

remedy some of the problems caused by still water impoundments. Further, we have burdened future North Carolinians with too many unknown problems, not the least of

which will be what to do with all these reservoirs when they eventually silt up and fill in.

We see no responsible course of action at

this time except to place this river in trust for posterity by recommending that it be included in the Natural and Scenic Rivers System.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, August 9, 1974

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

Rev. Jack P. Lowndes, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

If any of you lacks wisdom, let him ask of God—and it will be given him.—James 1: 5.

We are grateful, our Father, for the Founding Fathers of our Nation who sought and found wisdom from Thee and gave us the form of government that keeps us now.

Today we continue to need that wisdom beyond our own. We pray for Thy wisdom. We pray for the President leaving office and the President assuming office today. They both need Thy wisdom, strength, and the assurance of Thy love. Help our new President make the decisions that will bring reconciliation to our Nation and help bring peace to our world.

For the Speaker of this House and those who serve with him we pray. As they work together for the good of our Nation help them to have that divine wisdom needed.

We pray for the news media who have the responsibility of reporting to us the actions of our Government. Give them wisdom to report fairly and impartially the news upon which we all depend to make our judgments and decisions.

Lord, help all of us to have mercy and sympathy toward one another and to be good stewards of our national heritage.

"Grant us wisdom, grant us courage for the facing of this hour."

In Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 7218. An act to improve the laws relating to the regulation of insurance companies in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 11108. An act to extend for 3 years the District of Columbia Medical and Dental Manpower Act of 1970; and

H.R. 12832. An act to create a Law Revision Commission for the District of Columbia, and to establish a municipal code for the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the

House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3782. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend for 1 year the authorization of appropriations for Federal capital contributions into the student loan funds of health professions education schools.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 15323. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to revise the method of providing for public remuneration in the event of a nuclear incident, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15581. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15791. An act to amend section 204(g) of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 15322) entitled "An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to revise the method of providing for public remuneration in the event of a nuclear incident, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PASTORE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DOMINICK, and Mr. BAKER to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had tabled the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14715) and it further announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14715) entitled "An Act to clarify existing authority for employment of White House Office and Executive Residence personnel, and for other purposes," requests a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCGEE, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. FONG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 15581) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BAYH, Mr. INOUE, Mr. CHILES, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. MATHIAS, and Mr. BELLMON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

A NEW HEAD AT THE HELM

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's farewell message was monumental in content and delivery—one of his most impressive speeches. In it there was sadness, an obvious regret at not finishing the task he had undertaken, but no bitterness. It was spoken like a patriot.

He stated well that America cannot afford to have a part-time President—the position he would have had to occupy for the next 6 months while fighting impeachment. We would also have a part-time Congress. The Nation's economy and many external problems are at stake. The slow but deadly paralysis of Watergate and impeachment already have taken too much from America.

Now this terrible period is behind us. America can breathe again, live again, work again. We have a new administration which, hopefully, will bring new drive for a better America and new solutions for America's economic ills.

Gerald Ford is a man of ability and character. I have confidence in him. I sincerely believe that he will seek earnestly to restore harmony, to rebuild America's faith in its Government, and that he will do everything in his power to insure a sound working relationship with Congress. He will need the help and the prayers of the American people in this most difficult task.

Perhaps most of all there is a need to put the bitterness of Watergate and impeachment behind us and to learn again the essentiality of building up, not tearing down, a country. America needs to look ahead, not backward.

THE RESIGNATION OF PRESIDENT NIXON AND THE SWEARING IN OF PRESIDENT FORD

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of Richard M. Nixon is an event without precedent in our history.

Thirty-seven Presidents have served our Nation with varying degrees of distinction, but until now no Chief Executive has been forced to relinquish his office prior to the end of his term.

For nearly 26 months we have witnessed an unfolding tale of conspiracy, perjury, misuse of Government agencies, and obstruction of justice.

And we have seen a President of the United States approve and participate in such illegal activities while directing a complex plan to conceal his wrongdoing.

We should not forget, nor should we

minimize, the tragic pattern of events which led to Mr. Nixon's announcement.

But our Nation will survive this ordeal, as we have survived more violent upheavals in the past.

We now have a new President, a new custodian of the national trust.

I have known Gerald Ford throughout my 16 years in Congress. He is an honorable man.

President Ford faces the difficult task of reuniting the country, and in this endeavor I join all Americans in wishing him well.

I know that in the future President Ford and I may disagree on some questions of public policy as in the past we sometime disagreed when we served together in the House.

But on one matter I know we do not disagree.

It is that the public interest now requires that both Congress and the President act together, in a spirit of mutual cooperation, to seek solutions to the problems that beset our Nation in a troubled world.

As a Member of Congress I look forward to working with President Ford for the best interests of the people of our country.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH P. VIGORITO ON THE RESIGNATION OF THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. VIGORITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that this Nation has to witness the resignation of a President. Since we are a Nation governed by laws and not ruled by men, we are left with no other choice.

I am sure that we will come out of this stronger than ever and our democratic institutions will survive.

My best wishes and support go to President Ford in these trying times.

AMERICA NEEDS MENDING

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the worst is over. The American people and their representatives in Congress must now concentrate on the larger problems that confront our Nation—inflation, poverty, unemployment, health care, education, and peace.

Our country needs mending. It can only be done with a Chief Executive willing to share his assignment with the leadership of both major parties. A strong bipartisan effort is needed to restore people's faith in Government and tend to matters that have been neglected for too long because of the Nixon diversion.

THE PRESIDENT RESIGNS

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

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's admission that he withheld important evidence from Congress, the courts, and the American people virtually assured his impeachment by the House and a strong probability of conviction in the Senate.

Previous to this admission, the matter was so grave that in my opinion, every precaution had to be taken to see that full justice was done, not only to President Nixon, but to the Nation at large.

I have spent many hours reading both the White House and the Judiciary Committee transcripts and personally listened to the actual tapes in an effort to be as objective as possible in the event I would be called upon to cast my vote for or against impeachment.

The President's decision to resign has now put that all behind us. As a nation, we have encountered and survived many crises in the course of history: a civil war, several international conflicts, agonized through a major depression, and suffered through Presidential assassinations. We have emerged stronger as we met these crises head on. We will also survive the tragedy of Watergate.

We must now devote our efforts toward providing an orderly transition in Government and begin healing the wounds left by Watergate. It is incumbent upon us to clearly demonstrate to the other nations of the world that our form of government which guarantees freedom and justice to all, has survived another major crisis.

THE PRESIDENT'S RESIGNATION

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the events that have led to the resignation of our President, but I also feel that we as a nation can take heart that our constitutional processes and system of government have withstood the trauma. The President's resignation is in the national interest; we have provided for the orderly transition of power to a new administration; there will be no lack of continuity in our domestic or international policies nor any weakening of our position in the world community.

We must come together as a nation, healing the wounds of the past so that we can meet the very pressing problems that face us and the world. Let us as well put on notice those throughout the world who would view what has happened as a sign of weakness. To the contrary, this Nation has shown its strength in the face of unprecedented strain.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, 1975

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1297 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1297

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. 16136) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 3, rule XIII are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on 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. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1297 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 16136, the military construction authorization bill for the fiscal year 1975.

House Resolution 1297 provides that the bill shall be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections. House Resolution 1297 also provides that all points of order against the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 3, rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives—the Ramseyer rule—are waived.

The purpose of H.A. 16136 is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments during the fiscal year 1975. The total authorization in the bill is \$2,983,821,000 and provides construction in support of the active forces and Reserve components, defense agencies and military family housing. Of this total, \$152,267,000 represents construction for the Reserve components.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1297 in order that we may discuss, debate, and pass H.R. 16136.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1297 provides for the consideration of H.R. 16136, the military construction authorization for fiscal year 1975. The rule has several provisions. It provides for 1 hour of general debate. The bill is open to amendments, and points of order are waived for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 3, rule XIII. This waiver is needed because the committee report does not include a complete Ramseyer of the bill. The rule also provides that the bill be read for amendment by title instead of by sections.

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize \$2.9 billion for military construction for fiscal year 1975. This figure represents a reduction of \$347,957,000 below the amount requested by the Department of Defense. The following chart shows how the funds will be allocated within the Department of Defense:

ORIGINAL DEPARTMENTAL REQUEST AS CONTAINED IN H.R. 14126 TOGETHER WITH THE COMMITTEE ACTION AS REFLECTED IN H.R. 16136

Title	Service	H.R. 14126 department request	Changes in amounts authorized for appropriations	Percent change	H.R. 16136 adjusted totals authorized for appropriations
I	Army	\$696,815,000	-\$85,162,000	-12.2	\$611,653,000
II	Navy	567,674,000	-21,801,000	-3.8	545,873,000
III	Air Force	468,276,000	-67,049,000	-14.3	401,227,000
IV	Defense agencies	47,400,000	-19,000,000	-40.1	28,400,000
V	Family housing and homeowners assistance	1,347,283,000	-161,402,000	-12.0	1,185,881,000
	Deficiency authorization	42,898,000	+5,122,000	+11.9	48,020,000
VII	Reserve forces	150,932,000	+1,335,000	+0.9	152,267,000
Total		3,321,278,000	-\$347,957,000	-10.4	2,973,321,000

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. 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. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant-at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 327, nays 1, not voting 106, as follows:

[Roll No. 471]

YEAS—327

Abdnor	Cleveland	Fulton
Abzug	Cochran	Fuqua
Adams	Cohen	Gaydos
Anderson,	Collier	Gettys
Calif.	Collins, Ill.	Gialmo
Andrews,	Collins, Tex.	Gilman
N. Dak.	Conlan	Ginn
Annuizio	Conte	Goldwater
Archer	Corman	Gonzalez
Arends	Cotter	Green, Oreg.
Ashbrook	Coughlin	Green, Pa.
Bafalis	Crane	Grover
Barrett	Cronin	Gude
Bauman	Daniel, Dan	Gunter
Beard	Daniel, Robert	Guyer
Bell	W., Jr.	Haley
Bergland	Daniels	Hamilton
Bevill	Dominick V.	Hammer-
Blester	Danielson	schmidt
Bingham	Davis, S.C.	Hanley
Boggs	Davis, Wis.	Hanrahan
Boland	Delaney	Hastings
Brademas	Dellenback	Hawkins
Bray	Denholm	Hébert
Breckinridge	Dennis	Hechler, W. Va.
Brinkley	Dent	Heinz
Brooks	Derwinski	Helstoski
Broomfield	Dickinson	Henderson
Brotzman	Dingell	Hicks
Brown, Calif.	Dorn	Hillis
Brown, Mich.	Downing	Hinshaw
Brown, Ohio	Drinan	Holt
Broyhill, N.C.	du Pont	Holtzman
Broyhill, Va.	Eckhardt	Horton
Buchanan	Edwards, Calif.	Hosmer
Burgener	Eilberg	Howard
Burke, Fla.	Erlenborn	Huber
Burke, Mass.	Eshleman	Hudnut
Burleson, Tex.	Evans, Colo.	Hungate
Burlison, Mo.	Evins, Tenn.	Hunt
Burton, John	Fascell	Ichord
Burton, Phillip	Findley	Johnson, Calif.
Butler	Fish	Johnson, Colo.
Byron	Fisher	Johnson, Pa.
Camp	Flood	Jones, Ala.
Carney, Ohio	Flowers	Jones, N.C.
Carter	Foley	Jones, Okla.
Cederberg	Ford	Jones, Tenn.
Chappell	Forsythe	Jordan
Clancy	Fountain	Karth
Clark	Fraser	Kastenmeier
Clausen,	Frelinghuysen	Kazen
Don H.	Frenzel	Kemp
Clay	Froehlich	Ketchum

Kluczynski	Patman	Stanton,
Koch	Patten	J. William
Kuykendall	Pepper	Stanton,
Lagomarsino	Perkins	James V.
Landgrebe	Pettis	Stark
Latta	Peyster	Steele
Leggett	Pike	Steelman
Lehman	Poage	Steiger, Ariz.
Litton	Preyer	Steiger, Wis.
Long, La.	Price, Ill.	Stokes
Long, Md.	Price, Tex.	Stratton
Lujan	Pritchard	Stubblefield
Luken	Quillen	Studds
McClary	Railsback	Sullivan
McCloskey	Randall	Symington
McCollister	Rangel	Symms
McCormack	Rees	Talcott
McEwen	Regula	Taylor, Mo.
McFall	Reuss	Taylor, N.C.
McKinney	Riegle	Teague
Madden	Rinaldo	Thompson, N.J.
Madigan	Roberts	Thomson, Wis.
Mahon	Robinson, Va.	Thornton
Mann	Robison, N.Y.	Tiernan
Martin, N.C.	Roe	Towell, Nev.
Mathias, Calif.	Rogers	Traxler
Mathis, Ga.	Roncallo, Wyo.	Ullman
Mayne	Roncallo, N.Y.	Van Deerlin
Mazzoli	Rooney, Pa.	Vanik
Meeds	Rose	Veysey
Meicher	Rosenthal	Vigorito
Metcalfe	Rostenkowski	Waggonner
Mezynsky	Roush	Waldie
Miller	Roussellot	Walsh
Minish	Roy	Wampler
Mink	Roybal	Whalen
Minshall, Ohio	Runnels	White
Mitchell, N.Y.	Ruth	Whitehurst
Mizell	Ryan	Whitten
Moakley	St Germain	Wilson,
Montgomery	Sandman	Charles H.,
Moorhead,	Sarasin	Calif.
Calif.	Sarbanes	Winn
Moorhead, Pa.	Satterfield	Wolf
Morgan	Scherle	Wright
Mosher	Schroeder	Wydlie
Moss	Sebellus	Wydler
Murtha	Seiberling	Yates
Guyer	Shipley	Yatron
Natcher	Shoup	Young, Alaska
Nedzi	Shriver	Young, Fla.
Nelsen	Shuster	Young, Ga.
Nichols	Sikes	Young, Ill.
Nix	Sisk	Young, S.C.
Obey	Skubitz	Young, Tex.
O'Hara	Slack	Zablocki
O'Neill	Smith, Iowa	Zion
Parris	Smith, N.Y.	Zwack
Passman	Spence	

NAYS—1

Harrington

NOT VOTING—106

Addabbo	Conable	Hansen, Idaho
Alexander	Conyers	Hansen, Wash.
Anderson, Ill.	Culver	Harsha
Andrews, N.C.	Davis, Ga.	Hays
Armstrong	de la Garza	Heckler, Mass.
Ashley	Dellums	Hogan
Aspin	Devine	Holifield
Badillo	Diggs	Hutchinson
Baker	Donohue	Jarman
Bennett	Dulski	King
Biaggi	Duncan	Kyros
Blackburn	Edwards, Ala.	Landrum
Blatnik	Esch	Lent
Bolling	Flynt	Lott
Bowen	Frey	McDade
Brasco	Gibbons	McKay
Breaux	Goodling	McSpadden
Burke, Calif.	Grasso	Macdonald
Carey, N.Y.	Gray	Mallory
Casey, Tex.	Griffiths	Maraziti
Chamberlain	Gross	Martin, Nebr.
Chisholm	Gubser	Matsunaga
Clawson, Del	Hanna	Michel

Milford	Reid	Udall
Mills	Rhodes	Vander Jagt
Mitchell, Md.	Rodino	Vander Veen
Mollohan	Rooney, N.Y.	Ware
Murphy, Ill.	Ruppe	Widnall
Murphy, N.Y.	Schneebell	Wiggins
O'Brien	Snyder	Williams
Owens	Staggers	Wilson, Bob
Pickle	Steed	Wilson,
Podell	Stephens	Charles, Tex.
Powell, Ohio	Stuckey	Wyatt
Quile	Thone	Wyman
Rarick	Treen	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Andrews of North Carolina.

Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Rodino with Mrs. Griffiths.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Owens.

