of the present canal. The other sites are far lengthier, and economical only with cheap nuclear blasting.

THREE REASONS ADVANCED

"I think there are three reasons," Mayr said, "why nuclear blasting is unwise—one, radioactive fallout; two, tritium level; three, possible seismic (earthquake-causing) effects of blasts near any populated areas."

Study of nuclear blasting has also won little recent backing from the Nixon administration, though the Atomic Energy Commission still thinks there is an excellent chance that it could prove safe and economical with more development. Soviet officials recently said they are planning some extensive nuclear digging, on the basis of what one U.S. official called "more extensive tests than ours."

The AEC did six canal excavation experiments between 1962 and 1968, setting off devices around 350 feet beneath the surface. The last blasted a crater 852 feet across and 208 feet deep.

"As in all cratering experiments," an AEC spokesman reports, "some radio-activity was released. But it was a comparatively small amount—most is trapped in the crater bottom or comes back in earth-rock debris thrown around the crater."

"We found you could go back to the area and work within several months. And we would expect by the time the canal is built—some years away—we would have explosives that release much less radioactivity."

The AEC is working on "cleaner" explosives at its Livermore, Calif., Lawrence Radiation Laboratory. But it also says it needs "at least" four more cratering tests before it can say whether nuclear excavation is a good idea.

NONE IN BUDGET

None is included in the AEC's fiscal 1971 budget. One was planned for this year, but was finally set aside to concentrate on the Livermore research.

"We've already told the President we can't define the feasibility of nuclear excavation," says John P. Sheffey, executive secretary of the canal commission. "But we certainly think the nuclear experiments should be completed."

The idea of U.S. nuclear blasting anywhere in Central America has found little favor in State Department halls, many diplomats see it creating only anti-American feeling, even if fallout is minuscule.

"But you can find all sorts of opinions, and no determination has been made," one official said. "No one has faced the question fully, and no one needs to for several years."

Here, some scientists disagree, though they are aware that the canal commission test incidentally, used a 35-canal being built for around 15 years. "Once projects get going and reach a certain size," one scientist said, "it's very hard to choke them off, even if many people then feel the idea is ecologically poor. Look at the SST."

The latest AEC cratering test, incidentally, used a 35-kiloton device (equal to exploding 35,000 pounds of TNT). One estimate has it that digging a canal would take 35 megatons, or the equivalent 1,000 35-kiloton bombs.

But it is the ecological consequence of the canal, no matter how it is dug that has worried the biologists most.

A National Academy of Science publication last fall credited committee members with saying that environmental effects would go "far beyond" merely altering the sea environment and its life forms, "and include effects on migratory species, on terrestrial (earth) fauna and flora, on microorganisms and on local urban and rural human populations."

This report said that: "While a few successful migrations have apparently taken place between the oceans, there has been

nothing to equal the predicted inter-Oceanic migrations that would be inevitable if a sea-level canal were built. Many scientists believe the invasion of competitive marine fauna on either coast might result in large-scale extinction of many species, an irrevocable catastrophe to science and a loss to future generations of men."

The biologists have some interesting ideas about how it might be possible to prevent or minimize mixing of the oceans. These include building effective tidal gates and keeping them closed at high-tide, and building a big man-made lake in mid-canal—much like Gatun Lake, which has served the old canal as a highly effective biological barrier. Salt-water species get into the present canal despite its locks, but seldom get across this fresh-water body.

A problem here, Mayr said, is that "no one knows yet whether such a man-made lake can be built." In all, he guessed, some \$20 million a year ought to be spent, starting soon, if a new canal's ecological consequences are to be estimated and, hopefully, minimized.

REPORT DUE IN WEEK

The biologists' major recommendations should be turned over to the Science Academy in another week. A more detailed report will be made to the canal commission by June 30.

A major question the commission must address is: Is a new multibillion-dollar canal really necessary? (Cost estimates so far have ranged from \$1½ billion—for a nuclear job—up to \$3 billion.)

Engineers' reports indicate the present canal, with improvements, could serve 60 per cent more traffic. But it still could not handle big wide-beamed aircraft carriers and super-tankers.

One commission job, therefore, is to balance a new canal's cost and value against the cost of a large oil pipeline across the isthmus, to transfer oil between super-tankers.

The commission, headed by Robert B. Anderson, head of a New York investment firm and former secretary of the treasury, meets here every two months. There will "definitely" be a report to the President by Dec. 1, Sheffey said, despite two previous one-year delays.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Apr. 15, 1970]

CANAL REPORT WILL LACK DATA ON ATOMIC BLASTING

(By Richard Basoco)

WASHINGTON.—After five years of study and the expenditure of \$22.5 million, the Atlantic-Pacific Inter-Ocean Canal Study Commission will be unable to suggest the feasibility of using nuclear excavation techniques when it submits its final report on a new canal through Central America.

John P. Sheffey, executive director of the canal commission, said today that "political constraints and budgetary problems" at the Atomic Energy Commission have made it impossible to collect the kind of data required to make a responsible recommendation regarding the use of nuclear explosions to create a "second" Panama Canal.

The AEC's nuclear cratering test program "has fallen behind the planned schedule so that the [canal] commission won't have enough information to find it either feasible or unfeasible," Mr. Sheffey said.

If construction of a canal across Panama—where two routes are under consideration—or across Colombia were deferred "for a large number of years," he said, the use of nuclear energy may be feasible, Mr. Sheffey said.

But, he added, if a decision were made to go ahead with a new canal project in the near future, "there is no question about it, it would have to be done through conventional excavation." A canal project would have to be delayed "a minimum of ten years" for

nuclear blasting to become a realistic alternative, he said.

Created in September, 1964, the commission is scheduled to submit its final report to President Nixon by December 1, 1970. Congress charged it with the responsibility of recommending which of several possible routes for a new canal seemed preferable, and to consider, in reaching that conclusion, the feasibility of using nuclear excavation methods.

Mr. Sheffey said that the commission's total authorization for its work was \$24 million and that he expected it would return some \$1.5 million to the government. Most of the \$22.5 million that will have been spent by December 1, he said, was allocated to extensive field surveys which probed the difficulties involved in the use of nuclear excavating techniques.

Most of the data, required to assess conventional excavation methods was already available, he said, but the possible use of the atom required studies of wind currents, the food chain from plant to animal to man, and the like.

But the Atomic Energy Commission was able to conduct only two significant tests, Mr. Sheffey said, when at least five had been anticipated and more than that preferred.

John Kelly, an AEC official involved in the testing program, said, "We are encouraged by what we've been able to do," but conceded that not enough experiments have been conducted to make realistic recommendations.

He said his agency has conducted about half a dozen nuclear cratering tests and "a substantial number" of cratering tests with conventional explosives, such as TNT.

SEVERAL MILLION PER TEST

But much more testing with higher yield nuclear blasts are required and they are more expensive, he said. There is no money for any excavation testing at all in the AEC's budget for fiscal 1971, he said, although the current budget had more than \$7 million for that purpose.

Each of the tests conducted, Mr. Sheffey said, "runs several million dollars."

Both Mr. Kelly and Mr. Sheffey expressed the hope that the AEC's test program would continue, although Mr. Kelly suggested that one reason no funds were provided in next year's budget was that the data would not have been available for the canal commission anyway and the urgency for continuation of the testing had therefore melted away.

COMPARISON ESTIMATE

A new canal dug by conventional means would take some 10 to 15 years to complete at a cost of perhaps \$3 billion, while, "if everything went perfectly," Mr. Sheffey said, nuclear excavation would take six to nine years and save about \$1 billion.

The difficulties in negotiating the use of nuclear devices, however, could mean that the length of time from inception of the project to completion might not be any shorter than by conventional means, he added.

The present canal is reaching the point of saturation usage by shipping and is too small to accommodate either the large tankers or big aircraft carriers already afloat.

H.R. 3792

A bill to provide for the increase of capacity and the improvement of operations of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Panama Canal Modernization Act".

Sec. 2. (a) The Governor of the Canal Zone, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized and directed to prosecute the work necessary to increase

the capacity and improve the operations of the Panama Canal through the adaptation of the Third Locks project set forth in the report of the Governor of the Panama Canal, dated February 24, 1939 (House Document Numbered 210, Seventy-sixth Congress), and authorized to be undertaken by the Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), with usable lock dimensions of not less than one hundred and forty feet by not less than one thousand two hundred feet by not less than forty-five feet, and including the following: elimination of the Pedro Miguel Locks, and consolidation of all Pacific locks near Miraflores in new lock structures to correspond with the locks capacity at Gatun, raise the summit water level to its optimum height of approximately ninety-two feet, and provide a summit-level lake anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal, together with such appurtenant structures, works, and facilities, and enlargements or improvements of existing channels, structures, works, and facilities, as may be deemed necessary, at an estimated total cost not to exceed \$850,000,000, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose.

(b) The provisions of the second sentence and the second paragraph of the Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), shall apply with respect to the work authorized by subsection (a) of this section. As used in such Act, the terms "Governor of the Panama Canal", "Secretary of War", and "Panama Railroad Company" shall be held and considered to refer to the "Governor of the Canal Zone", "Secretary of the Army", and "Panama Canal Company", respectively, for the purposes of this Act.

(c) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Governor of the Canal Zone may act and exercise his authority as President of the Panama Canal Company and may utilize the services and facilities of that company.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a board, to be known as the "Panama Canal Advisory and Inspection Board" (hereinafter referred to as the "Board").

(b) The Board shall be composed of five members who are citizens of the United States of America. Members of the Board shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows:

(1) one member from private life, experienced and skilled in private business (including engineering);

(2) two members from private life, experienced and skilled in the science of engineering;

(3) one member who is a commissioned officer of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army (retired); and

(4) one member who is a commissioned officer of the line, United States Navy (retired).

(c) The President shall designate as Chairman of the Board one of the members experienced and skilled in the science of engineering.

(d) The President shall fill each vacancy on the Board in the same manner as the original appointment.

(e) The Board shall cease to exist on that date designated by the President as the date on which its work under this Act is completed.

(f) The Chairman of the Board shall be paid basic pay at the rate provided for level II of the Executive Schedule in section 5313 of title 5, United States Code. The other members of the Board appointed from private life shall be paid basic pay at a per annum rate which is \$500 less than the rate of basic pay of the Chairman. The members of the Board who are retired officers of the United States Army and the United States Navy each shall be paid at a rate of basic pay which, when added to his pay as a retired

officer, will establish his total rate of pay from the United States at a per annum rate which is \$500 less than the rate of basic pay of the Chairman.

(g) The Board shall appoint, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, a Secretary and such other personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions and activities and shall fix their rates of basic pay in accordance with chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. The Secretary and other personnel of the Board shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

SEC. 4. (a) The Board is authorized and directed to study and review all plans and designs for the Third Locks project referred to in section 2(a) of this Act, to make on-site studies and inspections of the Third Locks project, and to obtain current information on all phases of planning and construction with respect to such project. The Governor of the Canal Zone shall furnish and make available to the Board at all times current information with respect to such plans, designs, and construction. No construction work shall be commenced at any stage of the Third Locks project unless the plans and designs for such work, and all changes and modifications of such plans and designs, have been submitted by the Governor of the Canal Zone to, and have had the prior approval of, the Board. The Board shall report promptly to the Governor of the Canal Zone the results of its studies and reviews of all plans and designs, including changes and modifications thereof, which have been submitted to the Board by the Governor of the Canal Zone, together with its approval or disapproval thereof, or its recommendations for changes or modifications thereof, and its reasons therefor.

(b) The Board shall submit to the President and to the Congress an annual report covering its activities and functions under this Act and the progress of the work on the Third Locks project and may submit, in its discretion, interim reports to the President and to the Congress with respect to these matters.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of conducting all studies, reviews, inquiries, and investigations deemed necessary by the Board in carrying out its functions and activities under this Act, the Board is authorized to utilize any official reports, documents, data, and papers in the possession of the United States Government and its officials; and the Board is given power to designate and authorize any member, or other personnel, of the Board, to administer oaths and affirmations, subpoena witnesses, take evidence, procure information and data, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents and records which the Board may deem relevant or material to the performance of the functions and activities of the Board. Such attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, may be required from any place in the United States, or any territory, or any other area under the control or jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone.

SEC. 6. In carrying out its functions and activities under this Act, the Board is authorized to obtain the services of experts and consultants or organizations there in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not in excess of \$200 per diem.

SEC. 7. Upon request of the Board, the head of any department, agency, or establishment in the executive branch of the Federal Government is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, for such period or periods as may be agreed upon by the Board and the head of the department, agency, or establishment concerned any of the personnel of such department, agency, or

establishment to assist the Board in carrying out its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 8. The Board may use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same condition as other departments and agencies of the United States.

SEC. 9. The Administrator of General Services or the President of the Panama Canal Company, or both, shall provide, on a reimbursable basis, such administrative support services for the Board as the Board may request.

SEC. 10. The Board may make expenditures for travel and subsistence expenses of members and personnel of the Board in accordance with chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, for rent of quarters at the seat of government and in the Canal Zone, and for such printing and binding as the Board deems necessary to carry out effectively its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 11. All expenses of the Board shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Board or by such other member or employee of the Board as the Chairman may designate.

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry out its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 13. Any provision of the Act of August 11, 1939 (54 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), or of any other statute, inconsistent with any provision of this Act is superseded, for the purposes of this Act, to the extent of such inconsistency.