Mr. Mitchell of Maryland with Mr. Milford.

Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Mills.

Mr. Biaggi with Mr. McSpadden.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Badillo with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Pickle with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Maraziti.

Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Powell of Ohio.

Mr. Hays with Mr. McDade.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Kyros with Mr. Lott.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Culver.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Duncan.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Conable.

Mr. Dellums with Mr. Blatnik.

Mr. Breaux with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Frey.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Devine.

Mr. Casey of Texas with Mr. Goodling.

Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Esch.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Gross.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Hutchinson.

Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Lent.

Mr. Conyers with Mr. Gray.

Mr. Rarick with Mr. Mallory.

Mr. Reid with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Stuckey with Mr. King.

Mr. Podell with Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. Bowen with Mr. Blackburn.

Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Vander Veen.

Mr. McKay with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas with Mr. Holifield.

Mr. Aspin with Mr. Hogan.

Mr. Bennett with Mr. Quile.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Schneebell with Mr. Thone.

Mr. Vander Jagt with Mr. Snyder.

Mr. Widnall with Mr. Wyman.

Mr. Wiggins with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Bob Wilson with Mr. Ware.

Mr. Treen with Mr. Williams.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PIKE. 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. 16136) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED) as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) to assume the chair temporarily.

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. 16136, with Mr. DENT (Chairman pro tempore) 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 pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WHITEHURST) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE).

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

Mr. Chairman, today we are presenting H.R. 16136, the military construction authorization bill for fiscal 1975. The purpose of this bill is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments, which is necessary for enactment before appropriations can be provided to finance these activities of the military departments during fiscal year 1975.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the ranking member, my colleague from New York (Mr. KING) and all the members of the subcommittee for their faithfulness and attendance to the subcommittee sessions.

The new authorization request was \$3,278,380,000. This was almost \$300 million over the request for fiscal 1974. The increase requested in fiscal 1975 is due primarily to additional emphasis on people related projects such as bachelor and family housing construction and medical facility replacement and modernization; facilities for the Navy's Trident weapon system, the Air Force shelter program in Europe as well as continued emphasis on the Reserve forces and the pollution abatement program.

The construction proposals contained in the fiscal year 1975 request are located at approximately 300 named installations and there are almost 700 separate construction projects.

After extensive hearings in 25 separate sessions, and review of each project requested by the Department of Defense the committee was successful in searching out those proposals that in our view could be deferred without impairing the

operational effectiveness of the armed services. In addition, our committee is convinced that these reductions will in no way jeopardize our national security.

The committee unanimously voted for a new total in the amount of \$2,973,321,000 in new authorizations and deficiency authorizations. That amount is for specific projects authorized for construction. This is a reduction in the total requested authorization in the amount of \$347,957,000 or a reduction of 10.4 percent.

I would like to discuss each project in H.R. 16136 with you, but I am afraid I would unnecessarily try the patience of this House. However, there are several significant items contained in this bill which I do feel you would be interested in.

In the family housing section of the bill, 10,462 units of new housing were requested, at an average unit cost of \$30,000, an increase of \$2,500 from last year's average. The committee voted to increase from \$27,500 to \$30,000 the average unit cost for housing within the United States—except Alaska and Hawaii; but limit the number of units to be constructed to 5,552.

One of the reasons for cutting the number of housing units to 5,552 was the Defense Department request for 3,000 units which would be assigned to the E-1's, 2's and 3's which heretofore were ineligible for family housing. The committee voted to eliminate these units because it was felt that we just cannot build housing units for all members of the military. In fact when I questioned the Defense witness regarding the reduction in criteria he confirmed my observation that if the criteria had not been reduced there would be no deficiency in family housing for the military in approximately two years, given the number of units requested. Further, the committee deleted 422 units of Navy housing in the Norfolk, Va., area because of objections from the Members representing that area and the local governing bodies. We believe the housing program recommended will be sufficient for the coming year.

In title VI, most of the general provisions contained in this year's bill are identical to those in prior years. Some of the general provisions, however, introduced departures from prior legislation and will be pointed out to the committee.

In section 303 the Defense Department sought to add a subsection providing authority to exceed the limitations contained in subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 603 up to a maximum of an additional 10 percent if it was determined that such increase was required in order to encourage change in design or construction estimated to affect substantial energy savings consumption or to meet unusual cost increases attributable to difficulties arising out of the energy crisis. The committee deleted the requested section since there were no guidelines on which to really base whether or not this extra expenditure was justified.

In section 606, which prescribes the cost limitation for permanent barracks and bachelor officers quarters, the Department requested an increase of \$2.50

per square foot for permanent barracks and \$3.50 per square foot for bachelor officer quarters, which amounts would also be retroactive to projects previously approved but not put under contract as of the time of enactment of this legislation. The committee voted to leave the square-foot costs limitations as they now exist, which is \$28.50 for barracks and \$30.50 for bachelor officers quarters.

The committee added several sections to title VI, the general provisions, one of which would make the proceeds from the sale of recyclable material available to the services for the cost of collection, handling and sale of the material including purchasing equipment to be used for recycling purposes. Also, the funds could be used for projects for environmental improvement and energy conservation at military facilities.

I would like to bring to your attention two major additions which were made to the bill. In the fiscal year 1974 supplemental request, \$29 million was requested for facilities on the Island of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean. As a result of the conference between the House and Senate on the supplemental, it was agreed that this item, which was approved by the House in the supplemental, would be carried over to the fiscal year 1975 military construction authorization bill. The committee voted to approve this Navy request.

The bill as submitted by the Department of Defense contained no request for the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences. However, under date of July 9, 1974, the committee received a communication from the Department of Defense which stated that the Deputy Secretary of Defense had approved a plan to provide an initial increment of construction funding in the fiscal year 1975 military construction program for the initial facilities required for the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences. The committee voted to approve the Department's request for an addition to the bill of \$15 million in order that the schedule as stated in Public Law 92-426, which requires 100 medical graduates by 1982, could be met.

That, in a nutshell, is the committee's recommendation to you. There are many details relating to the bill which I did not discuss, but we are ready to answer any Member's questions regarding the committee action and our recommendations. We believe our recommendation to you is a good one, and I recommend the approval of the bill before you, H.R. 16136.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16136, the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1975. This is a sound bill. I urge its immediate enactment.

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague from New York pointed out to the House the fact that our subcommittee met on 25 separate occasions and examined almost 700 separate construction projects, so this bill is not something that has not been seriously worked on. I do not think I have ever been on a sub-

committee during my years in Congress where all the members worked as hard as the members worked on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize that on the final day of the subcommittee markup every member of the subcommittee was present and the bill was reported to the full committee unanimously. During the full committee consideration 34 members were present and on the final rollcall, 34 members voted in favor of the bill and none against it. I think these facts deserve emphasis.

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 military procurement authorization bill. You will remember we adopted the conference report last week.

I would like to express my full support of H.R. 16136 because it recognizes twin goals. It provides construction which our committee believes to be necessary, and at the same time it recognizes the call for economy and a reduction of defense expenditures whenever possible.

I will not take the time of the House to go into extensive detail, because I do not think it is necessary to repeat what most of you have read in our report and heard the chairman of the subcommittee detail in his statement.

The reductions made by the Armed Services Committee were not based on a judgment that the items were not desirable or important, but because the committee felt they could be safely deferred without jeopardizing the security of the Nation or reducing the effectiveness of our military services.

I know that there are Members who feel that there are justifiable programs in their districts which deserve to be authorized. I can only say that, looking at one project alone, I would probably agree with them. However, 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 a second line of defense and I believe our committee has conducted itself accordingly.

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 programs approved, and we are prepared to answer any questions that the Members may have.

I hope the Members of the House will support this bill unanimously.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON).

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am most pleased to be able to address my colleagues on the military construction bill for fiscal year 1975. The Committee on Armed Services, under the competent leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana and New York, have achieved a well-balanced facilities construction program for each of the military services. I appreciate the opportunity to speak in support of enactment of this military construction authorization bill. I will address my

remark to title II of the bill, the Navy's program, which totals \$545,873,000.

STRATEGIC FORCES

Under strategic forces, the committee approved \$95 million or approximately 17.4 percent of the amount authorized under title II for facilities construction for the Trident support site, Bangor, Wash. The approved facilities will provide a practical construction schedule for meeting the initial operational capability date of late calendar year 1978 for this weapons system which will be one of the most survivable weapons systems of the Nation's strategic deterrence arsenal.

The approved project includes construction or modification to a number of missile production and missile support buildings, the initial increment of the bachelor enlisted quarters, enlisted mess, Marine Corps berthing and associated administration building, fire station, relocation of the quality engineering and evaluation laboratory, and the second phase of site improvement and utilities and training facility. The Trident facilities represent only 5 percent of the total cost of the system, but they are vital to deployment and economic life-cycle maintenance of the weapons system.

ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE

In this year's authorization bill, the committee has approved \$180.9 million to support the Navy's efforts to attract and retain personnel under an all-volunteer force. The Navy believes that bachelor housing and community support facilities, medical facilities and cold iron facilities directly impact on the Navy's enlistment and retention of personnel. Community support facilities are clubs, exchanges, libraries, theaters, and other morale, welfare, and recreational facilities. Cold iron facilities are the provision of utilities on a pier that will permit a ship in port to shut down its boiler plant and electrical generation equipment. This allows the crews of the ships to have increased amounts of liberty when in port and enjoy a work routine that is comparable to their civilian contemporaries. Projects approved in the all-volunteer category amount to 33 percent of title II of the authorization bill.

Approved for bachelor housing and messing was \$74.1 million or 14 percent of title II. This will provide spaces for 5,781 E2-E4, 1,135 E5-E6, and 107 E7-E9 personnel.

The Navy's emphasis on bachelor housing and particularly the lower rated personnel should pay dividends in tomorrow's Navy.

The amount approved for community support facilities of \$20.8 million is a significant increase—1.7 times greater—over the amount authorized in fiscal year 1974.

This is the second year of the Navy's efforts to accelerate the modernization of medical facilities. This bill will provide for a long overdue start on modernization of the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda.

Approved for upgrading and modernization of hospitals, dispensaries, and dental clinics was \$82.3 million or 15 percent of the total authorized under title II. Another \$17.4 million was ap-

proved for upgrading bachelor enlisted quarters, public work shops, roads, parking, and utilities at medical installations. The total approved under the Navy's medical installation modernization program was \$99.8 million.

For cold iron facilities, the Navy requested \$24 million which was 4.3 percent of the authorization request.

The committee approved \$24 million for eight projects at six installations. In addition, two amendments totaling \$7.6 million were approved to provide a capability for converting boilers to burn coal. These amendments are required in accordance with national policies to conserve scarce petroleum resources.

MAJOR WEAPONS SYSTEMS

For major weapons systems the committee approved \$8.7 million for projects that will directly support: the S-3A antisubmarine warfare aircraft, class 688 nuclear attack submarine; light airborne multipurpose system—LAMPS—helicopters which increase the capabilities of destroyer class ships to detect and kill submarines at long range; P-3C antisubmarine warfare patrol aircraft; captor weapons system, which is a remote unattended antisubmarine warfare system, that uses the MK-46 torpedo as its weapon; A-6E and A-7E attack aircraft, and the EA-6B electronic countermeasure aircraft. In addition, \$16.9 million was approved for projects that will be utilized for existing as well as new major weapons systems. These projects will support the S-3A and S-2 antisubmarine warfare aircraft, EA-6B electronic countermeasure aircraft, and A-6 attack aircraft; and F-14 and F-4J fighter aircraft. Facilities are included to house modern flight simulator equipment that will lead to savings in aviation fuel and in the cost-to-train flight crews.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The sum of \$59 million or approximately 11 percent of the total authorized for the Navy has been approved to abate air and water pollution, with a breakdown between air and water of \$10.9 and \$48.3 million respectively. This authority will provide facilities to reduce the risk of oil pollution and to reclaim oily wastes, improve or develop sewerage systems, provide pier sewers to serve ships in port, and construct the third increment of the demilitarization facility at naval ammunition depot, Hawthorne, Nev. Air pollution control facilities include a propellant disposal facility, solid waste facilities, fuel vapor collection and recovery systems and air emission controls for various industrial and power facilities.

I have covered some of the categories the Navy stressed in this year's bill, but I should make it clear that the Navy's authorization request is not unbalanced for the categories of facilities discussed. The Navy also had approved \$53 million which is 10 percent of title II, for operational facilities which provides airfield runways, parking aprons, a POL pipeline, communications buildings, radar facilities, runway navigational aids, berthing piers, and dredging. Another category with a significant amount approved was training facilities with \$35.6

million. The Navy considers that trained personnel are one of its greatest assets therefore, the Navy has allocated a major amount of its authorization request to training facilities as one of several actions being taken to strengthen, modernize, and vitalize its training programs.

Under the Navy's multiyear programming system, the Navy requests facilities in the various categories on the basis of achieving a generally balanced rate of correction in relation to the backlog of deficiencies, while of necessity pressing forward annually with projects for new weapons systems and new missions. Accordingly, facilities categories such as research and development, supply, administrative and utilities have fewer projects approved but are in general in balance with deficiencies. The committees reduction generally maintained the balance with the one exception of administrative facilities which was one category of facilities that could be deferred with a minimum of impact on the Navy's operations.

I believe the projects authorized under the Navy title fulfill the committee's goal of approving only those projects that are essential to the Nation's national defense interests. I recommend the bill be enacted as reported.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for providing this time for me. Also I would like to thank him for investigating what I think is an oversight going on all through the military construction field, an oversight which may be concurrently going on in our Department of Housing and Urban Development.

It came to my attention at the Oakland Naval Hospital in Oakland, Calif., that the Navy was building 35 housing units in the middle of my district at a cost of \$650,000. They are nice units and I think they are well worth that amount, but it turned out that within 12 blocks, which would be considered an easy commuting distance even in an energy shortage and shortage of gasoline, that HUD and FHA owned and had boarded up 60 units.

It also came to our attention that these houses would be available for lease to the Navy. Some of the 60 houses may not be as nice as the ones being built and some of them are much nicer, and they would have provided at far less cost adequate housing for our military personnel.

Further that would have had the effect of providing residents in my district who had good, high-paying jobs and it would have helped to bring these people into the neighborhood.

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if he would not join with me in the term ahead to see that we investigate this problem and see that where one branch of the Government owns good housing units, that we find out, through cooperation and more efficient use of Government resources, about it so we might save the Government resources in the future.

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

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

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to commend the gentleman not only for raising the issue and bringing it to our attention but also for providing us with documentary evidence and with photographs of the housing that was being built at the same time there was other housing available in the area.

The gentleman was absolutely correct. The gentleman knows I do not always agree with him. On this particular issue he was absolutely correct. There was no justification whatsoever for the Navy building what they built at the time there was the housing available which was adequate in the area. The gentleman was correct.

At the time however that the housing was built, while there is no logical explanation for what happened, as always, there was a legal explanation for what happened. The legal explanation for what happened was that while this other housing had been abandoned it was still not wholly available for the FHA to use.

The redemption time, or whatever it is called in the State of California, they said made it impossible for them to get their hands on it. I happen to think they did not try hard enough. I happen to think they really did not take a look at what else was available.

I can only say we presented them with this evidence. We did our very best to hold their feet to the fire. If additional legislation is required in the correlation between the Departments of Defense and the Federal Housing Authority as to Government-owned housing, if the gentleman will introduce the legislation, I will help get it passed.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the kind offer of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I am sure we will have many more of our colleagues joining with us to see where this lack of communication and cooperation between two Government agencies exists, that we can indeed find legislation that will cross over the boundaries of more than one committee. I am sure we will find bipartisan support to be more efficient in this question of the lack of housing.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BRINKLEY).

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on behalf of this year's budget request for MCA funding of Army bachelor housing.