BAD COMMUNICATIONS DESTROY THE FIBER OF A SOCIETY

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY, Mr. Speaker, St. Paul, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, wrote that "evil communications corrupt good manners." If I may, I would modernize that statement to say that "bad communications destroy the fiber of a society." In the midst of the turmoil and confusion presently sweeping the country, it has become painfully clear that one of the major stumbling blocks to national unity, to national harmony, is a lack of communications. It is one of the great ironies of our time that the most technologically advanced society in the history of the world, a society which has developed a capacity for mass communications, is apparently losing the simple capacity to talk with one another. We hear and read much about a supposed generation gap. I suggest, however, that what we really have is a "communications gap," and I suspect from my own observations that the communications gap is rooted not in enmity, but in indifference. Too many middle-aged and older Americans do not want to bother talking with members of the younger generation, apparently on the theory that young people, supposedly unenlightened and inexperienced, have nothing to offer. Conversely, too many of our young people will not take the time to communicate rationally with their elders on the weak theory that the older generation has run out of good ideas and are no longer "with it." Both are wrong, of course. Long hair and sandals do not denote revolution any more than baldness and a vest denote senility. Perhaps it

might help to bridge the communications gap if a few more older Americans started wearing long hair and sandals and a few more young people started wearing vests and pinstripes. At least there would be some common ground for conversation.

But the communications gap is not just between the old and the young or between parent and child. In varying degrees, it exists between black and white, between the haves and the have nots, between the citizenry and their government, between labor and management, between the educated and the uneducated. I think perhaps we have taken this gap for granted for too long. How often has each one of us turned a cold shoulder to the opinions of someone else and simply dismissed his or her ideas as the product of a demented mind, unworthy of even our slightest consideration?

The conditions of our present society, and the rapid pace with which we move today tell us, however, that we can no longer afford the luxury of noncommunication. Middle-aged Americans can no longer lump all students into one mass and dismiss them all as beatniks. And the student population can no longer write off their elders as "old goats" and "has beens."

The dizzying events of the last few weeks have shown us that communications are possible. I myself have spoken with literally hundreds of concerned citizens who had never bothered to express their opinions before. And it was, to be sure, an educational dialog for all. Those who visited me in Washington came away with a better idea of the responsibilities of a Member of Congress, and I derived from our meetings a much better insight into the deep-rooted feelings and moods of our young.

In simple form, communication is really a learning process. Those who fail to communicate, fail to learn; those who fail to learn continue to make mistakes.

The late Sir Winston Churchill once wrote that it was better to "jaw, jaw than to war, war." In the vernacular of the day, it is better to "rap, rap than to slap, slap."

MEN MUST BE BROTHERS

Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am truly alarmed by what appears to be a byproduct of the increasing divisiveness in our country. We have disagreed before, but never before has so substantial a portion of our people, old and young, lost that self-confidence required of a great people to resolve great problems.

Crisis has become an almost meaningless word in these days of national agony, senseless death, and endless war. Our ability to discriminate has been dulled by constant pressures and constant frustrations. In place of communications, we have self-righteousness, false pride, and mistrust.

It seems impossible that one short month ago our Nation and indeed our world were united as never before in con-

cern for the lives of the three Apollo astronauts. As the Miami Herald noted in its April 16 editorial:

Out of the dilemma of three frail men battling forces previously unknown there has come a kind of unity which suddenly finds all other men their brothers on startled earth.

For the ancient Chinese, the word "crisis" was composed of two characters: One represented danger, and the other, opportunity. The danger inherent in our present hypercrisis is two-sided. A democracy may disagree on anything except the "rules of the game" which give the people the right to disagree and the right to be heard. On the one hand we seem to hear from our young people a moral imperative which will countenance no disagreement. On the other hand, from the administration we discern until very recently a systematic deafness to the voice of youth and even opposing counsel. In both extremes there is danger.

The opportunity inherent in our present upheaval is more elusive and harder to articulate. It may have been demonstrated best in the universal concern for the lives of astronauts Lovell, Haise, and Swigert. The high regard for the value of one human life has been one of the most uplifting and distinguishing qualities of mankind. When we lose it, we lose our very humanity. We are in danger of losing it now, just as we are in danger of losing the self-confidence and determination necessary to the resolution of any problem.

When we combine the consideration for human life with the determination to meet and overcome our problems, we cross the boundary between anger and opportunity. Put in the context of the events of last month, as noted by the Miami Herald:

Astronauts Lovell, Haise and Swigert have given their countrymen and a watching, waiting, praying world more than a little to think about. How petty indeed are the quarrels of that world.

The editorial follows:

[From the Miami Herald, Apr. 16, 1970]

A CRIPPLED APOLLO 13 MAKES BROTHERS OF MEN

When Apollo 13 burst the bounds of earth and reached for the moon this newspaper called its mission the "most meaningful exploration of outer space."

These words are true today in a sense we had not intended nor could have foreseen. The mission failed, but even as it tests the resourcefulness and courage of three men and the ingenuity of the scientists back on earth who largely control their return flight, that mission is a success.

Never before have men spun through space in a crippled space ship. As no other event in world history and as perhaps only one in the experience of the United States, the plight of these men has captured the sympathy of almost the whole planet.

There were prayers at the Wailing Wall and in the Vatican, among many holy places.

Britain, Italy, Brazil and South Africa have alerted naval units should Apollo 13 land off course and in their vicinity.

Even the Soviet Union has dispatched two freighters toward a possible touchdown point near the Fiji Islands in a gesture coldly rebuffed by the State Department.

Out of the dilemma of three frail men battling forces previously unknown there has come a kind of unity which suddenly finds all other men their brothers on startled earth.

There is perhaps a primitive parallel in the case of Floyd Collins, the trapped Kentucky cave explorer 45 years ago. For days the nation and much of the world watched and waited while rescuers struggled to reach the doomed man.

Everyone is reminded now that each is mortal and that three lives are of special consequence. Despite the incredible accomplishments of space science, man can be thrust on his own when he seemed about to achieve what had become the well arranged commonplace.

Astronauts Lovell, Haise and Swigert have given their countryman and a watching, waiting, praying world more than a little to think about.

How petty, indeed, are the quarrels of that world.

CONGRESS AND WARMAKING POWER

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the question of who has the warmaking authority under our Constitution—the President, or the Congress, or both—remains in considerable dispute.

In the May 14 issue of Roll Call, Mr. Allan C. Brownfeld provided a capsule history of how various American statesmen have treated this issue since 1789.

I commend Mr. Brownfeld's article to all our colleagues for their study:

CONGRESS AND WAR-MAKING POWER

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

The rhetoric concerning the war in Vietnam is on a steadily escalating path. Student radicals state that they intend to smash the state, and last Friday they flew a Viet Cong flag from the Peace Corps building. Those circling the building called not only for a Communist victory in Vietnam but also urged the "freeing" of the Black Panther leaders who are now under indictment for murder. That evening, at his press conference, President Nixon somehow expressed the view that what the protestors were for, he also supported.

We must not prejudice the President's motives, for he apparently intended simply to be conciliatory in an effort to maintain peace and order through the weekend. He did, however, perform the function of misleading the American People about the nature of much of the protest movement. Many colleges are now closed, many campuses have had buildings destroyed and many professors are unable to perform their academic functions. What such protestors have done does not merit anyone's support. The President, in identifying his goals with that of the protestors may have given some listeners the impression that such destructive tactics also meet with his approval, which clearly is not so.

Beyond all of this, however, those protestors who do not seek to smash the state, to free the Panthers, or to see a Communist victory, are posing a question which must, at some time, in some forum, be answered. We have sent troops to Vietnam, and now to Cambodia, without a Congressional declaration, just as President Truman sent troops to Korea without such a declaration. Is this the kind of system the Constitution sets forth, and is this the kind of system we want to have?

In his volume, *The Way We Go To War*, Merlo Pusey asks: "Can the United States be committed to war without action by Congress? In 1787, the Founding Fathers resolved that it could not be, and the country

held to that principle with little deviation for a century and a half. In recent years, however, the President has been exercising the power to make war with alarming consistency. One-man decisions involving the lives of citizens and the fate of the Nation have become the rule at a time when the President has at his command more power than any other human being has ever had."

Criticism of the use of executive power in foreign policy is, of course, not a new theme in American political history. President John Adams' use of troops in the Mediterranean, President Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase, and the Monroe Doctrine all met with some hostility as usurpations of congressional authority. Unfortunately, fine lines of authority over our foreign relations are not drawn by the Constitution.

The preamble states that a purpose of the new constitutional arrangements adopted in 1787 is to provide for the common defense. This obligation appears to lie upon both the executive and legislative branches. Concerning executive responsibility, the Constitution provides the following in Article II, Section 2: "The President shall be Commander-in-Chief of . . . the United States, and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States . . ."

Article II, Section 2 also provides that "He shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls . . ."

Congress, in turn, is also given certain responsibilities in the field of foreign affairs. Article I, Section 8 gives Congress the right to regulate commerce with foreign nations; to declare war and make rules concerning capture on land and water; 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; and to provide for calling forth the militia to repel invasion.

These powers were purposely divided to prevent excessive domination by one branch. In a letter to James Madison in 1789, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "We have already given in example one effectual check to the Dog of war by transferring the power of letting him loose from the Executive to the Legislative body, from those who are to spend to those who are to pay."

But recent history has witnessed an increase in the exercise of Presidential power in the area of foreign policy. Presidents have used U.S. forces abroad or against foreign nations more than 150 times without a specific declaration of war by Congress, sometimes under the authority of a joint congressional resolution; sometimes in execution of a treaty which envisioned the use of force without further authorization; often to protect American lives, property and shipping; and at times without prior congressional statement.

In 1900, President McKinley sent troops to China to help put down the Boxer Rebellion. President Theodore Roosevelt sent U.S. forces to Panama, Cuba, and the Dominican Republic. President Wilson gave the order to take Vera Cruz in 1914 to "enforce respect" for the United States. And before the United States entered World War II, President Roosevelt used the executive agreement as a convenient instrument at a time when American public opinion was still largely isolationist and congressional approval might not have been forthcoming. In this way, he traded U.S. destroyers for British bases. After Pearl Harbor, the need for secrecy increased the use of executive agreements.

After the war an attempt by Senators John W. Bricker and Walter E. George to amend the constitution to prevent future use of executive agreements failed. Among the op-

ponents at that time was Senator J. William Fulbright. He then advanced the view that the executive must have a wide latitude in dealing with foreign affairs. Today, when the executive is acting in a way of which he disapproves, he is expressing a contrary view.

The case for the current role of the executive being continued was made in August, 1967 when, as Under Secretary of State Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He said: "I think it is fair to say . . . that under our constitutional system the source of an effective foreign policy is presidential power. His is the sole authority to communicate formally with foreign nations. . . . His is the responsibility for controlling and directing all the external aspects of the Nation's power. To him flow all of the vast intelligence and information connected with national security. The President of necessity has a preeminent responsibility in this field."

One way in which Congressional critics of the war in Vietnam now hope to challenge the President's authority is through the Congressional power of the purse. Senator Mansfield, for example, hopes to deny the President the power to order troops into Cambodia by refusing to authorize funds for such an action in the next military appropriations bill. If the Senate or House places real limits on the President's freedom of action, an unprecedented constitutional confrontation will be the result.

The Supreme Court has, thus far, refused to consider the complex question of which branch of government, under our Constitution, has the power and responsibility to make war. Not only the protestors, but all Americans have a right to some clear and decisive answer to that question.

STOP THE KILLINGS ON CAMPUS

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in the period of a few short weeks we have watched six of our Nation's youth fall from the heights of their dedication and enthusiasm to senseless death. The students at Kent State and Jackson State Universities could have been the children of any one of us. No less were the young and frightened National Guardsmen our children. Both were caught in the agonizing struggle to maintain and preserve the greatness of this Nation.

Excuses and accusations pale in relation to the untold grief brought upon the households of these young people. The questions which need to be asked are being lost in the attempts to determine guilt or innocence in these events.

What has come about in our country to cause our youth to face each other across embittered campus battlegrounds, separated by uniforms and weapons as well as distance? Neither wants violence, but as John Kennedy prophetically stated early in the last decade: "Where peaceful protest is made impossible, violence becomes inevitable."

Why has peaceful protest become so often the exception rather than the rule? The responsibility lies on both sides. Force called in on one side brings counterforce on the other. Loaded weapons make triggers of mere rocks. A mob assembled defuses as easily as a time bomb, and like a time bomb, the longer it is fused, the closer it comes to explosion.

Mr. Speaker, I confess to be at a

frustrating loss to explain, or even know the answer to, the conditions we find on our campuses in these troubled days. They are symptomatic of a larger malaise the only cure of which may be a review of our national priorities. The use of our human and material resources to solve the enormous problems of our cities, the environment, and myriad other domestic crises would do much to "defuse" our campuses. Just as violence begets violence in the confrontation of students and police, violence as a national policy begets violence as a domestic policy.

I offer my deepest condolences to the families of these children. They have been lost to the family of man as well, and although they cannot be replaced, they must not be forgotten. We, in the Congress, by our influence on the policies and priorities of this country, can do much to return our campuses to their primary and rightful focus on education.

DR. MILLER UPTON WRITES AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT NIXON

(Mr. SCHADEBERG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, living in First District, Wisconsin, is one of the outstanding educators in our Nation. He is a man who commands the respect of all who know him because his integrity is beyond reproach; his ability as an administrator is unchallenged; his loyalty to this Nation is unsurpassed, and his complete frankness and honesty is a breath of fresh air in a day in which are heard relatively few voices of reason.