To achieve the goal of an all-volunteer force, the Army has vigorously pursued several tracks to improve the lot of the soldier. Troop housing is one of these and, as we all know, has needed considerable improvement. World War II barracks will no longer meet the requirement.

Since fiscal year 1972, the Congress has approved the expenditure of \$695 million to construct or modernize nearly 151,000 spaces in the Army's troop housing program. After completion of this fiscal year 1975 MCA program the Army will have attained over 75 percent of its

stated goal of providing adequate quarters for its bachelor personnel. Recent upward enlistments and retention statistics are beginning to show the validity of Army efforts to improve the attractiveness of military life with housing playing a major part. For example, through mid-June this year the Army enlisted over 180,000 volunteer men and women. In May the Army achieved over 103 percent of its recruiting objectives and through mid-June nearly 107 percent of its objectives. Reenlistment, a better barometer of Army improvement, shows that the Army achieved nearly 108 percent of its reenlistment goals through May.

Much progress has been made in properly housing our soldiers. There is still much to be done and this year's MCA program will continue the momentum. Secretary Callaway and the Army should be highly commended for the vigor with which they have pursued this most worthy program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge approval of the Army troop housing contained in the bill before you.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WHITE).

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment briefly in support of that portion of the Army's construction program which pertains to medical facilities. The fiscal year 1975 program represents a substantial increase over previous years—and for good reason—for it comprises the first major increment of the Army's accelerated health facilities modernization program. The modernization program is designed to replace inefficient and deteriorated facilities built during and prior to World War II, modernize and expand outmoded and overtaxed facilities of more recent origin, and construct new facilities where there are unsatisfied requirements.

The present request marks an admirable beginning to this ambitious program, directed toward providing modern, adequate health care facilities in support of the All-Volunteer Army. While the present request includes but one comparatively small replacement hospital, two major clinic additions are included, reflecting the Army's increasing need for outpatient treatment facilities. Not unlike the civilian sector, the Army has experienced a change in the relationship between inpatient and outpatient care in recent years. There is an increasing trend to treat patients in an outpatient status, thus increasing clinic requirements and reducing the need for additional bed space in many cases.

Also included in the request is a major item for electrical/mechanical upgrade of a number of existing hospitals. This is a requirement generated by the standards applied under the Occupational Safety and Health Act, more advanced standards for life safety now included in the most recent edition of National Fire Protection Association codes, technological advances, more stringent requirements of the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals, increased electrical requirements of hospitals, and

increased seismic protection required as a result of scientific reassessment of seismic zones in the United States and the degree of protection required for hospital structures.

For many years, military dentists have been operating in conditions and under constraints imposed by their physical plant environment which are considered unacceptable and inefficient in the civilian community. The present program includes a number of dental clinics to replace the old World War II wooden clinic structures with modern efficient designs. Both military and civilian dentists have long recognized the need for more than one dental chair per dentist to make the most efficient use of each dentist's time. The design of these new clinics will allow the dentist to operate in a multiple chair configuration, thereby increasing the numbers of dental procedures which can be performed. Upon completion of clinics in the program this year, a substantial deficit remains, Army-wide, to be accomplished during the remaining 4 years of the health facilities modernization program.

I believe this program constitutes a significant and desirable contribution to an essential element of the military construction program and commend it to you for your support.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER).

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, basically I just want to thank the committee for the hard work it has done on this bill. I think the subject matter of this bill is one of the most thankless tasks the committee has. It is so laborious to take the time to go through each item.

Mr. Chairman, when we get to title II, I will be offering an amendment to delete Diego Garcia from the bill, which I think many Members have not heard of before. I just wanted to take this time to put the Members on notice that this will be coming up.

Some Members ask whether Diego Garcia is a private bill. No, it is an island in the middle of the Indian Ocean. We have \$32 million in the bill for expanding and building up the naval communication facilities which are already on Diego Garcia.

Therefore, I will be offering an amendment when we get to title II of the bill to eliminate this.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HEBERT).

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Chairman, I merely rise to pay tribute to and compliment the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE), and the members of his subcommittee. It is the action of such subcommittees as this headed by the Senator from New York (Mr. PIKE), and the diligence which the committee showed in bringing this bill before the House in record time, which makes the chairman of the full committee rest a little easier.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is also very significant that this is the only bill, since

I have been chairman of the committee, that was reported out of the committee without a dissenting vote. The vote was 34 to 0. No Member objected to the bill, all voted for it. I think this is a high compliment to those who served on that committee.

Mr. Chairman, I arise to address a few remarks to a special area of this year's military construction bill that is of particular interest to me and I believe will be to the whole body of the House.

Before proceeding with my remarks I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from New York, Congressman OTIS PIKE, for the thorough, expeditious, and effective manner in which hearings were conducted this year.

My remarks will be related to the Trident weapons system facilities authorized under the Navy's portion of the bill. In fiscal year 1973, appropriations were provided for initiating planning and design and last year's authorization act provided \$118.3 million for initiating construction at the Trident support complex, Bangor, Wash., and the Air Force eastern test range, Cape Canaveral, Fla.

In the fiscal year 1975 program for Trident Support Site, Bangor, Wash., the committee approved \$95 million for facilities construction. The Trident project will provide construction or modification to a number of missile production and missile support buildings; the initial increment of the bachelor enlisted quarters; enlisted mess; Marine Corps berthing and associated administration buildings; fire station; facilities relocation—the Quality Engineering and Evaluation Laboratory—and the second phase of site improvement and utilities, and training facility.

The Trident system is planned as this country's sea based deterrent in future years to prevent a nuclear war or attempted nuclear blackmail. The system is being developed, in a highly defined and orderly manner to be available to supplant our present strategic forces as they become more vulnerable and technically obsolete. The Trident system will include a new submarine; quieter and more survivable than its predecessors, a new missile, of longer range than the Poseidon, and a shore support facility for both to be located at Bangor, Wash.

Our present fleet ballistic missile submarine fleet is supported from submarine tenders positioned at various locations overseas to eliminate the long transit time from U.S. bases that would be necessary with the current relatively short-range missiles. The increased range of the Trident missile, in addition to providing a greater operating area for the Trident submarine and thus greater survivability, allows us to support the Trident submarine from a shore facility located within the continental United States.

The shore facility will provide maintenance for the Trident submarine during off-patrol periods, production and maintenance capability for the Trident missile, and initial and refresher training for the crews of the Trident submarine. The availability and cost effectiveness of the Trident submarine is

optimized by this dedicated shore facility which will allow a reduction in time spent in port between patrols as well as up to 10 years of operations between shipyard overhauls. The availability of the Trident submarine force will be about 15 percent greater than that of the present FBM force. This greater availability, coupled with the fact that each submarine will carry more missiles, means that the cost of keeping a missile at sea on Trident is approximately half of the cost per missile at sea for Polaris and Poseidon, even including all development and acquisition costs.

Last year, \$118,320,000 was provided for a new wharf and turning basin and related facilities at Cape Canaveral for the development and flight test program of the Trident missile and for the facilities required earliest at the Bangor support site. The facilities at Bangor included a submarine maintenance pier, an explosive handling wharf, the first phase of the training building, site improvements, and utilities.

At Cape Canaveral, work on the wharf and dredging project commenced in March of this year with the start of dredging for the new turning basin. Construction of the wharf itself will start in September. Contracts were awarded in June for the work on modifying the Poseidon guidance/telemetry building and the missile assembly and checkout area to configurations to support Trident. The start of construction for modifications to launch complex has been delayed from July to September by a change in explosive safety criteria; however, this 2-month delay does not impact on the required availability date.

The Navy is continuing the planning for the Trident support site at Bangor, Wash. The preliminary master plan has been developed which, based on analysis of several alternatives, identifies a land use plan with general siting for all on-base and waterfront facilities. Design is underway for selected facilities; design criteria and detailed cost estimates are being developed for other projects. The preparation of the final master plan has begun. Concurrently a draft environmental impact statement—EIS—has been prepared addressing the construction and operation of the base. Public comments from individuals and organizations have been received during the public hearing held April 24 and 25, 1974, and during the public review period which ended on May 31, 1974. These comments were incorporated into the final environmental impact statement which was filed with the council on environmental quality on July 23, 1974. The Navy supported by the Office of Economic Adjustment within the Defense Department and other Federal agencies including the Office of Management and Budget are working closely with Washington State and county officials to address and mitigate the social-economic impacts identified in the Trident environmental impact statement. Necessary Federal assistance as identified is expected to be provided through the appropriate Federal agencies. The subcommittee added section 610 under the gen-

eral provisions to authorize the Secretary of Defense to assist counties and communities located near the Trident support site in Bangor, Wash., in meeting the cost of providing increased municipal services and facilities to the residents of such areas if it is determined there is substantial need for such services as a direct result of the Trident facility.

Industrial engineering analyses and engineering studies of individual facilities and functions at the site have continued. Additional reviews of explosive safety requirements have confirmed that existing naval ship repair installations cannot be used for Trident refits unless all missiles are offloaded. The time to offload and reload all missiles between patrols would reduce the percent of time at-sea-on-alert and therefore would reduce the cost effectiveness of the Trident system; the additional missile handling would also create safety hazards and degrade missile reliability.

Plans for the Trident support site will provide industrial facilities to refit submarines while missiles remain on board. This will reduce the off-patrol time and keep more missiles at sea. The capability to refit while carrying missiles could not be developed at existing naval ship repair activities.

Even though the Trident shore facilities represent only 5 percent of the total cost of the system, the facilities are vital to deployment and economic life cycle maintenance of the weapon system. The provision of this dedicated and integrated Trident support at a single site provides the most cost effective life cycle for the weapon system.

I strongly support this project and urge approval of the bill as reported so that construction may continue in an orderly manner to meet the initial operational capability date of late calendar year 1978.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Air Force request to provide additional aircraft shelters and associated hardened support facilities on various European bases. This item is a continuation of the theater airbase vulnerability reduction program—TAB VEE—that the Air Force initiated and Congress approved in fiscal year 1968.

The quickest and where possible, the most effective way of gaining air superiority is to destroy the enemy's aircraft on the ground. In this regard, congested airbases, when unprotected by anti-aircraft defenses, dispersal and camouflage, are highly vulnerable to low-flying enemy aircraft and insurgent attacks. Unsheltered aircraft on the ground can be destroyed by bombing, strafing, or napalm even in the face of heavy ground anti-aircraft and surface-to-air missile fire. In addition to direct hits, near misses, blast, shrapnel, fire, and sympathetic detonation can all cause unsheltered aircraft to be damaged or destroyed. Determined insurgents or a few aircraft in bombing or strafing passes can inflict widespread destruction to aircraft which

are not dispersed and sheltered. The merits of aircraft protective shelters, coupled with aggressive ground-based anti-aircraft defense, has been shown in the dramatic difference in the survival rates of the Egyptian Air Force in the 1967 war when its aircraft were destroyed on the ground, and the 1973 war when only an insignificant number of Egyptian and Arabian aircraft were destroyed on the ground. A major factor in this reversal of destruction was that in the 1973 conflict the Arabian aircraft were protected on the ground by hardened shelters that were surrounded by effective surface-to-air missiles and other anti-aircraft weapons. In light of this and our experience, it is prudent to look to the survival of the U.S. aircraft we have committed to the NATO mission. The \$92.3 million of funds provided in earlier programs by the Congress have sheltered every U.S. aircraft permanently based on the continent of Europe.

However, we do have commitments to send additional aircraft squadrons to NATO in the event of force mobilization. Should the Warsaw Pact nations initiate an attack on Western Europe using conventional weapons, as opposed to a surprise attack with nuclear armed missiles, there will be sufficient warning to NATO by troop movements, materiel stockage, and other unusual actions to allow a reactive NATO mobilization. U.S. aircraft that we are committed to deploy to NATO during a mobilization would have no shelters at their assigned bases, and would be extremely vulnerable to destruction by conventional weapons even with dispersal, camouflage, and vigorous anti-aircraft defense.

The aircraft shelter, when coupled with a strong anti-aircraft defense, is probably the most effective measure for improving aircraft survivability. It forces the attacker to consider each shelter as a target whether or not it houses an aircraft. This strategy requires a commitment of one sortie for each shelter and exposes his aircraft to heavy attrition from defensive firepower while reducing our risk to a minimum.

To keep the momentum that the United States has generated in the shelter program, to provide a visible deterrent to potential enemies, and to protect our aircraft should hostilities occur, the shelter program should proceed. The merits of shelters have been recognized in NATO and the other NATO countries have in being, and under construction, protective aircraft shelters that provide for the major portion of their forces. The shelters in this request will protect a portion of the rapid reaction aircraft and are designed to accommodate the full gamut of U.S. tactical fighters including the new F-15, A-10, and F-111.

Construction of these shelters by direct NATO funding would delay their completion for at least 15 months. The Defense Department will take the necessary action to secure the maximum possible recoupment from NATO for this \$62 million prefinanced program.

In conclusion, it should be noted that the net U.S. outlay to shelter those com-

bat fighter aircraft which would be deployed under various contingency situations, is approximately 1 percent of the value of the aircraft protected. I feel this is a sound investment to pay for increasing the survivability of our tactical aircraft.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding and request permission to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, in considering the military construction authorization, H.R. 16137, now before us, the Armed Services Committee has authorized \$7.1 million for renovation and an addition to the gymnasium at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

The initial request for this worthy project was \$9.1 million, the committee having reduced that request by \$2.1 million. While improving the antiquated gymnasium facilities at West Point warrants the full requested funding, the \$7.1 million authorized by the committee, if it is not further reduced by the Appropriations Committee, should be sufficient to make most of the changes necessary for modernizing the existing structure.

Having personally visited the present gymnasium facilities at the Academy, I am convinced that it is inadequate, antiquated, and a health hazard. It was originally built to accommodate 2,700 cadets but is now utilized by almost twice that number.

Recognizing that the physical fitness of our cadets is of great importance to the training of our Nation's future military leaders, we have always encouraged our military academies to foster rigorous physical education programs. Since the major portion of the West Point gymnasium was constructed almost 65 years ago, with only minor alterations and additions completed in 1935, 1947, and 1970, this facility is totally inadequate for the needs of the growing West Point community.

A priority project anticipated by the Academy is the renovation of the ventilation system in the gym. An appraisal of the existing ventilation system reveals that in the boxing and wrestling areas, there is no provision for fresh air. Additionally, the present system is only capable of recirculating the stale air, creating an unpleasant and unhealthy atmosphere.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the urgent need for improving the facility at West Point, there is another, equally important reason for early funding of this project. The depressed economic climate of the region surrounding West Point, particularly in the building and construction trades, stresses the need for increased activity in that industry. With several thousand building and construction workers currently unemployed in the greater West Point area, the deteriorating status of the economy in that region is threatening. Accordingly, early approval of the renovation and addition to the existing gymnasium facilities at

West Point will not only provide needed physical expansion for the U.S.M.A. but will also be a boon to our sorely affected construction industry.

Mr. Chairman, while the full \$9.1 million funding would have been a more adequate response to the needs of the Academy's physical fitness program, I recognize the necessity of tightening the reins on our Nation's pursestrings during this critical economic period, and willingly accept the Committee's authorization of \$7.1 million, provided it is not further reduced.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, in the interests of enhancing the physical fitness program at the U.S. Military Academy, I urge my colleagues to support this proposal authorizing an early funding of the West Point gymnasium project.

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

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I notice that in addition to the gymnasium at West Point, there are already 839 military swimming pools in the United States. I wonder if any of those are in the gentleman's district.

Mr. GILMAN. Not that I know of. I am not requesting any swimming pool. I am concerned about an antiquated gymnasium at West Point. West Point has recently doubled its cadet personnel. The existing 65-year-old gymnasium was built to serve one-half the size of the academy's present personnel. The Academy has outgrown this facility.

Mr. STARK. Would the addition of that gymnasium accommodate female cadets at West Point?

Mr. GILMAN. I would hope that it would, for I favor admission of women to our service academies.