Dr. Miller Upton is at present and has been for the past 15 years the president of Beloit College, Beloit, Wis. He is also a personal friend with whom I have had numerous discussions in which we were on opposite sides philosophically. While we do agree on many things, there are issues on which we honestly disagree, but this does not lessen to any degree my respect for him and for his intellectual honesty.

I am a recipient of a copy of a letter Dr. Miller Upton has written to President Nixon in which he pours out his heart in anguished concern. His letter clearly exposes his inner sensitivity to the problems created in our Nation by some of his colleagues laboring within the academic community of which Beloit is a vital part. My colleagues in the House may not all agree with him. That is unimportant. What is important is that reading his letter they will have a keener appreciation of what this college president believes to be the opportunity and responsibility of the academic community in these troubled times. I commend the letter for their thoughtful consideration:

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON

BELOIT COLLEGE,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Beloit, Wis., May 11, 1970.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a college president, a past scholar-teacher, and one who has consciously devoted his whole life to the cause of higher education in the conviction that

it offers the greatest hope for social progress and the elevation of man to his highest potential, I wish to apologize to you and the nation for the grotesque failure of the academic community at this hour of national trial and turmoil.

I am fully aware of how extremely presumptuous it is for one to represent himself to apologize for the many, but I am constrained to do so nonetheless for the shame I feel for the community with which I have been so intimately related for so long and in which I have placed so much confidence in the past. Those who do not agree with me will, of course, be able and willing to speak for themselves.

Let me establish a point about myself at the outset so that my position can be more accurately interpreted. I was a conscientious objector during World War II, and were I of draft age now I would be a conscientious objector again. But my moral opposition to war, however deeply and conscientiously held, does not entitle me on any ethical or moral grounds to take violent action against those who disagree. I must bear witness to truth as I see it, but I must also respect the right of the other person to do the same. Certainly, I must never hurt or demean another simply because he won't go along with my own conviction.

This commitment to respect for the individual, intellectual openness, and freedom of inquiry is the transcendent value to which an academic community must be subservient. In fact, it is the only value to which the academy can pledge allegiance if it is to be consistent with itself. To elevate any other value is to break faith with this transcendent value and it is at this point that we have violated our public trust as professional educators: we have given in to violence and threats of violence in support of a particular point of view, and in doing so we have allowed the academic integrity of our individual institutions and the academic community at large to be violated.

Being a conscientious objector to war and one who would issue such an open letter as this, I clearly am not opposed to dissent and protest. But I am vigorously opposed to violence in any form and for any reason, and most of all I am opposed to would-be leaders capitulating to intimidation and violence. Those who respect violence when used against them will inevitably employ violence when it suits their cause.

We in the colleges and universities have tolerated unspeakable intimidation and thought control on the part of radical students, faculty and others, and yet when Vice President Agnew speaks out forcefully against such the only voices that are heard from the academy are those who castigate him and you for repressing dissent. There are few college campuses, if any, where Vice President Agnew, or any member of your cabinet for that matter, could speak without disruption and even physical abuse and intimidation. But a convicted murderer, dope peddler, or one committed to the forceful overthrow of the government will receive not only a respectful hearing, but will be paid a handsome honorarium in addition. In the light of his high position, I have been embarrassed by some of the Vice President's intemperate language. But surely he has as much right to dissent and to be given a respectful hearing as any of the criminal elements of our society.

Much of the academic community is now telling you how to settle the war in Vietnam and being critical of your effort to protect lives and shorten the war by moving troops into Cambodia. I find it highly unbecoming of us to presume to tell you how to fight the war in Vietnam when we aren't even able to settle the wars on our own campuses. Nor do I use the word *war* in this context lightly. The throwing of missiles to do physical harm, the throwing of firebombs to burn buildings, the use of guerrilla tactics

via arson and vandalism, the shooting and killing of combatants and noncombatants is every bit as much war as that which prevails in Vietnam, Cambodia, and the Near East. I have often wondered sardonically how many protestors of napalm have themselves thrown fire bombs or engaged in arson.

I have also been appalled by a certain arrogance and inconsistency on our part with regard to the way we are free to tell you and others how to handle your jobs but become deeply resentful, insulted, and even hostile when there is any suggestion of your intrusion into "our" domain. I am quite sure that I am able to run Beloit College better than you, but by the same token I am sure that you are able to deal with the issues of the Presidency of the United States, including fighting the war in Vietnam, better than I. The widespread propensity of members of the "intellectual" community to make judgments without benefit of facts is one of my greatest disillusionments and embarrassments.

As a matter of fact, my early naivete led me to embrace the academic life because of my belief that members therein were committed to intellectual honesty, rational behavior and humanistic concern and compassion. Recent incidents have merely confirmed all the more what my life's experiences have suggested. Academic man is as much motivated by vested interest, is as much controlled by base emotion, and reasons as much from prejudice as any other mortal. My readings of Ecclesiastes, the New Testament and the life of Mahatma Gandhi should have prepared me for this, but they didn't.

We who work closely with young people and should know and understand them best have not been very helpful to them or to you and others of the adult community in serving as a vehicle of communication. We have too often taken sides ourselves and been critical of one group or the other and not been sufficiently discriminating in our communicative role.

Maybe we can be forgiven on the grounds that the task is such a difficult one. I know that the great bulk of college students are genuinely concerned about the inhumanity and futility of war and deeply question the legitimacy of a life that sanctions and even glorifies indiscriminate killing and maiming. I also know that the great bulk of adults and members of the establishment are sincere, dedicated individuals with the same hopes and aspirations as the young. But I also know that in each group there are examples that support the worst stereotype of each. The great frustration of the day is that despite this great community of interest and concern there is a growing separation based upon the sinful tendency to judge by stereotype and preconception. We in the academic community are frequently party to this sin even though our training should particularly help us to know better.

Although my own sentiments are basically with the young people, I must admit that there is a general pandering to the young at the present time that is both disgusting and irresponsible. Disgusting because it prostitutes normal respect and affection. Irresponsible because it is creating an unrealistic cleavage between age groups.

Of course, young people on the whole are wonderful, but what's new about that? The great reward of college work is the opportunity it affords to associate regularly with this age group. The idealism, absolutism, intellectual honesty and great aspiration of the young are the eternal attributes of this age group upon which society is dependent to preserve its vital, dynamic quality. These attributes are the standards of behavior to be expected, not glorified as unique in any narrow time span of human history.

Young people are first and foremost people. Those who are young today will be old tomorrow and having to relate to those who

are younger than. As people they represent all types, some taller than others, some fatter than others, some with higher IQs than others, some more criminally inclined than others, some more saintly than others, some more hostile than others, some more vocal than others, and so forth. There is no general virtue attributable to youth any more than there is general evil. We have done all young people a great disservice in recent years by suggesting to them that they are of a different breed from the rest of us and beyond reproach. They are nothing more than the fresh blood being pumped into the human society, just as we were in the past and their children will be in the future. We in Academe should have known this better than anyone else and not have faltered them and you in your common need for understanding.

We have been quick to tell you that you are alienating the youth of America, but we seem to pay little attention to the way we are alienating our own constituencies by our failure to protect the authentic academic integrity of our institutions. Implicitly we are also alienating the youth of America over the long run by our failure to be faithful to our leadership responsibilities.

The pain that hurts most of all is the realization that I bear partial responsibility for the unnecessary deaths of four young people on the campus of Kent State University. The National Guard troops should never have been there in the first place, because we should never have permitted the conditions to develop which necessitated the presence of troops. Once this die was cast, it was simply a matter of time before tragedy would strike. If fault lies anywhere for the Kent State deaths it lies not with you and the Vietnam war but with the radical acts and excesses we have tolerated in the name of dissent.

I am sure you know, Mr. President, that I do not say these things with tongue in cheek to placate others, to curry favor, to advance partisan interest, or to defend your war policies. Last fall I joined with a number of other college presidents to urge your rapid withdrawal of troops from Vietnam. I reaffirm this plea. But when I consider the whole matter fully and objectively, I have to concede that you have been more faithful to your leadership responsibilities than we in Academe have been to our own.

With respect for the tremendous burdens you must bear for the rest of us and the conscientious way you are bearing them and with apology for the cruel injustices that have been foisted upon you by the professional community of which I am a part, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

MILLER UPTON.

LORD, FORGIVE US OUR DISHMOPS

(Mr. WAGGONER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONER, Mr. Speaker, I am sorely tempted to send a bill to the Appropriations Committee asking for a few dollars with which to chisel into concrete the words of James J. Kilpatrick's column in yesterday's Washington Evening Star, then to mount the plaque above the door of this Chamber so that every Member would see it each time he enters here.

No one has ever captured the sentiment of the Nation's majority better than has Mr. Kilpatrick in these words:

EAT THE TOSSED PIE—AND BE SURE TO TIP

(By James Kilpatrick)

A couple of years back—perhaps it was more than that—Bill Buckley wrote a delightful little essay in which he rued our

lost capacity for outrage. I am not feeling so delightful just now, but I mark his remembrance anyhow.

My erudite friend noted, for example, the reluctance of the humblest diner in the humblest hash-house to complain of bad service: The food arrives both cold and tough; the waitress slops it down with a sneer; the customer says not one word, and he leaves the usual tip. The commuter train is 15 degrees too hot or 10 degrees too cold; the cowed passengers sweat or shiver depending on the season, but they are inhibited from speaking out.

All of us know what Mr. Buckley meant. All of us have experienced the rude clerk, the insolent mechanic, the reckless driver of a cab; and we are their captives. We will not make a scene. We are prisoners, if you please, of manners. We are patsies.

Reading the Washington papers, a few nights ago, one recalled the Buckley reproach. It is just as he said; but the captivity grows worse.

There in the papers was a report of the visit of Kingman Brewster, president of Yale. Mr. Brewster's message to the Congress, ever so slightly simplified, was this: Surrender. Quit. Give in. If we fail to give the hardcore students everything they demand, he appeared to be saying, the brutes will burn the country down. Can we let a thing like that happen? No. So sign here. And leave a tip.

I was in Kansas City on Thursday, and picked up the morning Times. There was an article over the byline of Arnold Toynbee, explaining the vileness of the United States of America. We are everywhere feared and hated, he said. Let me quote:

"Would I rather be a Vietnamese who was being 'saved' by the American army, or be a Czech who was being 'saved' by the Russian army? Of course I would rather be the Czech."

Of course, Mr. Toynbee, in the awful alternative, would rather be Red than dead. He would surrender his freedoms before he would defend them. If his statement means anything, that is precisely what it means: Don't talk back to the waiter. Tip him. It is ungentlemanly—it might soil one's coat—to fight for so small a thing as freedom. Tyranny is no more than inferior gravy. Mr. Toynbee would rather be the Czech. Of course.

The distinguished historian is not alone. I fly back to Washington Thursday night, dump the dirty shirts, and pick up the papers. A gang of insolent bums, it appears, have occupied the office of Welfare Secretary Finch. They broke in without notice or invitation, ousted him from his chair, put their feet on his desk, and proceeded to belabor him with three hours of abuse.

How did Mr. Finch react? He was calm. He never raised his voice. His visitors were shouting obscenities at him. He took a chair to one side; he attempted to reason with the intruders. As any child might have imagined, the intruders refused to be reasoned with. They cursed him until they wearied of the fun; they sat there all day, and finally, late in the afternoon, they negotiated the terms of cheap arrest and swaggered into paddy wagons belatedly summoned to the scene.

Meanwhile, the Federal Commission on Obscenity and Pornography had been holding a public hearing. A 28-year-old witness by the name of Thomas K. Forcade, coordinator of the obscene Underground Press Syndicate, turned up, spouting obscenities, and concluded his testimony by hurling a whipped cream pie into the face of one of the commission members. Two policemen watched, uncertain, paralyzed, wondering what to do. The commission member, Dr. Otto N. Larson, professor of sociology at the University of Washington, apologized for being in front of the pie. He made no move to have Forcade arrested. He ate the pie off his vest; and he tipped.

There are times, honest to Pete, when some of us long for George Wallace: "The next pointed-headed demonstrator," he said, "who lies down in front of my car..." When a cabinet secretary and a federal commission member quiver like so much lemon Jello before outrageous insolence, they do not achieve communication or promote reconciliation. They invite further outrage. Lord, I am minded to pray, forgive us our dishmops; they know not what they do.

To which I add, Amen.

If any of these men had a sense of decency, they would resign their positions. In the absence of that decency, the alumni of Yale should boot Brewster out of his chair, the President should ask Dr. Larson to step aside and urge Finch to submit his resignation, something he apparently wants to do but lacks the courage to do.

CAPITOL POLICE MASQUERADING AS MEMBERS OF THE PRESS

(Mr. BURTON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Washington-Baltimore Newspaper Guild, Mr. Llewellyn King, has called my attention to a complaint that members of the Capitol Police Force are masquerading as members of the press.

Mr. King outlines in his letter the problems of legitimate journalists because of such tactics and I would like to call them to the attention of the House.

WASHINGTON-BALTIMORE
NEWSPAPER GUILD,
Washington, D.C., April 30, 1970.

HON. PHILIP BURTON,
The House of Representatives, Longworth
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you to solicit your support in a grave matter that can have a long-range impact on the life of every American.

It is not disputed, I believe, that the constitutional right of the freedom of the press to publish the news is dependent on the freedom of the press to gather the news. Recent actions by federal law enforcement agencies seriously threaten that freedom.