Mr. STARK. I thank the gentleman for that, and ask him to yield for just a moment more.

I note that the bill also contains 289 maintenance funds for golf courses in the United States. I wonder if the gentleman knows whether or not those golf courses are sufficiently severe to challenge the members of our Armed Forces to sharpen their eyes for the very difficult job they may have of defending us.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, while I am not aware of any of those golf courses being provided for any military installation in my own region, I am certain that the Armed Services Committee has given appropriate attention to the concern expressed by the gentleman from California.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Virginia will yield a couple of minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WHITEHURST. I will be glad to.

Mr. PIKE. First of all, I cannot let stand on the record the statement that there are 839 swimming pools in this bill, because there are not 839 swimming pools in this bill.

I think there are only 700 line items, in total, in this bill. Therefore, somewhere along the line the gentleman from California got some very bad statistics. I

just hate to have very bad statistics spread on the record.

One just cannot have more swimming pools in the bill than there are line items. We are building airfields and shelters and barracks, and we are building all kinds of things all over the United States of America and all over the rest of the world.

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16136, the military construction authorization. I think the chairman of the subcommittee hit the nail on the head when he said in the well a moment ago that the best measure of the worth and merit of this bill is that he has received complaints from both sides, first, from those who felt they had not received enough authorization, and also complaints from some who believed these complaints had received too much.

Now let me answer the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) who is worried about swimming pools and golf courses. First there was no request for a single golf course, and there never has ever been a single request or authorization. These are all built with nonappropriated funds. Next about the swimming pools—one was requested—note, only one and no more than that and it was rejected. These are the facts and that should put to sleep these false reports or rumors.

All of the line items in this bill, are necessary and essential and many are sorely needed. True, there is not enough housing provided, but this is a time for austerity because of inflation.

If I may be pardoned for being provincial I can attest to the need for a flight control facility at Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base in our district which is needed as a safety measure. Then throughout the bill are numerous hospitals much like the one at Whiteman Air Force Base in our district.

The subcommittee approved a project that will replace three obsolete buildings.

In this bill there is a \$6 million project for a composite medical facility at Whiteman Air Force Base. There is nothing extravagant about this. This is only a 30-bed facility and it is not only too small even before it is built. It does contain some very badly needed outpatient clinic space and 18 dental treatment rooms. This facility is needed most because it is required to satisfy the medical needs around this Air Force base where retirees have chosen to make this their permanent home. At present medical and dental requirements exceed the space of the facilities. As it is now there are only three buildings. They are all obsolete. Inpatient care space is needed. It is too crowded at present and out-patient space is even more crowded. It has been noted that the present facilities are approximately only one half of the area that should be allotted. Surely, the time has come to provide this necessary medical care for our airmen and their dependents.

Before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, I

wish to say a word in support of the funds for the Navy base at Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean. I am opposed to deletion of any of these funds. This is an item of construction of utmost strategic importance. One has only to look at the map to prove that if we do not proceed to work on this base we might just as well turn over the Indian Ocean, to the ships and the submarines that carry the insignia of the Red Star.

Mr. Chairman, the hour is late. Any one of us who doubts that the Soviets control this area, had better revise their thinking. We need Diego Garcia now.

Finally let me commend the chairman and all the members of the committee. They have worked many, many hours. There is no reason why this military construction bill should not be regarded as one of the very best that has ever been presented to the House. It should just be adopted without amendment.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. CARTER. I rise in support of what the gentleman from Missouri has said, and I want to associate myself with his remarks.

I realize and we all should realize that if we visit the military hospitals outside of this country and in this country, they are not in the state that they should be in. They should be improved.

The Armed Forces of our country deserve the very best that the country can give them. During wartime we do not hesitate to demand much, but this is the time when we are really putting them on the back burner, so to speak.

They deserve our support, and I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Missouri for his remarks.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against this military construction authorization, H.R. 16136, just as I voted against the military appropriation, the agricultural appropriation, the legislative appropriation, the State, Commerce, and Justice appropriations, and other bills which represent huge increases every year without significant new programs.

Inflation is raging. We ought to be holding it back. Instead we spend as if money were going out of style. My vote will be a lonely one, and it is no reflection on the fine committee that handled the bill, but I believe it is an important one.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment to strike funds for Diego Garcia. We are asked to approve a mere \$29 million to turn a communications facility into a naval base. But the implication of this mild request is staggering. It is nothing less than a redirection of our foreign policy, by the Pentagon.

Shapers of foreign policy in both executive and legislative branches have always regarded the Indian Ocean as low priority in terms of national security, by contrast with the Atlantic, Pacific, and Mediterranean oceans. We have kept a

low profile there and so has the Soviet Union. The states bordering on the Indian Ocean have the long-term objective of making it a zone of peace, freedom, and neutrality.

Last May our Assistant Secretary of State, Joseph Sisco, observed that "our interests there are marginal." In 1972, as Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird defined our strength there as "not so much in maintaining a large standing force * * * but rather in our ability to move freely in and out of the ocean."

On August 1, William Colby, the director of the CIA, testified that the Soviet presence in that ocean is not a military threat and will not be unless the Soviets feel compelled to match an American buildup. Despite all this, Secretary Schlesinger with messianic fervor to resume the role of world policeman upholds the Navy's request to start building a major base.

Actually, the Navy appears to have had this ambition for some time. A secret search for new bases resulted in the choice of Diego Garcia, because it could be expanded into a major service base for submarines and B-52's. In 1966 the island was made available to the United States through the cooperation of Britain. Periodic patrols of Polaris and Poseidon submarines were possible because of the communications facility established there.

According to retired Rear Adm. Gene LaRocque, the next step in the creation of an infrastructure for increased naval deployment is the development of a supply and repair base in the Indian Ocean. That is what we are now being asked to approve.

The Navy has already received \$6 million for dredging the harbor to accommodate submarines and aircraft carriers. Reconnaissance aircraft and a submarine tender for servicing nuclear submarines may soon be sent there.

And at that point we begin a naval race with the Soviet Union. The surrounding countries are alarmed. New Zealand and Indonesia have already raised questions about our intentions, and Australia has called on the Soviets and the United States to "exercise mutual restraint."

According to expert testimony, we already have overall naval superiority. We can quickly move sizable forces into the region if some emergency should arise. That is highly unlikely, however. A reopened Suez Canal could as quickly be closed again, leaving the Soviets vulnerable without support facilities. There is no indication, either, that the Soviets intend to interfere with the shipment of oil from the Persian Gulf. Oil could more easily be "turned off at the wellhead" in the Middle East before being shipped.

What then is the purpose of this planned expansion? Some suggest that it is to keep the Navy at present strength and growing, to fill the gap left by the pullout from Asia. If this is the real intent, it is a very dangerous gamble, and one which the House should not approve.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the bill by titles.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

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

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND
Fort Bragg, North Carolina, \$26,170,000.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky, \$9,742,000.
Fort Carson, Colorado, \$27,731,000.
Fort Hood, Texas, \$40,214,000.
Fort Sam Houston, Texas, \$4,286,000.
Fort Lewis, Washington, \$10,270,000.
Fort Riley, Kansas, \$24,478,000.
Fort Stewart/Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia, \$42,197,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, \$9,031,000.
Fort Benning, Georgia, \$36,827,000.
Fort Bliss, Texas, \$13,704,000.
Fort Eustis, Virginia, \$9,288,000.
Fort Gordon, Georgia, \$9,625,000.
Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation, California, \$1,108,000.
Fort Jackson, South Carolina, \$19,078,000.
Fort Knox, Kentucky, \$2,264,000.
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, \$9,911,000.
Fort Lee, Virginia, \$5,218,000.
Fort McClellan, Alabama, \$17,344,000.
Presidio of Monterey, California, \$3,107,000.
Fort Ord, California, \$3,660,000.
Fort Polk, Louisiana, \$7,304,000.
Fort Rucker, Alabama, \$4,928,000.
Fort Sill, Oklahoma, \$15,587,000.
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, \$3,360,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Fort Myer, Virginia, \$2,497,000.
UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND
Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Texas, \$541,000.
Anniston Army Depot, Alabama, \$7,648,000.
Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania, \$4,726,000.
Lexington/Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky, \$616,000.
Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, \$2,820,000.
Red River Army Depot, Texas, \$269,000.
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, \$10,322,000.
Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, \$2,731,000.
Sacramento Army Depot California, \$2,599,000.
Seneca Army Depot, New York, \$815,000.
Sierra Army Depot, California, \$717,000.
Watervliet Arsenal, New York, \$3,256,000.
White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, \$1,542,000.
Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona, \$1,859,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY COMMUNICATION COMMAND

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, \$3,399,000.
Fort Ritchie, Maryland, \$2,023,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, \$7,720,000.

HEALTH SERVICES COMMAND

Fort Detrick, Maryland, \$486,000.
Various Locations, \$16,600,000.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Cold Regions Laboratories, New Hampshire, \$2,515,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, ALASKA

Fort Greely, Alaska, \$251,000.
Fort Richardson, Alaska, \$1,732,000.
Fort Wainwright, Alaska, \$11,473,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, HAWAII

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, \$15,324,000.
Tripler General Hospital, Hawaii, \$1,205,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$1,356,000.
Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$16,358,000.

DINING FACILITIES MODERNIZATION

Various Locations, \$10,723,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND

Canal Zone, Various Locations, \$324,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, PACIFIC

Korea, Various Locations, \$1,663,000.

KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE

National Missile Range, \$1,272,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY

Various Locations, \$148,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY COMMUNICATION COMMAND

Fort Buckner, Okinawa, \$532,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE

Germany, Various Locations, \$25,000,000.
Camp Darby, Italy, \$4,159,000.

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, \$88,000,000: *Provided*, That, within thirty days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of the Army shall furnish to the Committee 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 Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (1) unforeseen security considerations, (2) new weapons developments, (3) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (4) improved production schedules if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment; in the total amount of \$10,000,000; *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire upon enactment of the fiscal year 1976 Military Construction Authorization Act 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. 103. (a) Public Law 93-166 is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES—UNITED STATES ARMY EUROPE," in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Germany, Various Locations" strike out "\$12,517,000" and insert in place thereof "\$16,360,000."

(b) Public Law 93-166 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "107,257,000" and "\$596,084,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$111,100,000" and "\$599,927,000," respectively.

SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Fort Myer, Virginia," strike out "\$1,815,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,615,000."

With respect to "Fort Still, Oklahoma," strike out "\$14,958,000" and insert in place thereof "\$16,159,000."

(b) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES—UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND" in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Canal Zone, Various Locations" strike out "\$8,129,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,238,000."

(c) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 702 "\$444,767,000;" "\$117,311,000;" and "\$562,078,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$447,768,000;" "\$118,420,000;" and "\$566,188,000" respectively.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois," strike out "\$2,750,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,650,000."

(b) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "\$181,834,000" and "\$267,031,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$182,734,000" and "\$267,831,000," respectively.

SEC. 106. Public Law 93-166 is amended in section 105 as follows:

Public Law 93-166, section 105(b), amending Public Law 92-145, section 702, clause (1) as amended, having inserted erroneous figures, is amended by striking out "\$404,500,000" and "\$405,107,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$405,000,000" and "\$405,607,000," respectively.

Mr. PIKE (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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. 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 Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, \$261,000.

Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Kittery, Maine, \$2,332,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, \$255,000.

Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island, \$2,582,000.

THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, \$2,354,000.

FOURTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Test Facility, Lakehurst, New Jersey, \$7,350,000.

Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$296,000.

NAVAL DISTRICT, WASHINGTON

Naval District Commandant, Washington, District of Columbia, \$2,883,000.

Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, District of Columbia, \$205,000.

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, \$1,256,000.

National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland, \$14,943,000.

Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Bethesda, Maryland, \$15,000,000.

FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Regional Medical Center, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, \$290,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Cherry Point, North Carolina, \$252,000.

Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Atlantic, Dam Neck, Virginia, \$2,034,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia, \$896,000.

Atlantic Command Operations Control Center, Norfolk, Virginia, \$633,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia, \$2,900,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, \$8,364,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia, \$4,990,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, \$1,047,000.

Norfolk Naval Regional Medical Center, Portsmouth, Virginia, \$15,801,000.

Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Virginia, \$5,602,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia, \$3,438,000.

SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida, \$6,893,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, \$446,000.

Naval Regional Medical Center, Jacksonville, Florida, \$12,413,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, \$3,239,000.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, \$4,569,000.

Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, \$620,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, \$20,948,000.

Naval Technical Training Center, Pensacola, Florida, \$4,478,000.

Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, \$1,561,000.

Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, \$1,485,000.

Naval Hospital, Beaufort, South Carolina, \$7,112,000.

Charleston Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina, \$200,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, \$15,352,000.

Naval Supply Center, Charleston, South Carolina, \$3,750,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina, \$2,564,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, \$4,284,000.

EIGHTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, Louisiana, \$3,080,000.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas, \$1,830,000.

Naval Air Station, Kingsville, Texas, \$1,428,000.

NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, \$10,164,000.

ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Regional Medical Center, Camp Pendleton, California, \$10,021,000.

Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, California, \$8,371,000.

Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, \$6,011,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, \$11,354,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California, \$12,050,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California, \$1,048,000.

Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, San Diego, California, \$3,238,000.

Naval Regional Medical Center, San Diego, California, \$26,375,000.

Navy Submarine Support Facility, San Diego, California, \$4,234,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, California, \$2,147,000.

TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Rework Facility, Alameda, California, \$1,638,000.

Naval Hospital, Lemoore, California, \$333,000.

Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California, \$77,000.

THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska, \$4,605,000.

TRIDENT Support Site, Bangor, Washington, \$95,000,000.

Puget Sound Naval Shipyard Bremerton, Washington, \$393,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, \$2,201,000.

FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii, \$795,000.

Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$1,505,000.

Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$3,356,000.

MARINE CORPS

Marine Barracks, Washington, District of Columbia, \$1,874,000.

Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia, \$2,803,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, \$13,864,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, \$1,260,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, New River, North Carolina, \$499,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, \$3,203,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California, \$1,463,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, \$7,271,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, \$3,076,600.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii, \$5,497,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$9,849,000.

Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$44,251,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Telecommunications Center, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, \$3,186,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, \$947,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Sabana Seca, Puerto Rico, \$1,026,000.

FIFTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Support Activity, Canal Zone, \$800,000.

ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Air Station, Bermuda, \$1,866,000.
Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, \$2,317,000.

EUROPEAN AREA

Naval Security Group Activity, Edzell, Scotland, \$571,000.
Naval Activities Detachment, Holy Loch, Scotland, \$1,188,000.

INDIAN OCEAN AREA

Naval Communications Facility, Diego Garcia, Chagos Archipelago, \$29,000,000.

PACIFIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$355,000.
Navy Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$907,000.
Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Republic of the Philippines, \$4,052,000.
Naval Hospital, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, \$278,000.
Naval Station, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, \$3,741,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$1,059,000.
Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$4,038,000.

SEC. 202. 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 (1) unforeseen security considerations, (2) new weapons developments, (3) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (4) 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 upon enactment of the fiscal year 1976 Military Construction Authorization Act, 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. 203. (a) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland," strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,391,000."

(b) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 802 "\$241,668,000" and "\$248,533,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$244,059,000" and "\$250,924,000," respectively.

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Naval Air Rework Facility, Jacksonville, Florida," strike out "\$3,869,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,534,000."

(b) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "\$247,204,000" and "\$274,342,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$247,869,000" and "\$275,007,000," respectively.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 92-545, as amended,

is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia," strike out "\$3,319,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,019,000."

With respect to "Naval Hospital, New Orleans, Louisiana," strike out "\$11,680,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,609,000."

(b) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 702 "\$477,664,000" and "\$518,881,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$484,293,000" and "\$525,510,000," respectively.