I will quote to you the experience of a Washington Post reporter covering a demonstration near the Capitol:

"On Wednesday, April 15, while covering the day's antiwar demonstration at 9th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, I ran into a situation that I believe is becoming more and more common, and which is making the job of covering such demonstrations more and more difficult.

"Among those standing around the speakers' platform were two men, both in casual dress (slacks and windbreakers) who were filming the proceedings with a video tape unit. Both men wore red stenciled badges reading 'Press'. A small identification sticker on the side of their camera read 'U.S. Capitol Police'. When questioned, the men admitted that they were with the Capitol Police but insisted that they were members of the press."

This incident is typical of many that have been reported to the Guild over the past year and a half. The use of the press by the authorities as a cover comes at a time when the job of the media in covering demonstrations is more sensitive and more critical than at any time past. Both newspapermen and television crews are increasingly identified by the

electronic equipment that has become a tool of the trade.

They are constantly in a position of deciding whether their presence itself will change the nature of the event. (Television stations bear the heaviest burden in this respect.)

Reporters, with radio cars, often arrive on the scene simultaneously with the police and are identified with the authorities, particularly in the ghetto.

Sleuths masquerading as reporters complicate these delicate matters, are an affront to the profession, endanger further the safety of the legitimate working press, and are a violation of the spirit and the fact of the freedom of the press as envisioned by the Constitution. The Guild believes separation of the fourth estate and the state are essential to the wholesome survival of both.

Therefore, sir, we should be glad if you would raise this matter on the floor of the House and in other appropriate quarters to bring this abuse of a freedom to an end.

Very truly yours,
LLEWELLYN KING,
President.

FARM SUBSIDIES

(Mr. BURTON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished California labor journalist, Mr. Felix Rodriguez, has recently written an article in Organized Labor, the publication of the Building & Construction Trades Council of San Francisco, which I should like to share with my colleagues.

Felix Rodriguez has been and is a respected progressive voice. His column, "Crystal Bawling," which I am placing in the RECORD is but one example of his deep and abiding concern for his fellow man and of the courageous and forthright manner in which he fights injustice wherever he finds it.

CRYSTAL BAWLING
(By Felix Rodriguez)

FREE MONEY

You hear so much about farm subsidies. Everybody complains about how the most successful farmers pick up extra spending money from the taxpayers for not producing or for converting their lands from one produce to another.

It's like everybody complaining about the war: The taxpayers whose money is disappearing and families whose young men are also disappearing.

And both, farm subsidies and war, continue to escalate to a point of no return. In this here piece, let's examine the subsidy program; it probably won't bring me as much trouble as mentioning the dirty word—Peace.

In preparation for this, I have just spent more than an hour reading recent copies of the Congressional Record; you can look at it without getting emotionally upset.

The first thing that comes to mind after reading figures is not enough members in Congress are listening to the farm workers, the most economically deprived sector of the American economy and only because their faces have changed over the past decades of farming operations, they are not as racially deprived as the blacks.

How does this grab you? In California alone, the Government pays out in subsidies to farmers enough to buy school lunches for every child of a farm worker's family, plus a second hand car for each such family.

Considering that the farm worker is limited to seasonal work, you will find him no better off than the welfare recipient.

ASKS LIMIT

Congressman Paul Findley of Illinois has, again, introduced a bill to limit subsidy payments to \$20,000 for each farm. (Findley's bill last session passed the house but was shouted down, very conveniently, in the Senate, so that Congress could adjourn for Christmas. Senator James Eastland, wearing a Santa Claus suit, announced he had stockings to fill.)

Findley's limit proposal, he said, would save the taxpayers more than \$300 million a year. How public education would have liked a bit of that! To say nothing of the farm workers who are having a hard enough time trying to be recognized as people.

Findley's disclosures (a matter of record) are quite revealing. They are suggested reading for Governor Reagan and Senator Murphy who this week urged full speed ahead for the Murphy Bill that would outlaw strikes on farms, except when there is little or no need for workers. Like telling a carpenter he cannot go on strike once he has started construction work.

The J. G. Boswell Co. of Kings County has accepted a check of \$4,370,657 in 1969 farm subsidies. It does not take a stretch of the imagination to see that, at the moment of accepting the government gift, the firm was not thinking of a tattered farm child who went to bed hungry, tired of not-belonging and with a dread of facing more endless days of pretending.

Findley's figures show subsidies of \$659,327,827 for 1969 payments to U.S. farmers. The names are given of all those who were paid over \$15,000. They number hundreds. Those paid under \$15,000 number thousands and bring the total to hundreds of millions of dollars more. And it must be remembered, too, that the subsidies are paid principally to farmers for the use or non-use of their lands, not for crop losses.

FARMERS, WHO?

We should apologize to farm workers for saying that farmers receive the subsidies. Actually, the word farmer, in this instance, is a misnomer. Many of them do their harvesting by remote control from the plush offices in the agricultural capital of the world, San Francisco's Montgomery Street. This farm work is referred to as agri-business.

Here are some of Findley's figures (you can guess how the gifts would have helped the undernourished bodies and minds of children.):

609,327,827, paid to farmers receiving checks of \$15,000 or more. Figures are not available for the millions paid in lesser amounts.

The eight farmers receiving the highest payments in the U.S. All, incidentally, are from California counties:

- J. G. Boswell Co., Corcoran, \$4,370,657.
- Giffen, Inc., Fresno, \$3,333,385.
- South Lake Farms, Fresno, \$1,788,052.
- Salyer Land Co., Corcoran, \$1,637,961.
- Mt. Whitney Farms, Five Points, \$1,152,294.
- Kern County Land Co., Bakersfield, \$974,163.

- A. Camp Farms Co., Shafter, \$928,917.
- Vista Del Llano Farms, Firebaugh, \$778,624.

The California farms are mentioned here first because they represent the highest payments. More important, they give evidence that California farms are the largest in the country. While farm production is higher, the number of California farms is now about half the number of a few years ago.

But there are other, more revealing, figures. Here are the top three states receiving highest subsidies (totals for payments of \$15,000 or more):

- Texas—\$176,981,133.
- California—\$76,337,801.
- Mississippi—\$66,291,101.

For comparison purpose, New York state received \$378,043.

These payments do not include those for sugar and wool.

Texas, California and Mississippi received 38 per cent of the total subsidies for all 50 states.

Mississippi's huge support payments should be understandable. That state's Senator James Eastland is chairman of the Senate's Agricultural Committee and he is the godfather of the present subsidy program. Is it any wonder, then, that his Eastland Plantation in Sunflower County, Mississippi, received \$146,792 for 1969?

TEXAS, TOO

To repeat, the figures given are only for farms receiving \$15,000 or more (1969 payments were considerably higher than in 1969). Texas had a far larger number of farms receiving payments, although California farms received larger individual checks. Texas for 1969 received about 29 per cent of all payments above \$15,000.

The payments of some \$609 million of the nation's farms would more than double with the addition of the smaller farms under \$15,000. Findley's saving of \$300,000 would only reduce the largest payments.

I have not tried to study the significance of the figures showing that all of California's large payments, mostly in Kings, Kern and Fresno counties, are in southern part of the state. The largest recipient of all is Kern County where in Delano the farm workers have centered their struggle for recognition. Some of them are grape growers.

BAY AREA MONEY

Subsidy payments for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area were almost negligible. The longest farm area, Santa Clara County was not listed among those receiving \$15,000 or more. Only Contra Costa and Solano counties were listed:

- Contra Costa County:
 - A. J. Al Porto—\$19,136.
 - E. Girsky—\$16,170.
- Solano County:
 - Peter Cook, Jr.—\$44,618.
 - Moore Bros.—\$31,1220.
 - George Struve, Jr.—\$27,624.
 - Arnold Collier—\$24,147.
 - E. A. Anderson & Sons—\$20,028.
 - Gnos Bros.—\$19,198.
 - Mayhood Ranches—\$18,612.
 - Solano Farms, Inc.—\$17,193.
 - Tom Abel—\$16,699.
 - Hastings Farms—\$16,609.
 - Floyd Bonnified—\$21,077.
 - Wallace McCormack—\$20,416.

WORKERS' BEEF

The struggle of farm workers, then, is far more than a mere demand for decent wages. It seems that when new laws are passed affecting farm production, farm workers are usually bypassed. They want dignity and fairness, too.

The farm workers do not argue the policy that, especially in California, result in small farms disappearing. Large farms gobble them, and get bigger and richer thanks to the free government money. Farm workers do not argue about the additional millions of dollars it costs for administration of the program.

But farm workers do argue that they do not have the same rights for unionism and government protection that other Americans do. They argue against the labor contractors who hold them subservient to theirs and the growers conditions of contracts and servitude. They argue against the government farm labor offices that are established for the benefit of the growers. They argue against the attacks made regularly by conservative politicians against their rights to legal services, principally against attacks on the Rural Legal Assistance.

VIVA LA CAUSA!

The figures contained in this article are from official records. The comments on con-

ditions are my own, from actual experience. Many of the ranch conditions have not changed since I worked for many years, starting as a boy of eight picking and cutting fruit and missing many days of school. We were always at the mercy of standing and improvised rules imposed upon us by grower and/or labor contractors. Often at the end of a day's work the handkerchief from my nose would show evidence of dust and pesticides. Often before going to work in the cool mornings I could literally jump into my pants, they were so stiff from the previous day's prunepicking juices. Modesty would tell us to hide behind a tree for a toilet, always careful at the next picking not to trespass over the same area. Insect bites were occupational hazards. The pay was as lousy as the creatures and, in addition, there were deductions for this and that. And beware of strike talk—there were the town vigilantes. All this only within a few miles of the Bay Area.

NOT THE HEATED WORDS

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago it was my privilege to share with my colleagues an editorial from one of the newspapers in our district entitled, "Time To Keep It Cool." That same paper, the Sedalia Democrat, in its issue of May 14, 1970, has printed another excellent editorial under the title, "Not the Heated Words."

While the earlier editorial concerned the President's Cambodian incursion, this later editorial had to do with the very careless comments made by many television commentators and columnists after the tragedy at Kent State University. I call attention as contained in the editorial to the inflammatory language used by a Cleveland television commentator, and the intolerant and hideous language of a Boston College professor of political science.

Once again may I suggest that all of us, meaning those in the executive branch of Government, the other body of Congress, and Members of the House of Representatives including myself, should follow the suggestion of this editorial and not join the chorus of wordy dissonance and unreason. The editorial follows:

NOT THE HEATED WORDS

"Plain, outright murder," was how a respected Cleveland television commentator labeled the shootings at Kent State University. This is another example of emotionally inspired exaggeration of the news about which we have previously commented.

Another illustration of the heated words came from a director of a committee for a sane nuclear policy in a letter to a newspaper editor. He charged that the violence was a direct result of the Ohio Governor's sending in the National Guard, "for the main purpose of suppressing student expression of protest and dissent."

A Boston College professor of political science gave this intolerant and hideous opinion: "All people now see that the Government is not only willing to kill Vietnamese and blacks, but its own students."

Such statements and others like them are worse than asinine. Whether made in the heat of emotion or out of cold calculation, they can only confuse and divide and inflame. They can be as destructive to the fiber of Americans as flames are to educational structures burned on campuses or elsewhere.

Responsible leaders and molders of opinion must not join the choruses of wordy dissonance and unreason when supplemented by acts of violence.

What happened at Kent was unplanned and unexpected but made inevitable by the current disregard for the standards of civilized behavior without which a free nation cannot remain free.

America does not have a Government which dispatches troops to fire on those who dissent with its policies. But it must never become a country where the right of free speech and petition of grievances extends to the destruction of property, the stoning of legally constituted authorities and infringement on the rights and safety of others.

Those who claim that the Government of the United States is at war with its own citizens make a mockery of the deaths of innocent people. Wittingly or unwittingly, radical elements bent on the destruction of America are using such preposterous statements as additional treacherous devices to distort the minds of young people and spawn universal prejudice among them.

MRS. ALICE KOHN POLLITZER CELEBRATES HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, May 18, the Encampment for Citizenship, Inc., honored Mrs. Alice Kohn Pollitzer's 100th birthday and its own 25th anniversary.

Mrs. Pollitzer was a founder of the encampment and has been a guiding spirit throughout its 25 years. Known to her friends and admirers as "Nanny," Mrs. Pollitzer has devoted her lifetime to the community and to the causes of liberalism and reform.

One of the nine women graduated in the first class at Barnard College in 1893, she helped to institute Barnard's Alumnae Association, of which she is the oldest living member.

She has been actively involved in such organizations as the Ethical Culture Society, the Visiting Nurses Association, the Play School Association, and the American Civil Liberties Union.

She campaigned for enlightened child labor laws and women's suffrage, and helped found the Vocational Services for Juniors—now Vocational Advisor Service—an organization aimed at guidance counseling and vocational placement.

An active campaigner for President Franklin Roosevelt, in later years she worked with Eleanor Roosevelt for Democratic Party reform in New York.

In 1946, at the age of 75, Nanny Pollitzer founded the Encampment for Citizenship, a pioneer intergroup-relations organization of young people sponsored by the American Ethical Union. Mrs. Pollitzer served as chairman of the board for 13 years, and presently is honorary chairman of the board. The encampment teaches young people about the nature and extent of their own political power by bringing them together to share a common experience of work, study, and recreation without indoctrination into any specific religious, political, or economic points of view.

An independent group of social scientists has called the encampment "a rare

and successful experiment in democratic education."

"Nanny" Pollitzer's concern for democratic institutions and the education of young people to the democratic process has inspired countless young Americans who have made major contributions to our society. Her dedicated career of service is a model for her fellow Americans to attempt to emulate.

It is a pleasure to extend my best wishes and congratulations to Alice Kohn Pollitzer and the encampment on their common birthdays.

I include at this point in the RECORD an article by Enid Nemy about Mrs. Pollitzer which appeared in the New York Times on May 18, 1970.

[From the New York Times, May 18, 1970]

CENTENARIAN RECALLS SUFFRAGETTE DAYS

(By Enid Nemy)

Mrs. Sigmund Pollitzer doesn't feel old until she remembers that her two daughters are over 70. Mrs. Pollitzer will celebrate her 100th birthday May 31.

The only living member of the first graduating class of Barnard College (1893) and still active in several voluntary organizations, Mrs. Pollitzer will be honored tonight by The Encampment for Citizenship at a 25th anniversary banquet in the Plaza Hotel. The organization, of which she is honorary chairman and a board member, trains teenagers for community leadership.

YOUNGSTERS BRIGHTER TODAY

"Young people today are brighter," she said, a small smiling figure in a bright green suit, the afternoon sunlight reflecting a face mobile with awareness.

"My sister and I have decided that we would have a difficult time getting into college now," she said. Mrs. Pollitzer and Dr. Lucile Kohn, her surviving sister, who is 87, were the only two college graduates of five sisters.

"I don't know the answers to anything and the problems are of such magnitude that one needs to know so much to make a judgment," she said. "I'm sorry for young people who have to make them."

A woman who walked in suffrage parades "before anyone else was born," she is concerned about the generation gap and feels that "the older generation should take more trouble to understand young people."

"If there was a generation gap when I was growing up, I wasn't aware of it," she said. "It was the age of innocence. I thought my parents understood me very well."

The daughter of a silk and velvet importer, she had no difficulty when she decided that she would like to enter the first class at Barnard College.

"My parents encouraged me," she said. "But some of my contemporaries who wanted to go, ran into problems."

But Alice Kohn, as she was then, did meet a few lifted eyebrows in another direction.

NICE GIRL, BUT

"The boys were very worried about it," she said. "One of them told my husband before we were married that Miss Kohn was a very nice girl but nothing to marry. The idea was that you weren't interested in the other sex if you went to college."

Mrs. Pollitzer, who was married just before her graduation to Dr. Sigmund Pollitzer (a dermatologist who died in 1937), smiled as she recalled another comment made about her higher education.

"One man said, 'What difference does it make if a woman knows mathematics—it's enough if she knows more arithmetic than the cook.'"

After working for women's suffrage ("My husband walked in the parades with me—

we were spat upon"), Mrs. Pollitzer casts a benevolent but critical eye on the women's liberation movement.

WOMEN IN POLITICS

"I think it's exaggerated and some of the minor details are foolish," she said. "But women are still not playing as large a part as they should in public affairs. I'm disappointed there aren't more women in political life. I'm not sure whether it's that men are more interested or it's the traditional business of women having children."

The mother of two daughters, both now widows (Mrs. Louis Weiss, with whom she lives in New York, and Mrs. Lindsay Hoden in Milwaukee), Mrs. Pollitzer has six grandchildren and 25 great-grandchildren ("I'm responsible for the population explosion but they're nice").

She has been active in educational activities for most of her life and has been professionally associated with the Vocational Advisory Services, Story Parade magazine and the Walden School. She also has worked for numerous organizations, including the Ethical Culture Society, which she joined in 1913 and of which she is now an honorary trustee, the Legal Aid Society, the Play School Association and the Civil Liberties Union.

SOAPBOX ORATOR

Although she was a soapbox orator for Franklin D. Roosevelt at the age of 70 and considers herself "a good Democrat," she would, if she were able, "work for Mr. Lindsay."

"I voted for him," she said firmly. "I think he's imaginative and courageous."

Mrs. Pollitzer regrets that her sight now precludes reading ("I can do without Shakespeare, but it's very inconvenient not to be able to read recipes on a soup can") and that her hearing isn't what it once was, but she has found compensations.

"I listen to Channel 13 television a great deal," she said. "I enjoy the news and discussions and public affairs. And I find the world is very kind to old people—wherever I go, I find people very helpful."

Known generally to friends and acquaintances as "Nanny," a name derived from her grandchildren, Mrs. Pollitzer said she had no problems about the outfit she would wear tonight. It was already in her wardrobe.

"I got it for my 95th birthday, or perhaps it was my 90th," she announced. "When I went to buy it, I told the salesgirl I'd take any color but pink. She brought out the dress and I thought it was pink, but when I asked her about it, she told me it was 'ashes of roses' so I bought it."

A woman who treats each day as "the first and the last," Mrs. Pollitzer looks back on what she terms "an extraordinarily happy life."

"If everybody could have as happy a life as I've had, the world would be a different place," she said. "I feel ashamed I've learned so little in 100 years—I know many people who, in fewer years, have learned much more. But I don't spend too much time regretting things."

THE SST IS NOT A GOOD INVESTMENT

(Mr. MACGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, a summary of the supersonic transport program that was recently distributed by the Department of Transportation served to highlight one of the most questionable factors in the SST project. The DOT flier says:

The present SST program calls for developing and flight testing two prototype airplanes. Total cost is estimated at \$1.5 billion, with the Federal Government's participation amounting to about \$1.3 billion.

Very frankly, I appreciate this reminder from DOT, because it is easy to overlook the total Federal share as we consider the annual appropriations year after year. Last year, over my objection, we appropriated \$85 million for the SST. This year we are being asked to vote \$290 million. These are rather exorbitant sums in themselves, yet they pale in comparison to the \$1.3 billion total. Out of the overall cost of the project, the Federal Government is expected to pay some 85 percent.

The DOT flier has an answer to this. It says:

The Government's investment would be returned, with interest, with the sale of the 300th airplane.

Whether 300 of them will ever be sold, and whether the Government even then would recover its share, are questions that are now being studied by independent observers who are truly objective, and the conclusions do not put the SST in a favorable light.

Dr. Richard L. Garwin, who chaired a panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee in a study of the SST, told the National Journal:

My position is that the SST is not a good investment for the U.S. government.

Among the variables that Dr. Garwin said make the SST a bad risk are the airport noise problem—"There is a risk whether localities will allow them to operate"—and the uncertainty of passenger fares being competitive with subsonic jet fares—"How many people will pay a surcharge to fly the SST?" In addition, it is unclear whether the Government will have to put up still more money after the prototypes are completed. Said Dr. Garwin:

Boeing has said that private financing after the prototype phase will be hard to come by, and the President's ad hoc committee said it will be only prudent to consider that government aid will be required after the production phase begins. Boeing will be able to point to its candor when they come back for more money.

Mary Goldring, business editor of the Economist, also has reported that at the present state of aviation technology an economically feasible SST is an impossibility. Her views were expounded in some detail in the National Journal of May 2.

Quite aside from these risks in the SST project, we are already experiencing overruns, \$76 million to date, on the cost of the SST, and these are surely not the last. The SST project, in fact, is beginning to resemble a near bottomless pit into which the Congress will be asked to pour millions upon millions of dollars through the next few years, far exceeding the cost figures that were cited when the SST was first considered. Lt. Gen. Elwood R. Quesada, former head of the FAA, has predicted that even the prototype development will cost the Government not \$1.3 billion, but more than \$3 billion.

If we spend all that money on it despite the risks, bearing with the SST

through overruns and all, what will we have? An airplane that may well do more to hurt environment of our citizens than any single Federal project in history.

We know enough already about the economic risks of the SST, and about its likely environmental effects. Let us call a halt to all Government financing of the SST project now, before sheer momentum carries the SST any farther down this dead end runway.

The Minneapolis Tribune published a perceptive editorial on this subject on March 30, 1970. Under unanimous consent, I include it at the conclusion of my remarks, along with an editorial from the Washington Post:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Mar. 30, 1970]

MR. NIXON, THE SST, AND THE ENVIRONMENT

The case against the supersonic transport (SST) has been stated many times by many groups. The plane will be too expensive, too noisy; it probably will not pay for itself; it will present technical dangers; it will pose many environmental problems.

But somehow the SST—with its 90-percent federal funding—keeps taxing ahead. More than \$600 million already has been spent, much of it wasted because early designs were scrapped. Mr. Nixon wants to spend \$662 million more over five years, including \$275 million next fiscal year.

Two Cabinet-level task forces have recommended against the SST—one in 1967 to then-President Johnson, one to Mr. Nixon last year. The President's chief science adviser, the Environmental Quality Council, the Council of Economic Advisers and representatives of five federal departments all have signed in against the SST.

The administration's response to criticism has been to say that the SST and its thunderous wake of sonic boom will be banned over "populated areas" of the country. That is no answer. The President can't speak for authorities 10 years hence. If the SST proves unprofitable without high-speed overland routes (a distinct possibility), what will be scrapped—the overflight ban or planes costing perhaps \$50 million each?

But sonic booms in populated areas are only part of the SST threat to the environment. No one knows the effect of sonic booms on sea life. The SST is expected to be noisier at subsonic speeds and on the ground than present planes. And, perhaps worst, some scientists fear that the SST will pollute the upper atmosphere in a way that will cause significant alterations in weather.

A militant new organization, Friends of the Earth, recently took a full-page advertisement in the New York Times to point out some of the SST's drawbacks and to ask that citizens write the President, senators and representatives in opposition to the project. That is good advice; Mr. Nixon's \$275-million request will be heard in the Senate Appropriations Committee next month. Congress should have little trouble, it seems to us, in finding better uses for the money.

[From the Washington Post, May 8, 1970]

QUESADA ASSAILS U.S. ROLE IN SST, SEES \$3 BILLION COST TO TAXPAYERS

(By George Lardner Jr.)

A former head of the Federal Aviation Administration said yesterday that the government should never have gotten into the financing of a supersonic transport and predicted that it would cost the taxpayers more than \$3 billion.

"A lot of people say the airlines wish the plane would go away. I'm one of them," former FAA chief Elwood R. Quesada told the Joint Economic subcommittee on economy in government.

He blamed the difficulties and rising costs of the controversial SST on "heavy-handed government interference" in a project that should have been left to private industry.

Now chairman of the board of the L'Enfant Plaza Corp. and a director of American Airlines, Quesada headed the FAA from its inception in 1958 until 1961.

During his tenure, he told the subcommittee, the SST had always been envisioned as a technological spinoff of the Defense Department's program to build a supersonic bomber, the B-70.

The B-70 was dropped early in the Kennedy administration. Quesada suggested that the government should have dropped any thought of financing the SST at the same time, except for some help with research and development.

Instead, the Kennedy and succeeding administrations committed close to \$1.3 billion for construction of two SST prototypes by the Boeing Co. Officials have defended the government investment primarily on the grounds that the subsidized British-French entry in the supersonic race, the Concorde, might capture the market and the pre-eminence now held by the U.S. aviation industry.

"Europe has bought our airplanes for decades," Quesada said. "I can see nothing wrong with our buying a Concorde."

Quesada said he saw even less reason to get excited about the Soviet Union's SST.

"Let the Russians develop it," he said. "If they do, nobody'll buy it. I doubt that a Russian airplane could be given away this side of the Iron Curtain."

In any event, Quesada said, the U.S. aviation industry has long been the world's best. If the private market should demand an SST, he said, he had no doubt that a privately financed American model would pop up soon enough.

"Government interference and government participation to the degree it has invested in the SST is not a healthy thing," he said in testimony expanding on views he first voiced last year during a private session with a Nixon administration task force on the SST.

By contrast, Quesada pointed to the Boeing Co's new 747 "jumbo jets" which the company developed "solely within the free-enterprise system" and which he called "one of the best airplanes we've ever developed."

FAA officials have repeatedly said they hope to see private financing take over after SST prototype construction. Critics such as the subcommittee's chairman, William Proxmire (D-Wis.), and Rep. Henry Reuss (D-Wis.), who also testified yesterday, have contended that the project will require \$3 billion to \$4 billion in federal funds.

CRIME COMMITTEE HEARINGS, REPORT AND DRUG COMMENTARY

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a status report on the availability of documents prepared by the Select Committee on Crime:

Marihuana report—The House has approved the printing of 10,000 additional copies; Senate approval requested.

Drug documentary—A 30-minute audio program on the subject of narcotics addiction and drug abuse narrated by singer, "Oliver." For radio programming and classroom discussion use.

Washington overview hearings—"The Improvement and Reform of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice in the United States." Supply exhausted.

Boston hearings—"Crime in America—Drug Abuse and Criminal Justice." 1,000 copies available.

Omaha and Lincoln hearings—"Crime in America—A Mid-America View." 1,000 copies available.

San Francisco hearings—"Crime in America—Illicit and Dangerous Drugs." Supply exhausted.

Marihuana hearing—"Crime in America—Views on Marihuana." 1,000 copies available.

Amphetamine hearing—"Crime in America—Why 8 Billion Amphetamines?" 3,000 copies available.

Columbia, S.C., hearings—"Crime in America—Response of a Midsouth Community." 1,000 copies available.

Miami hearings—"Crime in America—Aspects of Organized Crime, Court Delay and Juvenile Justice." 500 copies available.

Washington hearings—"Crime in America—In the Nation's Capital." 400 copies available.

Baltimore hearings—To be printed; 3,000 copies requested.