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 93-166 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Naval Home, Gulfport, Mississippi," strike out "\$9,444,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,163,000."

With respect to "Naval Hospital, New Orleans, Louisiana," strike out "\$3,386,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,157,000."

With respect to "Naval Air Station, Alameda, California," strike out "\$3,827,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,756,000."

With respect to "Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California," strike out "\$3,802,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,210,000."

(b) Public Law 93-166 is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "\$511,606,000" and "\$570,439,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$523,433,000" and "\$552,266,000," respectively.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MRS. SCHROEDER

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, one amendment to title II and one amendment to title III, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered en bloc since they concern the same subject matter.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mrs. SCHROEDER: Page 15, strike lines 24 and 25.

Page 26, line 6, strike "\$8,100,000," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$4,800,000, provided that no funds authorized under this section shall be expended for construction of facilities at Diego Garcia Naval Installation, Indian Ocean."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, basically these two amendments considered together would delete \$32,300,000 that is to be used to improve and expand the naval communication facilities and aircraft accommodations located at Diego Garcia, which is a British protectorate in the Indian Ocean.

I am asking at this time that the committee consider deleting these funds, for several different reasons, and I would like to list them:

First of all, as I understand it, Great Britain has not yet finally agreed to the improvements and expansion.

Second, these plans are not new. The Navy has had these plans on hand since the early 1960's.

Third, we have no known military commitments that have been explained

to us as to why we require the expansion right now.

Fourth, our military allies in the area have not really been pushing us very hard to come in there, and, in fact, they are a little bit queasy about our moving in in any greater numbers or force. Some of our NATO allies such as France have also expressed concern. They wish we would hold back a while and consider this a little longer.

Some of the nonaligned nations have been showing a little concern about what we would be doing with the air base on the island. They have some fears that we might use it as a B-52 base and expand the aircraft servicing facilities and Vietnam haunts them.

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the main reasons I brought this matter up again today, is in the Senate the Committee on Armed Services has new testimony dealing with this subject. As the Members probably know, the CIA chief, Mr. Colby, appeared before the Committee on Armed Services in the Senate on the matter of Diego Garcia. He was the first person to appear counter to the Navy position. Much of his testimony was classified but the sanitized version was put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator SYMINGTON on August 1. In the sanitized version it came across very clearly that Mr. Colby felt we did not need to increase the facilities on Diego Garcia at this time because of the Soviet threat. The CIA, Mr. Colby's agency is the agency which supposedly monitors the Soviet threat, not the Navy. Colby stated that the CIA felt that the Soviet threat at that time was not so critical that we should move ahead with this expansion with great deliberate speed.

The senior Senator from my State, Senator DOMINICK, appeared at these hearings, and he specifically asked Mr. Colby whether the enlargement of the technical facilities was necessary, and if we did not enlarge them, would the Russians increase their naval forces.

Mr. Colby said, no, he did not think the Soviets would respond, that they have had a tradition of responding only when we reacted first. The precedents that were cited were the Pakistani war, where the Russians sent in no additional naval forces until the British had first sent in a carrier, and the Israeli or Mediterranean flare-up we had recently, where the Soviets did not send in any additional naval forces until we had first dispatched the carrier *Enterprise* into the area.

Mr. Chairman, what are we talking about? The Members have all seen the Defense Department map out in the hallway, and it makes it look as though the Russians have us in their jaws, but let us really talk about what we are considering. What do the Soviets have in the Indian Ocean?

What is this great Soviet threat that we are being asked to spend \$33 million to prepare a defense against?

In 1973 they had five surface ships, one diesel submarine, and six auxiliary support ships in the Indian Ocean. Today they have increased their surface ships by one. They now have six surface ships.

These are small, none of them are large. They still have one diesel submarine. The only major increase has been in mine sweepers. They have increased the number of mine sweepers in the area to nine, because they have been trying to clean out the Suez Canal.

Mr. Colby, from the CIA, stated that he feels that the Soviet presence in the India Ocean will increase only by one to two surface combatant ships per year at the present level, and based upon CIA observations of what has gone on before.

Further, 25 percent of the Soviet ships in that area tend to be just cruising from the Pacific territory over into the western ocean.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. SCHROEDER was allowed to proceed for one additional minute.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, in summary, I think what Mr. Colby presented—and I wish all of the Members would read it because the CIA explains a very serious situation coupled with Admiral Zumwalt's testimony, that we are now no longer the No. 1 ocean power; one wonders whether we should spread ourselves any thinner and extend our lines even further, when there appears to be no imminent Soviet threat according to the CIA. Further, the CIA says if we go ahead with Diego Garcia plans we might trigger the escalation of the Soviet threat in that area.

I think a lot of the people think that the sun never sets on an American commitment. Especially since this expansion has not been fully authorized by the British, this would be a good thing to hold back on, and study more thoroughly. I really do not believe that one Russian diesel submarine, six surface combatant ships, and a few minesweepers are any threat to the American people in this country.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER).

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado for her discussion of Diego Garcia. But I disagree.

I am amazed that so many have expressed concern that a refueling station of limited capacity—which obviously is needed by the U.S. Navy in the Indian Ocean—would trigger a U.S. arms race with the Soviets.

First of all, I should think we should be concerned with our own requirements. I cannot comprehend this tender regard for the sensibilities of the Soviets. They look after their interests; we should look after ours. The proposal to drop Diego Garcia would not affect Russia's plans. They already are in the Indian Ocean in force. Does not Congress know the facts? Everyone else does. The Soviets have constructed a major naval base in Somalia—on the horn of Africa. It commands the approaches to the Red Sea and the Suez. They are in South Yemen.

They have a base in Iraq. They still are operating out of Bangladesh.

The Russians have over four times as many combatant and support naval ships as we have in the Indian Ocean. We maintain a token force in Behran, but we have been told to get out because we are too friendly to Israel. There are but few places in all the Indian Ocean where we are allowed to buy fuel.

Perhaps you would like some comparisons. In 1968 the U.S. forces had 1,786 ship days in the Indian Ocean. The Soviets had 1,765. In 1973 the United States had 1,550 ship days in that area; the Soviets 8,544. Ours went down. Theirs expanded nearly five times. That should tell you all you need to know about Soviet intentions in the Indian Ocean.

I have seen a "Dear Colleague" letter which indicates the CIA does not feel concern about Soviet naval activities in the Indian Ocean. It just happens that I have access to the CIA, too. I presume that I am briefed about as frequently by the CIA as anyone else in the House. The information I have from CIA is diametrically opposed to what you have been told.

If we fail to develop this capability now we run the risk of being unable to respond to threats to our national interest because of our inability to support deployed forces there. We had serious problems providing support during the October war. We had to transport fuel all the way from the Philippines—4,000 miles away.

The Suez Canal soon will be reopened. It will not benefit U.S. naval forces but it will provide the Soviets with a far shorter route from the Indian Ocean to the Black Sea, and will enhance considerably their surge capability to position naval forces in the vital Arabian Sea/Persian Gulf area.

Do you want to see our ships stand idle and helpless because they run out of fuel during a crisis in the Indian Ocean? It could happen.

There are American interests throughout that part of the world: millions and millions in investments. Arab oil which is essential to our friends in Europe and badly needed by us.

You are being told that strong objections have been raised by other nations. I have seen no authentication for these statements.

We have a 50-year agreement with Britain for the use of Diego Garcia with the option for renewal. There is nothing to indicate serious concern by the new government in Britain. They want specific information on our plans. They have said that they will review all their military commitments. All new governments do this. No serious concern.

I have been informed in recent days by highest U.S. authority that some foreign governments say they have to object publicly to some extent to military build-ups in order to appease the more liberal elements in their country, but in reality they expect the United States to go ahead on Diego Garcia. There are just as many who want us to go ahead. And that is what we should do without further delay.

The funds in the bill are virtually all

that are considered to be required in the foreseeable future for our forces in Diego Garcia.

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

Mr. SIKES. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to announce to the gentleman in the well and the Members present that we have a new Commander in Chief as of right now, and a new President.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I would say the new Commander in Chief picked a significant time to be sworn in—while I have the floor and while the House debates the Nation defense. We all wish him well in his monumental task and our prayers are with him.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to rise in opposition to this amendment to bring my thoughts to the Members on this matter. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services we discussed this issue quite thoroughly.

We discussed this quite thoroughly, and it is my belief, from the information I have had that the Soviet Union began continuous naval operations in the Indian Ocean in 1968. It has bases on Socotra Island in the ocean and at nearby Aden, as well as easy access to port facilities in India and elsewhere. The Russians have no active combat troops in the ocean, but their force there is believed to include 1 large destroyer, 1 escort, 2 mine sweepers, 1 submarine, and 10 support ships, along with 4 or 5 mine sweepers and support ships based in Chittagong, Bangladesh.

By contrast, the United States is now represented by a single amphibious command ship and two destroyers, supplemented from time to time with carrier task forces from other areas.

I believe the United States must establish a genuinely counterbalancing naval force in an area that controls the sea lanes to Middle Eastern oil. Without a presence in the Indian Ocean, without fuel and repair facilities, without logistic support in the third largest ocean in the world, the United States would forfeit a large share of its naval position to the Russians. There is continuing concern that the British and American presence in Asia as a whole is leaving a vacuum that the Russians are intent upon filling.

In recent conversation with some of the Iranian military people, they tell me West Afghanistan and Afghanistan itself is bristling now with Soviet military hardware. They have had a coup in their government which is nothing but a puppet government for the Soviets. So there is no sense in hiding the idea, as the Iranian military people have said, that the Russians are wanting a corridor to the Indian Ocean through these two countries whenever they wish to do so in the near future.

Admiral Zumwalt, the U.S. Naval Chief of Operations recently testified that—

Events such as the Arab-Israeli war, the oil embargo and ensuing price rises show that our interests in the Indian Ocean are directly linked with our interests in Europe and Asia and, more broadly, with our fundamental interest in maintaining a stable, worldwide balance of power.

The implication is that a Diego Garcia base would make a specific difference to U.S. defense capabilities.

More importantly, the base would reduce U.S. dependence on Subic Bay in the Philippines, 5,000 miles away, for any action in the Indian Ocean. During the Bangladesh war it took the U.S. aircraft carrier *Enterprise* 7 days to sail from the Pacific to enter the ocean. From Diego Garcia, a ship could reach any port in the area within 48 hours.

More generally, experience has shown that a heavy U.S. presence has a tempering effect on nations locked in conflict and makes easier the big power task of containing local conflicts.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I would hope this amendment would be voted down.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado to strike these funds for Diego Garcia.

The significance of this money is far in excess of the \$30 some million that are involved. The fact is that if we vote for these funds we will be establishing for the first time a major U.S. military presence in an area of the world where we have heretofore had a low military posture and profile. An expansion of this base would give us a new capability in a region of the world where every significant Soviet military move in recent years has been in response to something that we have done originally.

I am persuaded that there are several good reasons for deferring action on this request at this time and for keeping the expansion of the facilities at Diego Garcia under review.

We have had comments today about the extent of the bases of the Soviets in the Indian Ocean area. Two that are mentioned most frequently are Socotra and Berbera in Somalia. Mr. Colby in his report says this about Socotra:

The barren island has no port facilities or fuel storage and its airstrip is a small World War II gravel runway.

With regard to the base in Somalia he says that there are no repair facilities ashore. They do have a small communications facility there.

One of the reasons we ought to oppose the money for Diego Garcia is that we should seek to avoid a naval arms race competition in this part of the world. It is the assessment of many of the experts, including the CIA, that Diego Garcia and the expansion of that base could have the effect of escalating naval competition in that part of the world.

In response to questions asked on the Senate side, Mr. Colby testified:

I think our assessment is that the Soviets would match any increase in our presence in the area.

The implication of that remark simply is that if we go in here and expand our facilities, then the Soviets will do likewise and we will be launched upon an arms race in a part of the world that has heretofore been free of military competition between the super powers. Our

expansion in Diego Garcia is going to attract like a magnet the Soviet presence in that area of the world.

The second reason we can support the amendment of the gentlewoman from Colorado is because deferring action on this will have no adverse impact on the position of the United States in the Indian Ocean. We are able today, and we can continue to be able, to protect our national interest in that area with occasional visits from the 7th Fleet stationed in the Pacific Ocean.

We have naval superiority in the Indian Ocean today and there is no indication that we are going to lose it.

The gentleman from Florida in his excellent statement cited the number of ship days in the Indian Ocean, but it makes all the difference in the world what kind of ships we are talking about and the fact is that today naval superiority rests with the United States in the Indian Ocean area.

There is another reason we ought to defer on this money, too. We should be testing Soviet intentions rather than testing Soviet capabilities to react to what we might do in Diego Garcia. The most important testing of Soviet intentions will come when the Suez Canal is open. I think we all agree that opening up that canal will add flexibility to the Soviet Fleet, but it does not necessarily follow that the Soviet Union can or will automatically as a result of that, increase significantly its Indian Ocean presence.

It is the opinion of Mr. Colby from CIA, that—

If there is no substantial increase in U.S. naval forces in the area, we believe the Soviet increase will be gradual, say one to two surface combatants per year. Should the United States make a substantial increase in its naval presence in the Indian Ocean, a Soviet buildup faster and larger than I have just described would be likely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HAMILTON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HAMILTON. To continue the quotation from Mr. Colby:

If the canal were open and available to Russian ships, the task of responding would be easier.

In any event, the Soviets would probably not be able to sustain an Indian Ocean force significantly larger than that presently deployed there without reordering their priorities and shifting naval forces from other areas.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, as the gentlewoman from Colorado observed, we should support her amendment, simply because the new British Government, the owners of the island, has not decided whether to support or not support the American request for expansion of facilities.

I think in light of these observations and several others that have been made this morning, the prudent course would be to hold back, to defer action for some time yet to see what happens so far as the Soviets are concerned.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, since last October, the United States has been maintaining naval forces in the Indian Ocean on a more frequent and more regular basis than in the past. These forces, which have included aircraft carriers and surface combatant units, have deployed on an intermittent basis from the Pacific Fleet to augment the three ships of the U.S. Middle East Force which have operated in the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean for a quarter of a century.

To date, these forces have had to depend on a logistical support chain which extends more than 4,000 miles to established U.S. bases in the Philippines. As a result, in the event of an emergency or crisis in the Indian Ocean area, these units could find themselves at the exposed end of a lengthy line of supply in circumstances which would require a massive commitment of tankers and other support units from the Pacific Fleet, thus seriously degrading our capabilities in the western Pacific.

The expansion of the support facilities available to our forces on the tiny island of Diego Garcia would significantly improve both the efficiency and effectiveness of the forces deployed to the Indian Ocean. Diego Garcia is a small atoll directly in the center of the Indian Ocean. It has not native population, and it is the sovereign territory of Great Britain. At the present time we already have a communications station on the island, with an airstrip and very limited port facilities.

The present bill proposes the authorization of \$32.3 million to lengthen the runway, improve the harbor by dredging a larger anchorage and lengthening the pier, construct fuel storage tanks, enlarge the quarters for personnel stationed on the island, and otherwise to equip the island with the necessary facilities to permit support of units deployed to the Indian Ocean.

The construction of additional facilities on Diego Garcia does not imply a larger U.S. military presence in the area. No operational forces will be based there. No ships will be homeported there. No U.S. dependents will live there. On the contrary, the effect of this construction will be to permit more efficient support of units which operate in that area from time to time. It will shorten the length of the supply chain and reduce the chances that such operations will place sudden and unexpected demands on our limited support resources in the Pacific.

We are all aware of the growing importance of this area to the United States and its allies. The Indian Ocean is the third largest ocean of the world, and over its surface each day passes 50 percent of all the oil transported by sea. The stability of this vast region is inextricably linked to broader issues of international security.