OPERATION FLORIDA SUNSHINE

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, While recognizing the large differences of opinion in regards to the war in Southeast Asia, we as a nation must do all we can to help our wounded and hospitalized veterans of the Vietnam conflict.

"Operation Florida Sunshine" is a program designed to give rest and recuperation in the Miami area to those brave men wounded in the Vietnam conflict. The program, conceived in 1967 by Lt. David F. Bird, infantry, U.S. Army, area adviser, Miami area, 3d U.S. Army, is now entering its third year. Much of the success of this program belongs to the South Florida Chapter of the Disabled Officers Association and to its chapter commander, Lt. Col. Sydney G. Osborne.

The residents of Miami are proud of the part they are playing in providing housing, meals, and entertainment to the wounded war veterans and we are all hopeful that other areas of Florida and other States will contribute to the expansion of this most worthy program.

I want to express my pleasure at attending the Third Annual Awards Banquet of the South Florida Chapter of the Disabled Officers Association. As I did on that occasion, I again wish to offer my warm and personal thanks to all who have so enthusiastically participated in this effort to show the wounded veterans of the Vietnam conflict that we are truly grateful for the sacrifices they have undertaken.

CUBA, 1970—A WOUNDED FAUN SEEKING REFUGE

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, 75 years ago a patriot and statesman gave of his life on a dusty road outside the city of Santiago, Cuba, so that a people might enjoy the priceless gifts of freedom and liberty.

Of his death, it was written:

Jose Marti died, but a people was born.

Cuba, an independent nation, a free people, obtained its quest only after the longest of struggles and human suffering.

The document signed in 1902 bore the ideals of Marti, incorporated the deeds of Maximo Gomez, and the leadership of Tomas Estrada Palma.

Today, the Cuban Constitution of 1902 has been abrogated by a repressive regime that fears the rights and liberties that document guarantees. As well it should.

For Jose Marti is once again in exile. He lives in the hearts and minds of the hundreds of thousands of exiles who have fled the tyranny of subjugation.

His words cry out today as they did three-quarters of a century ago:

I am a truthful man, from the land of palm trees. Before dying, I want to share these poems of my soul.

My poems are light green, but they are also flaming crimson. My verses are like a wounded faun, seeking refuge in the forest.

With the poor people of this earth, I want to share my fate. The little streams of the mountains please me more than the sea.

Jose Marti lives again in exile. A people await a rebirth.

LEGAL IMPACT ON PROPOSED EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT BY ADELE T. WEAVER

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, for many years, both in the other body and in this House, I have introduced a resolution for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing equal rights for women. Following is a statement I made in the Senate, 78th Congress, on January 21, 1943, on Senate Joint Resolution 25 on a constitutional amendment for equal rights for men and women:

STATEMENT MADE BY SENATOR CLAUDE PEPPER, JANUARY 21, 1943, 78TH CONGRESS, ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 25: "CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT DECLARING THAT MEN AND WOMEN SHALL HAVE EQUAL RIGHTS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES, AND GIVING CONGRESS POWER TO ENFORCE THE AMENDMENT BY APPROPRIATE LEGISLATION"

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I regret very much that the very few remarks I shall make should appear so proximate to contrary sentiments expressed by my distinguished colleague, for whom I have not only the greatest affection and deepest friendship, but to whose opinion I always very much defer. However, I cannot escape the conclusion that those of us who have advocated by our signatures the equal-rights amendment, which is now upon the desk and properly referred, as well as those who are favorably inclined toward it, advocate an ideal too long delayed, the complete emancipation of women.

The whole question of the evolution of human rights is a matter of interesting historical trend. There was a time when men were not regarded as entitled to many privileges or prerogatives, and protected by few immunities, if they happened to be men of poverty or without estate. I have read that at the time of the French Revolution in France it was permissible for one of the grand gentlemen of France, a member of the nobility, on a cold morning's hunt to have the privilege of warming his feet in the bowels of not to exceed two peasants.

We all know what great progress was made

in the protection of human rights when the Magna Carta was promulgated.

There was a long time in this country when able, earnest, and honest men and women opposed the extension of the suffrage to women because they really thought that association with politics would contaminate women and to subject women to such taint was unworthy of men.

I remember very distinctly a clever gentleman who was later in the Senate, making a remark in my high school, when I was a high school student, when he spoke against women's suffrage, to the effect that John was a suffragist—and Mary was a suffragette, and they were both suffering it. Those were just a few of the sentiments of ridicule and scorn which were hurled at those who advocated what we all now take as a matter of fact and right, and the right of women to vote.

I feel, therefore, that the trend toward women enjoying equal rights has progressed until today they are entitled to enjoy all rights equally with all human beings, and that sex is not a sufficient line of demarcation for different rights. There may be instances where there would be a difference in duties, but that will depend upon the ability of the person or persons affected to perform the obligation required, not to their rights equally to share and to enjoy the benefits which are derived from citizenship and equality due to all.

When the Declaration of Independence was written, and those moving words that "all men are created equal" were incorporated therein, to lift the hopes and the hearts of the oppressed everywhere in the world, I do not believe that Thomas Jefferson was thinking only of mankind which happened to be masculine in sex. I think he spoke about human beings, and therefore that it is in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Independence to say that women are born equal with men in the rights of citizenship and civil prerogatives.

I hope, therefore, that this may be the last hurdle which it will be necessary to surmount; that the race to bring equality, complete freedom, independence, and liberty for women shall at long last be won.

I believe the time is long past due when such an amendment should be adopted by the Congress and presented to the States for approval. The principal impediment which has been interposed by many conscientious people's approval of this proposal is that it would deprive Congress and respective legislatures of the capacity to enact legislation favorable to the health and welfare of women, much of which is on the statute books of the country and the several States today. I have always strongly believed as an attorney in either the Congress or States to give proper protection to women where there was a proper basis for classification of women or certain women engaged in fitting occupations as a predicate for such legislation.

Recently hearings have been in progress in the other body before the Constitutional Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee chaired by Senator BIRCH BAYH, upon this proposal. Among the many distinguished women of the country testifying was the president-elect of the National Association of Women Lawyers, Mrs. Adele T. Weaver, who, I am proud to say is an associate in my law office, Senator BAYH and many who heard Mrs. Weaver warmly commended her upon her able presentation affirming the compelling need in the interest of justice for the adoption of such an amendment and her able legalizing

that the adoption of such an amendment would not deprive the Congress and several legislatures of their power to give due protection to the women of this country.

I commend Mrs. Weaver's statement to my colleagues and to those who read this RECORD and include it immediately following my remarks in the body of this RECORD:

LEGAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

(By Adele T. Weaver)

This statement is not intended to be a legal treatise on Discrimination as to Sex under the laws of our fifty sovereign states since obviously, upon the ratification of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment to the United States Constitution, each state would be obliged to set up its own equal rights commission for the purpose of researching the Constitution and Statutes of that particular state and to propose legislation that would achieve the result of eliminating any conflict with the Equal Rights Amendment. This would also result in the enactment of statutes that would put into effect the intent of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment. There is no need, therefore, and it would be presumptuous of me to attempt to discuss the various legislative enactments that would be necessary in our fifty states. I shall limit my statement to a general survey of certain areas that would be affected by the proposed Amendment, i.e.:

- I. Political Rights of Women.
- II. Disabilities of Women.
- III. Family Law.
- IV. Divorce, Alimony and Custody.
- V. Military Service for Women.

I deliberately eliminate the area of Equal Opportunity in Employment for Women because it has been so thoroughly covered by other witnesses.

I. POLITICAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN

A. Suffrage

Suffrage has been defined as a political right or privilege as distinguished from a civil right, a property right, or a right of the person. It is not a natural, absolute or vested right. Although some authorities hold that the right of suffrage is included within the liberties and immunities guaranteed to every citizen in a republican form of government and that he may not be deprived of it except by due process of law, the right is not considered as being a privilege or immunity under the Constitution of the United States.¹ Women did not receive the right of suffrage in the United States until fifty years ago when the XIX Amendment to the Constitution was ratified. It is to be noted that the XV Amendment to the United States Constitution, ratified 100 years ago on March 30, 1870, provided that the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude.

It is worthy of comment that the political, social and legal rights of women are running generations behind the rights of black people. For this reason alone, the Equal Rights Amendment is vitally necessary to insure woman taking her place in today's society. The XIX Amendment erased from the constitutions and laws of each state every provision restricting the right of women to vote, and it gave to women the same right of suffrage that has been conferred on men in their respective states. Prior to the XIX Amendment, the Courts had taken the view that the status of women as citizens did not confer upon them the right to vote, and that right could be constitutionally limited to males.² This first

recognition of woman as a person and citizen was only achieved by a constitutional amendment.

B. Jury duty

Since the qualifications of jurors are governed by state constitutional or statutory provisions, rather than by rules of the common law, a state may prescribe such relevant qualifications as are deemed proper for jurors without offending the XIV Amendment to the United States Constitution. This is true as long as there is no unlawful discrimination with respect to the jury service against any class of citizens. At common law, women were not eligible to serve as jurors; however, there is no doubt that states have the power to make them eligible, and in most jurisdictions women are now qualified to be jurors, although the view has been taken that the XIX Amendment to the United States Constitution guaranteeing the right of suffrage, does not require states to admit women as jurors.

Therefore, though most states have now enacted jury duty statutes automatically qualifying women for jury duty and have eliminated the necessity of women having to volunteer for jury duty as was the case in my state of Florida until 1967, the proposed Equal Rights Amendment to the United States Constitution would make unconstitutional any discrimination against women in that regard so that any state not yet having provided for automatic selection of persons for jury duty without discrimination as to sex would be obliged to enact such legislation.

Since present statutory provisions disqualify persons in certain professions, for example, attorneys, and since jurors are consistently excused for hardship reasons, there is no legal problem involved in a statutory provision excusing the mothers of children under a certain age from jury duty upon their application to be excused.³ The need for women to be called consistently to fulfill this primary duty of citizenship is obvious; so long as we retain the jury system, the jury should be representative of the entire population, and not just 50% or less of it. Moreover, we not only make greater demands upon men for jury duty where such discrimination exists, but we neglect a tremendous potential source of capable jurors.

II. DISABILITIES OF WOMEN

A. Single women—disability of minority

The legal disability of single women is generally related to the age requirement for marriage, voting and entering into legal contracts. At the present time, influenced by the common law, most states allow a girl to marry without parental consent at a younger age than boys; here, the discrimination is actually against the male sex. The effect of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment prohibiting discrimination as to sex would be to lower the age requirement to that of the female. It follows that State Legislatures might well wish to enact legislation advancing the age requirement for marriage without parental consent for both the girl and boy, if this be deemed desirable. As to the right of suffrage, there has generally been no discrimination insofar as the age requirement is concerned; it has generally been consistent with the attaining of the legal status of majority by either sex. Many states, including my own state of Florida, are currently considering lowering the voting age requirement. This is, of course, a prerogative of the sovereign state, and the Equal Rights Amendment would not affect a state's right to legislate age requirements for voting, for marriage without parental consent, or for attaining majority so long as there is no discrimination as to sex in such legislation.

B. Married women

The real impact of the Equal Rights Amendment would be felt by the married woman. It is in the area of the disabilities

of married women, particularly in the handling of property, and in the areas of family law and divorce that great discrimination exists; and I must add that this discrimination is not always directed toward woman, but frequently toward the man.

The disabilities of marriage are generally the result of the common law under which a married woman lost her identity and husband and wife became legally only one person, i.e., the person of the husband. We have for so long in our Anglo-American society accepted the fact that Mrs. John Smith is merely the spouse of John Smith that we think of her in no other terms unless she makes a name for herself in some manner.

The married woman under the common law lost her right to contract, and except as that right was remedied or was granted to her by the legislature, her attempted contract was void. Under the common law she could not acquire or dispose of property without consent of her husband and she could not contract with her husband. Many states have removed most of these common law disabilities; yet the law has not placed husband and wife on an exact parity. For example, the husband, as head of the family (a) alone establishes the family domicile, and (b) is primarily obligated for support of the family. The wife, even where the common law has been modified, is limited to her own earnings in employment separate from her husband's and in many states still must obtain joinder of her husband in any conveyance or encumbrance of her separate property.

These common law restrictions and their many statutory modifications have resulted in the enactment of Free Dealer laws and their equivalents. Such Free Dealer laws would become unnecessary and would be eliminated by the Equal Rights Amendment. The necessity for free dealership or free agent statutes is an anachronism in this era when the majority of married women work, generally to contribute to the support of the family, many of them being in professions and businesses requiring them to contract, to bind themselves legally, to sue and be sued, etc. The only proper questions with regard to a woman's contracts or right to contract with third parties should have nothing whatsoever to do with her marital status, but should relate only to her own personal responsibility for her contract, i.e., her own personal credit rating, ability to pay, etc.

Heretofore, only under Free Dealer laws or specific legislation has a woman been able to convey or encumber her own separate property without joinder by her husband. The Equal Rights Amendment would eliminate the discrimination against either sex in this regard; naturally, if the constitutional or statutory requirements of a given state were identical as to conveyancing or encumbering of their separate property by either sex, the proposed Equal Rights Amendment would not affect such requirements.

In my state of Florida, our new 1968 Constitution provides that there shall be no distinction between married women and married men in the holding, controlling, disposition and encumbering of their property. However, because of existing statutes requiring a married woman to join her husband in the conveyance or encumbrance of his own separate property in order to release her inchoate dower right to that property, and which also require the joinder of a husband in any conveyance or encumbrance by a woman of her own separate property that that in conflict with the new Constitution, bills have been introduced and have passed the House of Representatives in our current legislative session putting into effect the policy and intent of the new Constitution. These bills, if passed, will

(a) eliminate the necessity for a woman to secure the joinder of her husband in any

Footnotes at end of article.

conveyance of encumbrance of her own separate property, and

(b) eliminate the necessity of joinder by the wife in the conveyance or encumbrance by a husband of his own separate property by elimination of the inchoate right of dower, i.e., limiting the right of dower to that property owned by the husband at the time of death.

In this regard, therefore, the Equal Rights Amendment would affect dower laws or their counterparts where the equivalent right of curtesy or its counterpart is not given to the husband. There is no reason whatsoever why a married man should not have at the moment of his wife's death a right to a portion of her property equivalent to the right of dower which she has in his property. I, of course, refer here only to those states having such statutes. In other states, the statutory share of the spouse's property to which the surviving spouse is entitled should be identical. In the community property states there would appear to be no problem that cannot be solved by some form of the community system of property, assuming that there is no discrimination as to sex. Generally, the effect of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment would be to eliminate any discrimination whatsoever in the area of the right to convey or encumber one's separate property and the right to dower, curtesy, community property or an equivalent right of inheritance between the spouses.

III. FAMILY LAW

A. Domicile

At common law, the husband establishes the domicile in most jurisdictions. The legal effect of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment would be to affect the automatic establishment of the domicile by the husband as head of the family. From a practical point of view, since marriages are established for the purpose of living together and it is generally desirable from the woman's point of view to be domiciled in the area most conducive to the welfare and business or professional activity of the husband, the Equal Rights Amendment would have little or no effect. Statutes that follow the common law could be modified to hold that the breadwinner of the family determines the domicile for the family or in those cases where neither one party or the other is predominantly the breadwinner, the domicile could be established by either party. The concept of domicile has lost its importance in family law, except as a basis for the right of one party or the other to come into the courts of any particular state for solution of domestic or family matters. Domicile is now primarily concerned with the establishment of the right to vote and other civil rights.

B. Right to support

Generally the support of a wife or child is the legal duty of the husband and father, and some states even make it a criminal offense for a husband to withhold support from his wife or child. Yet courts have consistently interpreted the obligation of the husband to support his wife with due regard to financial conditions, earning capacities and other circumstances of either spouse that bear upon the discharge of his obligation. Therefore, the legal effect of the Equal Rights Amendment would be to make the obligation of the husband to support the wife consistent with actual practice. Obviously, it should be the legal duty of either spouse to support the other more dependent spouse.

The argument of some opponents of the Equal Rights Amendment that it would allow a man to escape from his obligation of support is not a valid argument. So long as the wife contributes in services to the family, in the duties of homemaking, of rearing children, of being a social hostess for her husband, etc., she is contributing equally to the marriage, and with each year that she makes such contribution to the marriage her abil-

ity to earn an independent income from the outside world diminishes while her contribution to the marriage increases. It is conceivable that there may be a few cases where the spouse contributing the services to the home or caring for small children would be the husband. This may sound ludicrous, but the possibility exists, and the Equal Rights Amendment should result in State Legislation making the support of one spouse by the other dependent upon the circumstances of those spouses, and their respective contributions to the marriage, (the contribution of home-making and related duties being as vitally important a contribution as that of earning the family income).

It follows that both spouses should be responsible for the support of their children, and pursuing this thought—when have we ever seen a mother who would not go out to work or even to beg, borrow or steal to support her children when they were not being supported by the father? The legal effect of the Equal Rights Amendment in this area of support for the spouse and the children of the marriage would be to place the responsibility upon both spouses with due regard to their respective contributions to the marriage and their respective abilities to be self-supporting.

C. Dower

Mention has already been made of the effect of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment on the common law concept of dower. Where there is no equivalent right in the husband, i.e., the right of curtesy, obviously legislation would be necessary either to establish the latter or to eliminate the former. The necessity for married women who have dedicated their lives to the occupation of home-making, to share in the fruits of the marriage partnership can be established in any one of several ways, i.e.,

- (a) by dower and the equivalent curtesy;
- (b) by one of the community property systems, (community of acquisitions, full community or a compromise community system); or
- (c) inheritance laws; and
- (d) by alimony awards in the event of divorce. The nature of the particular measure will depend in each jurisdiction upon existing laws and the circumstances involved.

IV. DIVORCE

A. Alimony

It is not in the grounds or procedures for divorce that the impact of an Equal Rights Amendment will be felt; it is rather in the determination of the rights of the parties as to alimony, support and custody of children that the greatest thrust of the Equal Rights Amendment will be seen.

While the Amendment would make unconstitutional the award of alimony to a wife based simply on the ground of sex there would be no deterrent to an award of alimony on grounds such as the following:

- (a) Her financial contributions or their equivalent in homemaking services to the marriage partnership;
- (b) years of duration of the marriage;
- (c) need for support based on inability to be self-supporting;
- (d) age;
- (e) lack of education or training;
- (f) lack of availability or need for services that dependent spouse is capable of performing.

Using the above or similar guidelines, it is obvious that either spouse who, having dedicated many years to the marriage partnership without remuneration and with resulting depreciation of value in the labor market, is entitled to support by the other spouse; such support or alimony should, of course, be commensurate with the need of the dependent spouse and should be based upon the employed spouse's ability to pay. As a matter of fact, these are the guidelines generally used in our courts today by judges accustomed to hearing and deciding matters of support and alimony in divorce cases.

B. Custody of Children

At common law, the husband was automatically entitled to custody of his child. Gradually the concept of making a determination of custody solely "for the best interests of the child or children . . ." came into effect. Generally, neither parent has priority as to custody, although many courts follow the rule that the best interests of a child of tender years are served by granting custody to the mother, with reasonable rights of visitation to the father. An Equal Rights Amendment should have no effect whatsoever upon the existing law and practice in our courts.

V. MILITARY SERVICE FOR WOMEN

Amongst other possible legal effects of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment would be the eligibility of young women for military service. While it may seem at first impression a bit shocking to think of the young girl of eighteen being drafted, the fact is that many thousands of our young women went into the military service of their country in World War II, wore their uniforms with pride and rendered immeasurable service to this nation. There is no reason whatsoever why any healthy young woman should not serve her country for a year or two in any capacity for which she is physically, mentally and emotionally suited. No young man is required to do more. While we may not wish for our young women to be placed in hazardous battle areas, the fact remains that our military nurses are and have been subjected to such hazards. We may not wish to follow the example set by the Israeli Army—but there are thousands of activities by which our young military female could give her service to her country.

There are, no doubt, many other areas of concern to the American woman today which would eventually be affected by the proposed Equal Rights Amendment. Certainly one cannot be omniscient and predict the outcome of such an evolutionary measure as the proposed Equal Rights Amendment. The legal effects would seem, however, to be beneficial not only to woman, but to society generally. It is my humble contention that the American woman today really does not recognize her own value as a person and a human being, and until she is accorded the constitutional right to equality under the law in every respect, she will not begin to free herself from the bondage of centuries of self-deprecation. She must assume the full responsibilities as well as the full rights of citizenship and until she does this, this great country of ours will be deprived of the benefit of the service, the brains and the talent of a half of our population—woman!

FOOTNOTES

¹ 25 Am.Jur. 2d Elections, Sec. 53, pp 742 et seq.

² 25 Am.Jur. 2d Elections, Sec. 64, pp 756 et seq.

³ For example, see Sec. 40.01(1) Florida Statutes 1967.

⁴ Adams v. Adams, 206 Ga. 881 (1950).

INVASION OF CAMBODIA

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I insert immediately following my remarks the statement I issued on May 1 in respect to the President's order, sending our Armed Forces, air and ground, into Cambodia, announced by him the evening before:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CLAUDE PEPPER

I know the President is acting very conscientiously in this matter and I hope wise-

ly. Yet I share the very deep concern of many members of the Congress and my fellow citizens that this move on the President's part, regrettably without consultation with Congress, is simply an enlargement of the war and will make it more difficult for us to get out rather than easier.

If the same logic applied to our going into Cambodia is applied to our going into Laos and perhaps to Thailand, it means that we are simply getting more deeply mired in Southeast Asia rather than making progress in emerging from that costly involvement.

We would like to free oppressed people everywhere in the world but we must recognize there are limitations upon even our strength, great as it is, and our resources, enormous as they are. And sometimes in critical situations we have to determine priorities. We cannot save the world and lose our unity and well-being at home. I feel we must try to bring this war to an end as soon as possible.

CREDIT UNION SHARE INSURANCE LEGISLATION INTRODUCED BY CHAIRMAN PATMAN

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, credit unions began in Boston and Speaker of the House, Mr. McCORMACK, has been interested in credit unions for many years. He has worked on these bills and he has helped me greatly with credit union legislation for many years.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I want to report to you that I am introducing a bill for share insurance for credit unions all over the United States. It is a great giant step in the right direction of helping more poor people. Next to the church, the credit unions are the greatest good to humanity. Today there are 22 million members of credit unions—or in other words, 10 percent of all the people in every State and in every district.

Credit unions are great institutions and, Mr. Speaker, you have had much to do with making them a success. Through the years, I have deeply appreciated the help you have given me on these credit union bills.

Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation that provides for the insurance of savings accounts in credit unions.

My bill would establish a National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund in the U.S. Treasury. It would insure credit union share deposits up to \$20,000 each. The fund would be self-financing based on annual assessments of one-twentieth of 1 percent of a credit union's aggregate members' share accounts.

ADMINISTERED BY NEW ADMINISTRATION

The fund would be administered by the Administrator of the National Credit Union Administration. The Administrator would be authorized to reduce annual premiums or assessments when the fund had no outstanding loans from the U.S. Treasury and its operating level equalled or exceeded 2 percent of insured member accounts. The Administrator would also be authorized to make special assessments of not to exceed one-half of the regular annual premium of one-twentieth of 1 percent in any year that fund expenditures exceeded income.

The bill would also authorize the fund to borrow up to \$100 million from the

OCXVI—1027—Part 12

U.S. Treasury when needed. No capitalization assessment for the fund would be required. The Administrator would be authorized to use the fund to make loans to credit unions faced with liquidation, or to assist a credit union in liquidation.

Under the provisions of the bill, participation in the share-insurance program would be mandatory for Federal credit unions. State-chartered credit unions could participate in the program if they so desired subject to meeting certain requirements.

The bill also carries provisions for changing the reserve requirements for Federal credit unions by relating the reserve to outstanding loans and risk assets. A reserve of 7 percent of outstanding loans and risk assets would ultimately be required, with a graduated scale of gross income going into reserve to reach the 7-percent total.

In addition, the legislation would allow Federal credit unions to establish deposit accounts under rules and regulations established by the Administrator of the National Credit Union Administration. This provision is not to allow credit unions to offer checking accounts to their members, but rather to enable the credit unions to have greater flexibility in their savings account operations similar to those provisions enjoyed by many State-chartered credit unions.

CREDIT UNIONS WOULD BE FISCAL AGENTS

The legislation would further automatically designate federally insured credit unions as fiscal agents of the U.S. Government and allow the credit unions to hold tax and loan accounts for the U.S. Government and maintain accounts to which nonappropriated and appropriated funds may be deposited. By allowing the deposit of such funds, military credit unions will be able to hold savings accounts for such nonappropriated fund activities as officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men's clubs.

In introducing this legislation, I want to make certain that credit unions will receive the best possible insurance and at a rate that will not work a great financial hardship on credit unions. It is my feeling that the legislation introduced today will accomplish both of these goals and will not at the same time involve the credit unions in a great deal of administrative redtape in determining share insurance premiums.

Under the twentieth of 1 percent share of deposit accounts formula, the cost of the credit union would be minimal. For instance, a credit union with \$100,000 in insured accounts would pay an annual insurance premium of \$50; a credit union with a half a million dollars in insured accounts would pay a premium of \$250; while a large credit union with \$5 million in accounts would pay \$2,500 a year.

AN INITIAL POOL OF \$3.5 MILLION

Based on present figures, the premium charged in my legislation would provide the insurance fund with an initial pool of \$3½ million. And, of course, any State credit unions that joined the insurance program would increase the pool of money. Each year the amount of money in the pool will be increased until adequate reserves are reached.

It is important that the insurance pre-

miums be kept as low as possible since credit unions have maintained an excellent record of safety of members' savings over the years. For instance, since Federal credit unions were established in 1934, only about \$1.2 million has been lost in these credit unions. This excellent record has been achieved because of stabilization funds, State, and central credit unions and other liquidity saving methods adopted by CUNA International and State member credit union leagues throughout the country. I cannot speak in too glowing terms of the outstanding job that CUNA and the State leagues have done in this area and the very fact that losses have been so minimal is perhaps the most fitting tribute that can be paid to CUNA and the State leagues.

I would at this point like to state an example of how effective the work of CUNA and the State league have been in assisting credit union liquidation.

Recently the Swift Employees' Credit Union in South St. Paul, Minn., was forced to liquidate because the plant which sponsored the credit union was closing. At the time the credit union closed down, it immediately distributed to its members \$284,282 on payment of their share accounts. On March 15 of this year a final distribution of \$279,724 was made to shareholders.

The total distribution by this credit union to its shareholders was 198 percent, or almost double, what shareholders had on deposit. For example, a shareholder with \$1,500 on deposit in the credit union received \$2,974.50 in return.