The Soviet Union has maintained a permanent naval force in the Indian Ocean since 1968, and that presence has been growing steadily over the years. At the present time, the U.S.S.R. has almost 30 ships in the area, including 7 combatant units. For the most part, these units operate in the north-

western corner of the Indian Ocean, where they have established regular access to port facilities in the harbor of Berbera in Somalia. There they have a communications station, fuel storage, personnel quarters for the Soviet technicians and their dependents, and floating repair facilities, in addition to a runway which is under construction. To date, the Soviet Fleet has been supported from the Soviet Pacific Fleet, but this lengthy supply line will be cut sharply when the Suez Canal opens and the distance from the Black Sea to the Indian Ocean is cut by more than 70 percent.

There is no way to predict the course of events in this area where the United States and its allies have a significant investment both in the political and the commercial sense. In the absence of certainty, it would appear both prudent and reasonable to insure that we can make our own presence known from time to time. Such capability would be facilitated and rendered more economical by the development of support installations on Diego Garcia, as authorized in this legislation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do somewhat regret the fact that an issue such as this—and it is certainly no one's error, it just has happened—but I do regret that an issue like this has to be discussed on this day of all days, simply because I think we all recognize when we look around this floor that so many Members of this House are occupied with other momentous moments in this country's history. I think we know what will happen to this amendment because this issue has not yet received much publicity.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to rise, nevertheless, in support of the amendment, because I think it is important to state my doubts about it. I had opposed very strongly the inclusion of this amendment in the supplemental request for last fiscal year. I was somewhat ambivalent about it in this bill, but I thought long and hard about it, and I questioned the Navy in our hearings in the Military Construction Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and I have come to the conclusion, as the gentleman from Indiana has indicated, that prudence would dictate that for now we lay this matter aside.

I say this, not because I have any great worry about the fact that the Navy wants to use this refueling station, as it has been termed, as the foot in the door, the camel's nose under the tent, to go on to bigger and better things, but rather because I do think it could elicit an irrational overresponse from the Russians.

If one has studied Russian history, I think the one thing that becomes apparent is that because of their history, they really in a sense have almost a paranoid outlook on any action which takes place around the world which is anywhere near the Russian sphere of influence.

I think that the gentleman from Indiana is correct that while our intentions may be harmless and above board,

certain segments within the Russian power structure will not view it to be that way. I think that Diego Garcia, if it is developed, could, in fact, act as a magnet in attracting Russian efforts and presence in the Indian Ocean in the future.

Mr. Chairman, let me just make a few comments. It was indicated, I think by the chairman of my subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES), that the Russians have four times the amount of combatants and supply ships in that area, most of the time, than we have. That is true, if you look at the numbers; but as has been pointed out several times previously, the important thing is not to look at the number of ships in that area, but to look at the kind of ships in that area.

Of these questions, everybody has a tendency to toss around references to classified sheets and wave them before the House. Well, we can all do that. If anyone wants to look, I can show him here what the character of those ships was in the Indian Ocean, should he want to take a look at those sheets. I can show other sheets provided me by the Navy. I can show the Members sheets indicating what the situation is as far as access to various ports within the Indian Ocean is concerned.

We can all do that. But the point is that the Navy will admit—under questioning, they have to me and they have to others—that any time we want, we can have greater fire power there—indeed, we have had greater fire power in the Indian Ocean—than have the Russians.

The statement was also made by someone—I have forgotten which speaker it was—that the reason some of the countries in the immediate area have protested to our Government about our plans in Diego Garcia is because they merely have to do that to mollify the leftists within their own country.

If that is true, then I would suggest that it could indeed be a great mistake to follow through with Diego Garcia, because if one follows that same logic, he will recognize then that that would put great pressure on the Indian Government.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, to continue what I was saying, that would put great pressure on the Indian Government to agree to Russian pressure for base rights.

We would have that same chain occurring if we followed that logic, and I do indeed believe that in this case the Indians could feel under greater pressure to give in, not only to the leftist political groups in their own area, but also to a Russian request as well, provided that we have a visible new presence different in character than we had before which can be pointed to by those within the Soviet Union and in who are only too anxious to point to things of that nature.

It was also said by one speaker, if I heard him right, and I may not have, but if I heard him right, it was indicated by one speaker that this would really be our only base from which to strike at China and the Soviet Union. I do not think the Navy looks at this in those terms. If it does, we would most certainly be contributing to an escalation of military efforts on both sides in that area.

Mr. Chairman, if that is indeed what the gentleman from Texas said, let me also point out that the Navy itself admits that there is nothing which would be more vulnerable to attract during time of war than would be Diego Garcia.

This is not any base which we can use in time of all out war; it is only good for us in time of relative peace. If we have war, it can be wiped out in 10 minutes. I do not think anybody seriously doubts that.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest in the interest of prudence, in the interest of giving our new President time to consider all the political ramifications of this problem, that we lay it aside for a year and see whether or not there can be achieved negotiations which will result in agreement that the Indian Ocean ought to be a hands-off area for both the Russians and ourselves.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy enough to exaggerate the significance of the facility which is to be expanded at Diego Garcia. It was said just now that should we proceed with prudence—and I hope we do—as we may elicit an irrational response from the Soviet Union.

I think we exaggerate the irrationality of the Soviets if we think there is going to be some irrational response. I do not know what an "irrational response" would constitute. I doubt very much if it sends any tremors up and down the spines of the Soviet military establishment because we decide to improve a facility in the middle of the Indian Ocean.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we are going to reject the argument that somehow prudence dictates that we do not move. In my opinion, prudence dictates that we do move.

Obviously this is going to constitute a decided improvement in the availability of facilities needed by our naval units.

I see, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, no far-reaching foreign policy consequences that would be adverse to our own interests.

I happened to be in New Delhi in February when this issue was very much a matter of headlines in the Indian newspapers, and I heard no complaints from any Indian officials. I did have time to have some discussions with university students, who expressed concern about the development and the possible aggressive intentions of the United States because of our desire to improve Diego Garcia.

I said I would doubt very much that a base over a thousand miles from the territorial lands of India could possibly

be considered a threat under any circumstances. I think it is ridiculous to suggest that the Indians are now going to feel compelled to succumb to the demands of the Soviet Union for a base on Indian territory because we improve this facility.

So I hope we do not buy the argument that something is to be gained by postponing a decision. I think it is a reasonable suggestion that we go ahead and improve this facility, and I, myself, see no adverse foreign policy consequences in connection with this.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, what puzzles me is why we are doing this in the first place.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Well, as I said to the gentleman earlier, we held hearings in our subcommittee, and we did have considerable discussion then as to why we were doing it. The testimony is available.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman acknowledges that the testimony suggests there is no need for this.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, that certainly is not true. I suggest that the gentleman read the testimony, both in our own subcommittee and before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is familiar with the testimony in the record which was given by the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Of course. I might say to the gentleman I have read the testimony, and I come down firmly on the side that there is nothing to be gained by a delay or a mulling over of the wisdom of doing this. To me, all the cards are stacked in favor of this move.

I do not think it is against our national interest; I believe it is very much in our national interest.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman agree that if we increase the naval presence on the part of the United States in that area, that will increase the naval presence of the Soviets, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) pointed out?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think that is a ridiculous argument. I do not agree with the gentleman that this is necessarily going to increase our naval presence. It certainly is going to make our operations in the Indian Ocean more economical, because we will be able to do a lot more with a little improvement of our facilities.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin has already pointed out, there is already a far greater naval presence on the part of the Soviets in that area than there is on the part of the United States. I think it is ridiculous for us to try to develop some kind of a fear that we are going to develop a rivalry on the part of the Soviet Union because of this very modest improvement made by the United States. It is an absurd argument that the national interests of the Soviet Union

are involved, and that they will develop a naval race or a possible military confrontation in the Indian Ocean, certainly we are not advocating that.

Mr. FRASER. If the gentleman will yield further, what interests of the United States are at stake in the middle of the Indian Ocean?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In my opinion it is important that we maintain a presence there. A question like that from a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who presumably is informed on this surprises me. I would assume that what has been going on in the Middle East would surely be enough to indicate that we have a legitimate reason for a presence in that area.

No one is suggesting, that I know of, that we should move out entirely for fear of adverse consequences if we do not. I would think the gentleman from Minnesota would understand that we have a very major interest in the stability in the Middle East.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, unless the gentleman pushes that kind of argument, why should anyone think that this is what we are engaged in? What the gentleman seems to be saying is that we should not improve a facility that the gentleman recognizes is necessary. To me there is no logic in that, and unless the gentleman wants to make a mountain out of a mole hill, I do not find our potential adversaries, or those around the Indian Ocean, really pushing very hard if there is some imminent threat or a change in the character of their interest in the area by what we are proposing.

Mr. FRASER. The gentleman agrees that the agents have asked the Indian Ocean be demilitarized? Does he agree with that fact?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think we all would like to see demilitarization.

Mr. FRASER. Does the gentleman agree that they have asked for that status?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think it is a goal to be desired, and I think we would like to see less emphasis on armaments; but this is not an argument for us to say we should not improve the facility.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I can make an effective contribution to the factual side of this debate that has not been made very eloquently already by the speaker who preceded me, but let me offer some observations, if I can, on the state of mind attendant to the Diego Garcia proposal.

This debate has all the trappings of a hearing of Committee on Armed Services hearing. We are replete with maps outside of the door showing the "threat" in the now new-defined fashion. We have

so many references to secrecy, and certain Members being privy to knowledge which no one else has, that I am surprised we do not conclude this debate by stamping the whole thing "secret" and asking, once again, the American Congress to act as an article of faith and to take the word of those who claim to know much more about the threat than we do.

I served briefly, and I am sure controversially as far as substantive contribution made, on the committee from which this proposal emanates. To say that there is a balanced approach in the committee is, I think, to do a disservice to reality, when it comes to an objective effort at hearing the other side of this argument.

I am reminded, as recently as last night and as poignantly as this morning in the valedictory of the last holder of the Office of the Presidency, before Mr. Gerald R. Ford took office at noontime, that one of the hopes the previous occupant had for his administration, and that he remembered historically, was the contribution he made toward changing foreign policy perceptions which had been believed and adhered to for 25 years. Those perceptions are the sort of things that I think are at stake in this kind of debate.

We can argue the reasons for and against Diego Garcia. We can question whether or not our knowledge is roughly equal to the knowledge offered by those who have thought they had expertise because of service on the committee, or access to secret information. But when do we begin to take the step, to take the challenge to give something more than just promises, and give some substance to the questions of what we do, and when do we demonstrate we are not going to continue down that path which we so often find ourselves following?

I sat through most of the debate on the Defense appropriations bill the other day. Ironically, it took only a day to get rid of \$83 billion of our wealth over the course of the next fiscal year, and, the same kind of circular reasoning—the closed circuitry which characterizes the kind of committee activity on these things—again reemerges on this Friday afternoon.

Last Friday it was Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. This Friday it is Diego Garcia and the military construction bill.

There has been testimony on Diego Garcia, which has been clearly contradictory. The Navy's spokesman, Admiral Zumwalt, who has found popular support on the Republican side of the aisle and with certain segments on my side of the aisle, would like to have us believe that there is a Soviet threat that would justify a Diego Garcia base, while in separate testimony CIA Director Colby has cast severe doubt on the Navy estimate. Despite these contradictions, we cannot bring ourselves to stand here and say we will renounce right now, in the face of least conflicting testimony, the dangerous course of unilateral expansion in the Indian Ocean. The question now is whether or not we trigger another arms

race by giving the Navy all they want to spend over the next calendar year at Diego Garcia, and by giving the Navy one more ethic to justify its budget.

It seems to me, without attempting to repeat the kind of factual groundwork which has been gone over and over, that the time has come for this country to take a chance, in the direction of showing we can give something more than false expectations to that gallery as to what we are going to do with the resources of this country, and foresake the Diego Garcia Naval Base.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not hold up the Committee unduly but I do think it is time we got a little factual information on this situation. Although many of the Members have had the opportunity to see the charts that were in the corridor, I think it might be helpful to bring them in and remind the Members once again what we are really talking about and what the situation is that actually confronts us.

If these charts look familiar, Mr. Chairman, it is because we have been down this route once before. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said he thought it was last year. It was not last year. It was last April. We had the whole question of Diego Garcia before us in April in the supplemental appropriation bill, and on the fourth of April, after these charts had been presented and after the issue had been debated in detail and after we had a chance to make up our minds, this House voted 255 to 94 to go ahead with the construction at Diego Garcia.

So we are not operating in a vacuum. This is something that we have considered carefully and we have voted on before.

So why is it back here again in this Chamber? It is because the distinguished body at the other end of the Capitol decided they would rather handle the matter in the military construction bill, and so very, very reluctantly the conferees on the part of the House had to give in. We have now come back with the same proposal in the construction bill for the consideration of Members of the House.

A great deal has been made about the testimony of the head of the CIA. What the head of the CIA actually said was that regardless of what we do, if we do not even put a sailboat in a bathtub in the Indian Ocean, the Russians are going to continue to increase their naval presence in the Indian Ocean steadily as they have been for the past 5 or 6 years. He also said that if we increase our naval presence they will probably increase their naval presence accordingly.

OK. Now what we have presented in this bill is not an increase in naval "presence" at all. As a matter of fact we do not even have any naval presence in the Indian Ocean. We have to go into the Indian Ocean temporarily from Thailand or from the Philippines or from the Persian Gulf or around the Cape of Good Hope. We do not have a single base in the Indian Ocean. We have only a communications station.

Those hammers and sickles that the Members see over there on that chart are real live Soviet naval bases.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I will be glad to yield after I have completed my remarks, but now let us get the facts.

The one at the top for example is in Iraq. They have POL facilities there and they have got limited shore facilities. The one in Yemen has extensive British facilities which the Russians are now using. They also have dry docks and they have got storage and POL, which means petroleum, oil, and lubricants. Down in Berbera the Russians have a barracks and they have a repair ship and they have further POL storage. In Mogadiscio in the Somalia Republic the Soviets have been building, and I think by now have almost completed, a whole new military airfield. In addition to that they have the two anchorages at Socotra and one down in the Seychelles; and the Socotra anchorage also contains POL facilities, the kind of oil storage we seek for Diego Garcia.

But we have no "presence" in the Indian Ocean. All we want to do, all we are proposing in this bill, is to allow a fueling station for those U.S. ships that may occasionally, from time to time, come in. This is not going to increase the number of ships at all.

We think that it makes some sense that we should have at least one gas pump, if you like, in the middle of the Indian Ocean, a couple storage tanks with aviation gas and naval fuel, and that we ought to have a little pier, that we ought to have some dredging done, and that we ought to extend the runway by 4,000 feet. All those actions are not going to bring a single additional ship into the Indian Ocean.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. STRATTON was allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. STRATTON. As I say, this construction is not going to bring a single additional ship into the Indian Ocean. It simply is going to mean that the ships that we have there from time to time will have an opportunity to pick up a little fuel.

Somebody asked a moment ago, what kind of interest does the United States have in the Indian Ocean?

Well, I would think if we had a Navy it would certainly be in our interest to have fuel facilities available for that Navy in various places. Yet we do not have now a single fuel facility in the entire Indian Ocean for the Navy, in comparison to all that the Soviets have. That is all that is involved here. And all it includes is an expenditure of \$29 million.

Now, the last time we went through this debate, we heard all this business about escalating the arms race and the naval competition in the Indian Ocean which was now an area of peace.

Well, there are three things that have changed since we last debated this question in April. Point one is Portugal. We pointed out at that time that if we

wanted to supply the Middle East in a new emergency, and somehow Portugal denied us the Azores, the only other way to get supplies to the Middle East would be by staging our C-5's at Diego Garcia. We suggested then that perhaps there might be a revolution in Portugal. And now they have had one.

Second, the Indians complained last spring that we were upsetting this beautiful, peaceful area where everybody was at peace. But what did they do shortly thereafter? They exploded an atom bomb since we last voted on Diego Garcia. So the Indians cannot be too much concerned about threats to the peace.

The third thing that happened, the Air Force at Utapao in Thailand has recently been denied permission for any flights into the Indian Ocean for resupply or anything of that kind; so there is even more reason why we should build these facilities to supply fuel for the very limited presence that we have there now. What is the point of having a Navy and saying that we believe we ought to have access to all the world's sea lanes, and then say, however, we are not going to supply any fuel to our ships?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Thank you for yielding. The gentleman has always been fair on this point. It seems to me what the gentleman and others are talking about, this thing of putting a \$29 million filling station is at odds with the report. Now, who is kidding whom?

The last report I read this year said the chief advantage of Diego Garcia lies in the ability to show the flag, to make a major show of force.

The report this time says we may lose political and diplomatic influence by default. That is at odds with what the gentleman says.

Mr. STRATTON. It is not at odds at all. During the Middle East war, for example, the carrier *Enterprise* sailed into the Indian Ocean. I suppose that is what we mean by "showing the flag." But the *Enterprise* is a nuclear ship. If we do not have a nuclear ship available then we must get oil for it from somewhere. It cannot operate very long or over long distances without fuel.

The only reason we want ships in the Indian Ocean are the same reason we send ships everywhere; in other words, to protect the sea lanes and provide security.

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

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

Mr. RYAN. Let me see if I have this right. The gentleman is saying, if I can summarize his argument in favor of Diego Garcia, we have been in effect then a communications facility in the past, or a kind of phone booth, and now we are going to be a petroleum depot or a kind of filling station. There are those who say it is going to be a police station or a much larger permanent base to be used for American national defense interests.

I presume from all the gentleman says,

he would deny this is to be used for any further purpose than simply for petroleum and fueling purposes.

Mr. STRATTON. It would be used to supply those ships of our Navy which from time to time we would like to have operate in the Indian Ocean. By having the fuel there, it means that they can operate longer and faster in the Indian Ocean.

Mr. RYAN. It would be primarily for fueling purposes, is that right?

Mr. STRATTON. That is right.

Mr. RYAN. Let me ask the gentleman this: Would he then oppose, since the argument seems to be not so much fueling as what it may become—would the gentleman oppose a Pentagon request for that island to become more than a fueling station?

Mr. STRATTON. At this point, I do not see any need for any such request. I think what we ought ultimately to do should be based on what happens when the Suez Canal is opened. If we see, as some people tell us we will, that a great hegira of Soviet ships will come down from the Black Sea into the Indian Ocean, then that could conceivably create a new problem and we would have to reevaluate that new situation.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, the United States has maintained a military presence in the Indian Ocean area for more than 20 years, consisting primarily of the three ships of Middle East force operating out of Bahrain Island in the Persian Gulf. During the past 8 months, the United States has been conducting more frequent naval deployments into the Indian Ocean, including the periodic deployment of a carrier task force. Such deployments provide tangible evidence of concern for security and stability in a region where significant U.S. interests are located.

At the same time, we should not ignore the economic costs associated with such deployments. The nearest U.S.-support facility to the operating areas of our forces in the Indian Ocean is in the Philippines, some 4,000 miles away. Consequently, the Department of Defense has requested the Congress to authorize the expansion of the present communications facility on the island of Diego Garcia into a limited support facility. The requested \$32.3 million appropriation would permit lengthening of the runway from 8,000 to 12,000 feet, expansion of the anchorage area in the lagoon, extension of the small pier to permit alongside berthing, and construction of POL storage facilities and additional personnel quarters.

The island of Diego Garcia is an uninhabited coral atoll in the center of the Indian Ocean. It is under British sovereignty as part of the British Indian Ocean Territory—BIOT—which was constituted in 1965. Since 1966 the islands of the BIOT have been available for the joint defense use of Britain and the United States under the terms of a government-to-government agreement, and there has been a joint United States-

United Kingdom communications station on the island since 1973. The expansion of facilities on the island would facilitate the effective support of periodic deployments into the Indian Ocean area and would avoid many of the difficulties associated with a 4,000-mile logistical "tail."

Neither the deployments nor the proposed support facilities at Diego Garcia represent a uniquely American concern. Last fall, the French created a new Indian Ocean command which currently consists of nine combatant units; the British also regularly maintain up to five combatant naval units with maritime air support from several sites in the Indian Ocean; the Soviet Union, of course, has maintained a permanent naval presence in the Indian Ocean since 1968 which at times has exceeded 30 ships, and in recent years has developed its own communications and port facilities at Berbera in Somalia. Several of the littoral states also have sizable navies, two of which—India and Iran—are considerably larger in size than the forces deployed to the area by any of the external powers.

The Indian Ocean is no more a naval vacuum than it is a political or economic vacuum, and the periodic presence of the U.S. naval ships in the third largest ocean of the world can be considered neither a remarkable event nor a threat to any nation in the area. On the contrary, a periodic U.S. presence in the Indian Ocean provides tangible evidence of our concern for security and stability in a region where significant U.S. interests are located. Our capability to maintain such a presence would be significantly enhanced by the development of a limited support facility on the island of Diego Garcia.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. SCHROEDER) there were—ayes 28; noes 58.

So the amendments were rejected.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 11, line 16, strike out the figure "\$20,648,000" and substitute the figure "\$20,948,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 11, line 20, strike out the word "Feld" and substitute the word "Field."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 19, line 9, strike out the figure "\$4,151,000" and substitute the figure "\$4,157,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ST GERMAIN

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ST GERMAIN: Title II is amended by striking out on line 16 of page 9 "\$2,582,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$4,153,000".

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, August 8, I sent a "Dear Colleague" letter around to all of the Members of the House. It set forth the justification for the amendment offered.

On April 17, 1973, the Department of Defense announced a major realignment which involved the consolidation, reduction or closing of 274 military installations in the United States. Fifty percent of the impact fell on the State of Rhode Island with the closing of Quonset Point Naval Air Station and the transfer of the Newport Fleet, consisting of 39 destroyers and cruisers, to southern ports.

Revitalization of the economy of the Newport area from the outset has depended upon a full utilization of the vacated destroyer piers. Extensive negotiations have proceeded for over a year between the State of Rhode Island, GSA and the Navy with the assistance of the Department of Defense Office of Economic Adjustment.

The Navy has now solicited leasing bids for utilization of the piers and adjacent warehousing facilities.

The facilities involved were excessed last fall with the approval of the Committee on Armed Services.

Essential to this entire project is the relocation base public works administration building, which was struck from the Navy's request by the committee and placed in a deferred category.

Under the bill before us today, my review of the hearings reveals totally incomplete responses to questions, and legitimate questions, raised by the members of the Committee on Armed Services, by Navy and Department of Defense witnesses. The Sims Hall alterations were described as a project for the sole use and benefit of the Naval War College.

The facts are that the center serves the fleet worldwide and accommodates numerous other requests for war game programming essential for strategic long-range planning. Today, a number of potential subcontractors are even at this very moment inspecting the facility for bidding on software components, and equipment installation contracts are currently being negotiated or planned.

Last spring, many Members on both sides of the aisle expressed their sympathy for Rhode Island's being required to shoulder the burden of the DOD realignment plan. With the loss of a military population in excess of 15,000 officers and men in the Newport area alone in little over a year, the Members can well imagine the effect upon our economy. We have turned to the task of pulling ourselves up by our bootstraps. All I ask is that you support my amendment to restore a total of \$1,571,000 for the 2 items I have described, both requested by the Navy. The decision to close or substantially reduce our naval bases was

a cruel and callous one. Our efforts to obtain a review and reconsideration were met by failure. The total costs of the move are yet to be determined. But that is all water under the bridge.

I urge that the Members support, in the name of simple fairness and equity, my amendment to restore vitally needed facilities. I deeply regret that my colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services were not furnished accurate and complete responses to their questions.

I am hopeful, frankly, that the committee will accept this amendment.

I might say this to my colleagues: Newport does not just have scars from what happened to us with the closing down of the bases. We still have gaping, wide-open wounds. We have not recovered. The economy is in a very bad condition.

I would like to make another point, and that is that as far as the Navy requests are concerned, the cuts totalled \$21,801,000. Here again, the cut for Newport, Rhode Island, is practically 10 percent of the overall cut.

I have no quarrel, as I say, with the subcommittee members because they did not get accurate answers to the questions. The Navy witnesses were delinquent or did not possess the information they should have had.

No. 1, Sims Hall, as I say, will serve the entire fleet. No. 2, the warehouse is an antiquated warehouse.

One of the Members asked a question about whether there could not be a corridor built so that they could keep using the warehouse which is located in the area that had been excessed by the Navy, by the piers, and still utilize it for the War College and the schools that now remain in Newport.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ST GERMAIN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ST GERMAIN. The cost of the corridor would far exceed the \$600,000 requested, and there would be a continuing cost for security measures around this warehouse, plus the fact that the Navy is present right there at the piers that are going to be leased to private industry and private contractors.

I might say that over the years I have supported military construction authorizations and appropriations, year after year after year, for 14 years.

We were hurt by the base closings, and all I am asking here today is the restoration of what was requested by the Department of Defense as necessary to them, because it will mean jobs for Rhode Islanders and especially to those in the Newport area who are out of jobs.

It will mean some small additional income to the area, and it will help strengthen the War College and the school facilities existing in the area.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the subcommittee and the committee will see fit to go along with this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to

the amendment reluctantly, because I certainly do recognize that the State of Rhode Island did, in fact, assume a very major part of the realignments in the Defense Establishment when those were announced some time ago.

I do wish to correct one thing that the gentleman from Rhode Island just stated. I was absolutely shocked last year to find that when the final passage of this same bill came along, the gentleman was not one of those who were supporting it but was one of the 25 Members who opposed it. I just happen to have the RECORD here, if the gentleman would care to check me on it.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to state that as to the amount of cuts which were going on in this bill in relation to the State of Rhode Island, it is true that the net cuts in the bill were only \$21 million but the gross cuts in this bill were \$86.5 million.

So I do not think that the gentleman from Rhode Island or the State of Rhode Island is bearing an unfair proportion of those cuts.

We had some add-ons that we had to make. The Members just heard the add-on of \$29 million for Diego Garcia which was transferred from the military construction bill. I voted against that add-on. But the net was there. We had add-ons for deficiency authorizations of \$21.5 million.

The gentleman asks that two separate items be added to the bill. The larger item of \$971,000 was the 27th item of the bottom percentage in the priorities of the Navy as they were presented to the committee. That was for the alteration to Sims Hall.

As to the public works administration building, the committee rejected that because the Navy had assured us—and they assured us not when the base was closed but when they went to dispose of the excess property—that the disposal would not require any new construction anywhere else. This is new construction somewhere else, in contradiction to what the Navy told us would happen.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIKE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the gentleman this: Am I right in assuming that the committee made some more cuts in Rhode Island in this bill?

Mr. PIKE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. In addition to the meat ax cuts which were exercised a few years ago?

Mr. PIKE. We put \$2.5 million in for Rhode Island in this bill, and there is \$1.6 million taken out in this bill.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. What did the committee do to Massachusetts this year?

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer overall; the only thing that jumps to my mind is an addition to the bill in the Reserve program for Massachusetts. I cannot give the gentleman the overall figure for the whole State because, honestly, when I look at these bills when

we are marking them up, I look at them by bases.

If the gentleman wants to ask me what we have done for the First Congressional District in the State of New York, I would be able to tell him. The answer is that there is not a dime in the bill for that district, which is my own congressional district.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I just want to make sure that we do not exercise any more cuts in facilities for the State of Massachusetts. If more cuts were made, it would be a tragedy after the meat-ax cuts that were exercised a little over a year ago.

Mr. PIKE. Let us not confuse the action of the Department of Defense in closing the bases with the actions—

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. The Committee on Armed Services would not give us any hearing. We had to go over to the other branch and get hearings.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield any more at this point.

It may have escaped the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts but, honestly, I am not the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and I do not always vote the strict party line, as far as the Committee on Armed Services is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. ST GERMAIN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. PIKE was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. ST GERMAIN. If the gentleman would yield, I would say to the gentleman from New York that I appreciate the gentleman's staff correcting me about my vote last year. And my memory was vague on that one, because last year I must admit that my glands were pumping very, very heavily, and my emotions were very, very high. Frankly, in that respect, that is not the way to act. I assure the gentleman that, no matter what the results are on this amendment, I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Rhode Island that I have a great deal of sympathy for the gentleman's position.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I think that my colleague has clearly indicated that this was a request by the Navy Department; it is not an add-on, as the previous amendment was. I would like to point out to the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee that I supported the add-on just passed. My colleague and I voted in support of that add-on when it was in the military authorization bill.

So it is not just a question of consistently voting for or voting against, because, as the chairman of the subcommittee just admitted, he himself voted against that add-on that was supported by most of the Members of the House today, and was supported on April 4 in the general Defense Department authorization.

What we are asking the Members to support today is the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. St GERMAIN), that the Navy's request be honored by this committee. As the gentleman has pointed out, we feel that the testimony presented to the subcommittee members by the Department of Defense was not adequate because in their testimony they stated that the \$971,000 facility was for the use of the Navy War College alone, when in fact it is used for the support of the entire fleet in war games, and also in the training all of the line officers for service throughout the world in support of the naval operations.

So I urge my colleagues to support the amendment. It is a small amount; it is \$1.6 million. I think this is a cut that is not necessary. I hope that the Members will support this amendment today.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. St GERMAIN).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. St GERMAIN) there were—ayes 15, noes 26.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a sign of protest, I am going to regretfully vote against this bill. I realize that we need a strong military defense. I realize that there is much good in this bill, but I think we have to start rearranging our priorities.

I come from a district which is a steel mill district, the heart of America, the Ruhr of America. It will take about \$150 million in my district to take care of water pollution, probably another \$100 million to take care of air pollution. The plants in my district are older plants, they are marginal, standby plants, and the EPA is on our necks, quoting the rules and regulations and laws that this Congress passed which require the steel industry to install up-to-date air pollution facilities and up-to-date water pollution facilities.

The steel company officials in my district are saying we just cannot afford it and make a profit. There is no money coming from Government. The chances are that thousands of Americans in my district will be forced out of work.

One thing we have in here is \$1,059,000 for pollution abatement outside of the United States. There is \$400 million for water pollution abatement, one probably in a populated area, which may be necessary. But it just does not make sense to me, to spend this money somewhere else when I think of our own taxpayers, our own people.

I heard the very fine argument about the island of Diego Garcia, the little spot out in the middle of the Indian Ocean. I do not want to argue with the great naval genius, the gentleman, the captain of the Navy. However, some experts tell us that in case of a war, that little spot will not last 10 minutes. It is out in the middle of nowhere.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If the gentleman wants to reorder his priorities, this is probably the right bill to reorder them on. He mentioned the figure of \$1 billion outside of the United States for disposal services. Actually it is only \$4 million. I should not really say only \$4 million. That is a substantial figure, but it is a lot different than \$1 billion-plus, and I think the gentleman should be corrected on his figures.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. No. On pollution abatement the committee approved \$1,059,000 for one air pollution abatement facility located outside of the United States—just one. \$1 million for one.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. It was not \$1 billion.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. And \$4 million for the water pollution.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. The gentleman has his billions and millions mixed up.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. We have talked about billions of dollars around here so much, it is easy to do. I do know one thing: Whenever there is something on this floor for the American people, if we want to feed school kids lunches, if we want to provide safety for American workers, if we want to give housing to people, that side is lined up. I do not see my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, here, the great man on economy. What is the matter? I do not see the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT) who does not think we should spend 10 cents on an American. But now when these things come up, billions of dollars for war, we are not patriotic unless we vote for them. We are unpatriotic if we want to raise a question about it.

There he is, Mr. ROUSSELOT. Why does he not get up here and let us talk about some of these billions of dollars being thrown away instead of 50 cents for some American? That is what I am talking about.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against this bill, realizing that my vote will be a protest vote.