A TRIBUTE TO STATE LEAGUE

The prompt and efficient liquidation of Swift Employees' Credit Union was the result of effective management within the credit union and the wholehearted cooperation of the Minnesota Central Credit Union, which purchased the outstanding loans of the credit union, amounting to \$123,908. As a result, shareholders were promptly paid off in full with a dividend of almost 100 percent.

The point of the illustration is to show that savings insurance should be made available to credit unions not because they are poor risks, but rather because credit unions should be rewarded for their diligence and hard work in protecting the savings of millions of Americans, particularly the little man.

As I stated earlier, it is my desire to make certain that credit unions receive the best possible insurance with the least amount of expense and redtape. Therefore, my legislation is being introduced, not as a finalized product, but rather to provide credit unions throughout the country with a workbook so that they may discuss the question of savings insurance with their members. After all sections of the credit union movement have had an opportunity to discuss the legislation, it is my plan to hold hearings on the subject. I feel that it would be unwise to rush into this subject without full discussion and complete consultation with credit union people across the country, and, therefore hearings on the legislation would not be scheduled prior to the 92d Congress.

SPEED NOT THE ANSWER

This is the same approach that was

adopted with H.R. 2, the recently enacted legislation creating an independent agency for the supervision and regulation of the credit unions. The legislation was introduced in the 90th Congress, was thoroughly discussed throughout the credit union movement, and was reintroduced and passed in the 91st Congress, incorporating many of the changes suggested by credit union members.

Mr. Speaker, it must be remembered that many credit unions throughout the country are operated to a large extent by volunteers. We must make certain that any legislation passed by this body will not become so cumbersome as to cause volunteers to lose their interest or devotion to credit union work.

There are nearly 24,000 credit unions in the United States today, with a membership of more than 22 million people. As I have stated many times before, there are more credit unions in the United States than all other financial institutions combined. Because of the magnitude of these institutions, it is imperative that we seek quality legislation rather than quickie legislation.

Number of credit unions by States

United States:	
Alabama	375
Alaska	38
Arizona	163
Arkansas	154
California	1,870
Colorado	333
Connecticut	502
Delaware	81
District of Columbia	190
Florida	662
Georgia	421
Hawaii	169
Idaho	175
Illinois	1,728
Indiana	612
Iowa	420
Kansas	312
Kentucky	278
Louisiana	483
Maine	196
Maryland	240
Massachusetts	791
Michigan	1,162
Minnesota	427
Mississippi	212
Missouri	521
Montana	144
Nebraska	158
Nevada	63
New Hampshire	71
New Jersey	604
New Mexico	135
New York	1,207
North Carolina	320
North Dakota	124
Ohio	1,444
Oklahoma	201
Oregon	264
Pennsylvania	1,441
Rhode Island	138
South Carolina	185
South Dakota	116
Tennessee	572
Texas	1,430
Utah	317
Vermont	76
Virginia	359
Washington	407
West Virginia	201
Wisconsin	780
Wyoming	55
Total	23,327
Commonwealth of Puerto Rico	437
Grand total	23,764

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. RANDALL, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, May 21.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COWGER), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter to:)

Mr. HALPERN, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN, on May 21, for 30 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Texas, on May 20, for 60 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Texas, on May 21, for 60 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, today, for 10 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PREYER of North Carolina), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter to:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN, today, for 20 minutes.

Mr. REUSS, today, for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD, today, for 20 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. YATES and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FRIEDEL, immediately prior to the vote on the amendment offered by Mr. PIKE in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. HORTON, to revise and extend his remarks after the remarks of Mr. PIKE on his amendment today.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, to have his remarks placed in the RECORD following those of Mr. MATSUNAGA today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COWGER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROUDEBUSH in six instances.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. BLACKBURN.

Mr. RUPPE.

Mr. QUIE in three instances.

Mr. BIESTER.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

Mr. POLLOCK in five instances.

Mr. FINDLEY in two instances.

Mr. KLEPPE.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. HOGAN.

Mr. FOREMAN in three instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. SCHERLE in two instances.

Mr. WYDLER.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. NELSEN in two instances.

Mr. HORTON in two instances.

Mr. CRAMER in two instances.

Mr. BURTON of Utah in five instances.

Mr. SKUBITZ in three instances.

Mr. LUKENS.

Mr. TAFT.

Mr. HASTINGS in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. McCLOSKEY in three instances.

Mr. BUTTON in two instances.

Mr. GOLDWATER in three instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PREYER of North Carolina) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RARICK in two instances.

Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. BOLLING in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. MONTGOMERY in two instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in eight instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.

Mr. BURTON of California in two instances.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. HÉBERT.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. HATHAWAY in two instances.

Mr. SCHEUER in two instances.

Mr. CHAPPELL in two instances.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS in three instances.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. PIKE in two instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. BIAGGI in five instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.

Mr. RYAN in five instances.

Mr. CAREY.

SENATE BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 782. An act to protect the civilian employees of the executive branch of the U.S. Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 885. An act to authorize the preparation of a roll of persons whose lineal ancestors were members of the Confederated Tribes of Weas, Plankashaws, Peorias, and Kaskaskias, merged under the Treaty of May 30, 1854 (10 Stat. 1082), and to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in Indian Claims Commission Dockets Numbered 314, amended, 314-E and 65, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3558. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide continued financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S.J. Res. 144. Joint resolution to provide for the appropriation of funds to assist school districts adjoining or in the proximity of Indian reservations, to construct elementary and secondary schools and to provide proper housing and educational opportunities for Indian children attending these public schools; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 19. An act to reimburse certain persons for amounts contributed to the Department of the Interior; and

S. 1934. An act for the relief of Michel M. Goutmann.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 21, 1970, 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:

2069. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a Presidential determination that the sale of defense articles and defense services to a country in the Western Hemisphere will strengthen the security of the United States and promote world peace, pursuant to the provisions of section 3(a)(1) of the Foreign Military Sales Act of 1968; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2070. A letter from the Commissioner, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for fiscal year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 4127; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2071. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the safety of ports, harbors, waterfront areas, and navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2072. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting prospectuses proposing alteration of public buildings in various locations, pursuant to the provisions of 73 Stat. 480; to the Committee on Public Works.

2073. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report listing required information with respect to contracts negotiated by NASA under 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(11) and (16) for the period July 1, 1969, through December 31, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(e); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2074. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the feasibility of using "should cost" concepts in Government procurement and auditing; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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. GREEN of Pennsylvania: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2076. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; with an

amendment (Rept. No. 91-1111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 15979. A bill to provide that the interest on certain insured loans sold out of the agricultural credit insurance fund shall be included in gross income (Rept. No. 91-1112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 16506. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the applicability of the exemption from income taxation of cemetery corporations; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 17708. A bill to extend the fourth-class mail rate for books and educational materials to photographic prints mailed to and from amateur photographers and nonprofit photographic exhibitions, photographic societies, and photographic print study groups; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORDOVA:

H.R. 17709. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to cooperate with the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in the preparation of plans for the development, utilization, and conservation of water and related resources of drainage basins and coastal areas in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRADEMAs, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MOSS, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. REES, Mr. RODINO, and Mr. TUNNEY):

H.R. 17710. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize election of health benefits coverage by employees and annuitants for themselves and their spouses at a special rate based on coverage of two persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FUQUA (for himself, Mr. ABERNETHY, and Mr. NELSEN):

H.R. 17711. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Cooperative Association Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 17712. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 17713. A bill to provide additional protection for the rights of participants in employee pension and profit-sharing retirement plans, to establish minimum standards for pension and profit-sharing retirement plan vesting and funding, to establish a pension plan reinsurance program, to provide for portability of pension credits, to provide for regulation of the administration of pension and other employee benefit plans, to establish a U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 17714. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to establish a program of grants for hospitals to provide in-service training to employees who served as medical corpsmen in the Armed

Forces to facilitate the advancement of such employees into positions which will advantageously utilize such training; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 17715. A bill to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on L-Dopa; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 17716. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct certain expenses paid by him for special education furnished to a child or other minor dependent who is physically or mentally handicapped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 17717. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide or to guarantee any bid, payment, or performance bond applied for by or on behalf of a small business concern which is a construction contractor or subcontractor; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.R. 17718. A bill to encourage institutions of higher education to adopt rules and regulations to govern the conduct of students and faculty, to assure the right to free expression, to assist such institutions in their efforts to prevent and control campus disorders, and to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 17719. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 17720. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to make certain widows of veterans of periods of war and certain children of such veterans who are deceased eligible for care in Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 17721. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 35-percent benefit increase with a \$100 minimum and subsequent cost-of-living increases, to improve the computation of benefits and eligibility therefore, to raise the earnings base, to eliminate the actuarial reduction and lower the age of entitlement, to provide optional coverage for Federal employees, and to liberalize the retirement test; to amend title XVIII of such act to reduce to 60 the age of entitlement to medicare benefits and make such benefits available to the disabled without regard to age, to provide coverage for certain governmental employees, and to include prescription drugs under the supplementary medical benefits program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL (for himself and Mr. BROCK):

H.R. 17722. A bill to provide insurance for member accounts in State and federally chartered credit unions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 17723. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced rate transportation for elderly people on a space-available basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 17724. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the continuation of the investment tax credit for small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTAIN:

H.R. 17725. A bill to provide that all federally assisted child day-care programs shall provide, as a part of such program, nutritional meals and preventive, diagnostic, and

emergency medical care; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

H.R. 17726. A bill to provide for the arrest and punishment of violators of certain laws and regulations relating to the public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:
H.R. 17727. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to permit donations of surplus property of public museums; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 17728. A bill to provide additional assistance to the State of Texas for the reconstruction of areas damaged by tornadoes occurring on April 17 and 18, and May 11, 1970; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 17729. A bill to provide Federal share insurance for credit unions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 17730. A bill to provide that the United States shall reimburse the States and their political subdivisions for real property taxes not collected on real property owned by a foreign government and therefore exempt from taxation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROTH (for himself, Mr. PODELL, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. FISHER, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ESCH, Mr. LUTJAN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, and Mr. DONOHUE):

H.R. 17731. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced rate transportation for elderly people on a space-available basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 17732. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to permit certain service-connected disabled veterans who are retired members of the uniformed services to receive compensation concurrently with retired pay, without deduction from either; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS:

H.J. Res. 1239. Joint resolution to hasten the safe withdrawal of American military personnel from Southeast Asia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. PUCINSKI):

H.J. Res. 1240. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the power of the President to make treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. Con. Res. 629. Concurrent resolution to provide for a joint meeting of Congress to hear the views of five students on the Indochina war and the cause of peace; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H. Con. Res. 630. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the question of the maintenance of the neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia and the human rights of the Cambodian people be referred to the Security Council of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H. Con. Res. 631. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint meeting of Congress on Friday, May 22, 1970; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H. Con. Res. 632. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment of a United Nations international supervisory force for the purpose of establishing a ceasefire in Indochina to aid efforts toward a political solution of current hostilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H. Con. Res. 633. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the conflict in Southeast Asia and the exercise of constitutional authority in matters affecting grave national decisions of war and peace; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RARICK:

H. Con. Res. 634. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Organization, take such steps as may be necessary to pace the question of denial of the right to self-determination, and other human rights in Cuba on the agenda of the United Nations Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Con. Res. 635. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STANTON (for himself, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. McKNEALLY, and Mr. WHALEN):

H. Con. Res. 636. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should establish a commission to examine the recent events at Kent State and other college campuses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAREY:

H. Res. 1038. Resolution to set an expenditure limitation on the American military effort in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 1039. Resolution to set an expenditure limitation on the American military effort in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 1040. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the care of the aged in the United States and the effects of Federal laws and programs on the availability and quality of care; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H. Res. 1041. Resolution: 1970 U.S. census of population; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL of California:

H.R. 17733. A bill for the relief of Mr. Ting Wah Shen and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLISON of Missouri:

H.R. 17734. A bill for the relief of Sherman Webb and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 17735. A bill for the relief of Gloria R. Tallnao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 17736. A bill for the relief of Earl R. Rawson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 17737. A bill for the relief of Philip Tang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 17738. A bill for the relief of Barbara A. Marlow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 17739. A bill for the relief of Kim Ai Ni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 17740. A bill for the relief of Vladimir Rodriguez LaHera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

390. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, relative to relocating the battleship U.S.S. Missouri in the State of Missouri, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

488. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Leslie Kosloff, New York, N.Y., et al., relative to trading with the enemy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

489. Also, petition of the Episcopal Diocese of Washington, D.C., relative to the war in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

490. Also, petition of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Department of Minnesota, relative to the elimination of the Selected Reserve in the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE—Wednesday, May 20, 1970

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. FRED R. HARRIS, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, from the clash and clamor of the world without and from the tumult of our times, we quiet our

spirits and open our hearts to Thy presence. Help us to be still and know that Thou art God—and to hear again Thy still small voice. Forgive our failures and our sins. Be to us the Silent Sentinel, monitoring our thoughts, illuminating our pathway, guiding us through this day.

Endow Thy servants here with light and wisdom from beyond themselves that in the stewardship of their high

office they may serve the Nation's welfare and advance Thy kingdom.

In these dangerous and turbulent times help us, O Lord, to cherish all that is holiest in heritage, to welcome all that is healthiest in change, and to be unafraid of the future. Help us to live by the higher truth that "whosoever shall lose his life for My sake shall find it again."

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.