I want the people of my district to know this, and also I want my steelworkers when they start losing their jobs to know this. We cannot afford the water pollution facilities in these United States, but in this bill alone there are more than \$5 million for water pollution and air pollution facilities outside the United States. We had better change our priorities.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

First of all I do want to get some statistics in here as to what we are spending for pollution control and where. We are spending for pollution control, total outside the United States of America, \$4 million, and it is not billion, we are spending \$4,038,000 for the Navy and \$595,000 for the Air Force for a total of \$4,633,000—and that is not billion. On the item of \$1,059,000,000 that the gentleman referred to, it is an item of

\$1,059,000 and it is in Guam. It is outside of the continental United States but it is in Guam.

Before the gentleman votes against the bill based on what we are doing for pollution control and air control, I would like to call his attention to the fact that we are spending \$7,717,000 in Ohio for air pollution control and \$537,000 in Ohio for water pollution control. I think that the pollution control items in this bill are not only justified but they are also rather properly distributed among the States of the United States of America and its possessions.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I would like to, if I may, ask on my time a couple of questions of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. On page 10, under "Naval District, Washington" on line 7 we have for the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md., \$14,943,000. On lines 9 and 10 we have \$15,000,000 for the university. Are they same item or two different items?

Mr. PIKE. No; they are two different items. They are not the same.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman tell me what is the relationship between the two?

Mr. PIKE. Yes. The first item is for improvement and modernization of the existing Naval Hospital at Bethesda and the second is for preliminary planning and beginning of the new school for the training of medical officers for the services.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Then the \$15 million would be only preliminary because this is to train more military doctors, I believe.

Mr. PIKE. It is only the beginning of the project and what the total amount of the project will be, I do not think I can tell the gentleman at this time.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. That was my concern, because I did not feel that \$15 million would be enough for such a worthy project.

Mr. PIKE. \$15 million, I guarantee, will not be enough to build a new medical university.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. So this would really just be the beginning for us?

Mr. PIKE. That is correct.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

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

Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado, \$5,426,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida, \$2,775,000.

AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Grandview, Missouri, \$805,000.

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, \$11,894,000.
 Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$4,079,000.
 McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, \$7,017,000.
 Newark Air Force Station, Newark, Ohio, \$1,977,000.
 Robins Air Force Base, Warner Robins, Georgia, \$792,000.
 Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, \$9,839,000.
 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, \$10,371,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee, \$48,240,000.
 Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California, \$1,198,000.
 Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida, \$10,475,000.
 Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico, \$232,000.
 Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida, \$642,000.
 Satellite Tracking Facilities, \$832,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois, \$6,267,000.
 Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi, \$169,000.
 Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi, \$7,297,000.
 Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas, \$298,000.
 Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado, \$7,885,000.
 Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, \$2,143,000.
 Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$790,000.
 Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas, \$836,000.
 Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas, \$8,631,000.
 Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma, \$1,998,000.
 Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas, \$776,000.
 Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona, \$536,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, \$3,753,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska, \$310,000.
 Various Locations, \$14,962,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland, \$5,929,000.
 Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, District of Columbia, \$3,155,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware, \$1,373,000.
 McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey, \$408,000.
 Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois, \$5,451,000.
 Travis Air Force Base, Fairchild, California, \$8,800,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii, \$10,959,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana, \$641,000.
 Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas, \$675,000.
 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona, \$3,009,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota, \$10,105,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York, \$1,774,000.
 Grissom Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana, \$323,000.

K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Marquette, Michigan, \$7,050,000.
 Kincheloe Air Force Base, Kinross, Michigan, \$835,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, \$3,740,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas, \$3,038,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, \$238,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, \$5,595,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, \$115,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York, \$882,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri, \$6,692,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico, \$883,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California, \$3,846,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico, \$1,565,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia, \$3,056,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas, \$5,141,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, \$300,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada, \$6,495,000.

Pope Air Force Base, Fayetteville, North Carolina, \$730,000.

Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina, \$3,948,000.

Various Locations, \$5,194,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$9,156,000.

Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$13,700,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various Locations, \$9,152,000.

AEROSPACE CORPORATION

Los Angeles, California, \$9,000,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

Various Locations, \$138,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Various Locations, \$4,812,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Germany, \$280,000.

United Kingdom, \$884,000.

Various Locations, \$63,081,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE
 Various Locations, \$4,135,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$595,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various Locations, \$1,999,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the total amount of \$8,100,000.

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: (1) unforeseen security considerations, (2) new weapons developments, (3) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (4) 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 upon enactment of the fiscal year 1976 Military Construction Authorization Act, 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. Notwithstanding any other law or regulation to the contrary, the sum of \$8,000 is authorized for the purchase and installation of material at the transmission facility of KNTV in San Jose, California, to shield such facility from interferences with its broadcast signal caused by operation of the radar facility at Almaden Air Force station in California.

SEC. 305. (a) Section 301 of Public Law 93-166 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND" with respect to Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado, strike out "\$7,843,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,733,000."

(2) Under the subheading "AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND" with respect to Robins Air Force Base, Warner Robins, Georgia, strike out "\$4,628,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,324,000."

(3) Under the subheading "AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND" with respect to Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida, strike out "\$7,039,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,882,000."

(4) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi, strike out "\$8,786,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,733,000."

(5) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, strike out "\$6,509,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,186,000."

(6) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas, strike out "\$4,211,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,461,000."

(7) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma, strike out "\$371,000" and insert in place thereof "\$895,000."

(8) Under the subheading "MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND" with respect to Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma, strike out "\$1,078,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,440,000."

(9) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming, strike out "\$5,834,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,265,000."

(10) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND" with respect to Little Rock Air

Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas, strike out "\$1,165,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,200,000."

(b) Public Law 93-166 is further amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 "\$238,439,000" and "\$260,741,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$256,094,000" and "\$278,396,000", respectively.

Mr. PIKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title III 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 New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title III? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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 MAPPING AGENCY

Defense Mapping Agency Aerospace Center (Saint Louis AFS), Saint Louis, Missouri, \$2,573,000.

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, \$670,000.

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY

Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio, \$1,862,000.

Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, \$394,000.

Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee, \$1,399,000.

Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah, \$527,000.

Defense Electronics Supply Center, Dayton, Ohio, \$572,000.

Defense Industrial Plant Equipment Facility, Atchinson, Kansas, \$646,000.

Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$936,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, \$2,363,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY

Johnston Atoll, \$1,458,000.

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 \$15,000,000: *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.

Mr. PIKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title IV 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 New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title IV? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING AND HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Sec. 501. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units and mobile home 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 of the 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 nine hundred units, \$58,614,639:

Fort Stewart/Hunter Army Air Field, Georgia, four hundred units.

Fort Riley, Kansas, one hundred units.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky, one thousand units.

Fort Eustis, Virginia, one hundred units.

United States Army Installations, Atlantic Side, Canal Zone, one hundred units.

United States Army Installations, Pacific Side, Canal Zone, two hundred units.

(2) The Department of the Navy, two thousand and fifty units, \$66,049,919:

Naval Complex, San Diego, California, five hundred units.

Naval Complex, Jacksonville, Florida, two hundred units.

Naval Complex, New Orleans, Louisiana, two hundred units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, three hundred units.

Naval Complex, Charleston, South Carolina, three hundred and fifty units.

Naval Complex, Bremerton, Washington, three hundred units.

Naval Complex, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, two hundred units.

(3) The Department of the Air Force, one thousand four hundred units, \$44,653,442.

United States Air Force Installations, Oahu, Hawaii, two hundred units.

Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, one hundred units.

Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma, one hundred units.

Misawa Air Base, Japan, two hundred units.

Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, three hundred units.

Clark Air Base, Philippines, five hundred units.

(b) Mobile home facilities—

(1) The Department of the Army, two hundred and forty spaces, \$960,000.

(2) The Department of the Air Force, two hundred spaces, \$388,000.

Sec. 502. (a) Authorization for the construction of family housing provided in section 501 of 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, the cost of the family unit, and the proportionate costs of land

acquisition, site preparation and installation of utilities.

(b) The average unit cost for all units of family housing constructed in the United States (other than Alaska and Hawaii) shall not exceed \$30,000 and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$46,000.

(c) When family housing units are constructed in areas other than that specified in subsection (b) the average cost of all such units shall not exceed \$40,000, and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$46,000.

Sec. 503. 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—

(1) for the Department of the Army, \$20,000,000.

(2) for the Department of the Navy, \$20,000,000.

(3) for the Department of the Air Force, \$20,000,000.

Sec. 504. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct or otherwise acquire at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units not subject to the limitations on such cost contained in section 502 of this Act. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise. Total costs shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and other installed equipment and fixtures, the cost of the family unit, and the costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(a) Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, two hundred units, at a total cost not to exceed \$9,600,000.

(b) Two family housing units in Warsaw, Poland, at a total cost not to exceed \$120,000. This authority shall be funded by use of excess foreign currency when so provided in Department of Defense Appropriation Acts.

Sec. 505. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish repairs and improvements to existing public quarters in amounts in excess of the \$15,000 limitation prescribed in section 610(a) of Public Law 90-110, as amended (81 Stat. 279, 305), as follows:

Fort McNair, Washington, District of Columbia, five units, \$175,500.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas, one hundred forty units, \$2,352,800.

Sec. 506. (a) Section 515 of Public Law 84-161 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended by (1) striking out "1974 and 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof "1975 and 1976", and (2) revising the third sentence to read as follows: "Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities, including the cost of utilities and maintenance and operation, may not exceed: For the United States (other than Alaska and Hawaii), Puerto Rico, and Guam an average of \$235 per month for each military department or the amount of \$310 per month for any one unit; and for Alaska and Hawaii, an average of \$295 per month for each military department, or the amount of \$365 per month for any one unit."

(b) Section 507(b) of Public Law 93-166 (87 Stat. 661, 676) is amended by striking out "\$325", and "seven thousand five hundred", and inserting in lieu thereof "\$355" and "twelve thousand", respectively.

Sec. 507. There is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, for military family housing and homeowners assistance as authorized by law for the following purposes:

(1) for construction and acquisition of family housing, including improvements to public quarters, minor construction, relocation of family housing rental guarantee payments, construction and acquisition of mobile home facilities, and planning, an amount not to exceed \$245,366,000;

(2) 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 \$935,515,000; and

(3) for homeowners assistance under section 1013 of Public Law 89-754 (80 Stat. 1255, 1290), including acquisition of properties, an amount not to exceed \$5,000,000.

Mr. PIKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title V 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 New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title V? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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 and 9774 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 \$490,555,000; outside the United States, \$121,098,000; or a total of \$611,653,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$490,542,000; outside the United States, \$55,331,000; or a total of \$545,873,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$317,203,000; outside the United States, \$75,924,000; section 302, \$8,100,000; or a total of \$401,227,000.

(4) for title IV: A total of \$28,400,000.

(5) for title V: Military family housing and homeowners assistance, \$1,185,881,000.

Sec. 603. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), 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, III, 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 upon 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 Command, Department of the Navy, or such other department or Government agency as the Secretaries of the military departments recommend and the Secretary of Defense approves 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 (except architect and engineering contracts which, unless specifically authorized by the Congress shall continue to be awarded in accordance with presently established procedures, customs, and practice) 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 annually 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. As of October 1, 1975, all authorizations for military public works including 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, IV, and V of the Act of November 29, 1973, Public Law 93-166 (87 Stat. 661), and all such authorizations contained in Acts approved before November 30, 1973, 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, land acquisition, or payments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in whole or in part before October 1, 1975, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 605 of the Act of November 29, 1973, Public Law 93-166, 87 Stat. 661, 681), authorizations for the following items which shall remain in effect until October 1, 1976:

(a) Sanitary sewer connection in the amount of \$2,200,000 at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 26, 1970 (84 Stat. 1204), as amended and extended in section 705(a) (3)(A) of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1153).

(b) Cold storage warehouse construction in the amount of \$1,215,000 at Fort Dix, New Jersey, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(c) Enlisted men's barracks complex construction in the amount of \$12,160,000 at Fort Knox, Kentucky, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(d) Enlisted women's barracks construction in the amount of \$245,000 and bachelor officer's quarters construction in the amount of \$803,000 at Fort Lee, Virginia, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(e) Chapel center construction in the amount of \$1,088,000 at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(f) Enlisted men's barracks construction in the amount of \$7,996,000 at Ford Ord, California, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(g) Enlisted men's barracks and mess construction in the amount of \$699,000 at Sierra Army Depot, California, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1136), as amended.

(h) Test facilities Solid State Radar in the amount of \$7,600,000 at Kwajalein National Missile Range, Kwajalein, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1137).

(i) Land acquisition in the amount of \$10,000,000 for the Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii, that is contained in title II, section 201 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1140).

(j) Message center addition, aircraft fire and crash station, aircraft maintenance hanger shops, bachelor enlisted quarters, mess hall, bachelor officers' quarters, exchange and recreation building, and utilities construction in the amounts of \$110,000; \$199,000; \$837,000; \$1,745,000; \$377,000; \$829,000; \$419,000; and \$792,000 respectively for the Naval Detachment, Souda Bay, Crete, Greece that is contained in title II, section 201 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1141).

(k) Authorization for exchange of lands in support of the Air Installation Compatible Use Zones at Various Locations in the amount of \$12,000,000 that is contained in title III, section 301 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1145), as amended.

(4) Notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 705(b) of the Act of October 25, 1972, Public Law 92-545 (86 Stat. 1135, 1153), as modified by section 605(3) of the Act of November 29, 1973, Public Law 93-166 (87 Stat. 661, 681), the authorization to construct 600 family housing units at Naval Complex, Norfolk, Virginia, contained in title V, section 501(b) of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1148) shall remain in effect until October 1, 1975.

SEC. 606. None of the authority contained in titles 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 index is 1.0:

(1) \$28.50 per square foot for permanent barracks;

(2) \$30.50 per square foot 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 authorization 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. Section 612 of Public Law 89-568 (80 Stat. 756, 757), is amended by deleting the figure \$150,000 wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof \$225,000.

SEC. 608. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, proceeds from the sale of recyclable material shall be credited first, to the cost of collection, handling and sale of the material including purchasing of equipment to be used for recycling purposes and second, to projects for environmental improvement and energy conservation at camps, posts, and bases establishing recycling programs in accordance with regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense. The amount expended for environmental improvement and energy conservation projects shall not exceed \$50,000 per installation per annum. Any balance shall be returned to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The Secretary of each military department shall make an annual report to Congress on the operation of the program.

SEC. 609. (a) The Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, is authorized to convey to the Gulf Coast Council, Boy Scouts of America, for fair market value and subject to such terms and conditions as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America, other than mineral rights including gas and oil which shall be reserved to the United States, in and to a certain parcel of land containing 12.46 acres, more or less, situated in Escambia County, Florida, being a part of the Naval Education and Training Program Development Center, Ellyson, Florida, more particularly described as follows:

Commence at the southeast property corner of Naval Education and Training Program Development Center (NETPDC), formerly Naval Air Station, Ellyson,

thence north 3 degrees 55 minutes west along the east boundary of NETPDC a dis-

tance of 725.8 feet more or less to the point of beginning; from said point of beginning, continue north 3 degrees 55 minutes west along the east boundary of NETPDC a distance of 829.1 feet more or less to a point,

thence north 0 degrees 27 minutes west along the east boundary of NETPDC a distance of 623.3 feet more or less to a point, thence south 45 degrees 25 minutes east a distance of 304.8 feet more or less to a point,

thence south 87 degrees 48 minutes east a distance of 40.5 feet more or less to a point, thence south 0 degree 25 minutes west a distance of 38.1 feet more or less to a point, thence south 45 degrees 25 minutes east a distance of 139.8 feet more or less to a point,

thence south 87 degrees 00 minutes east a distance of 24.6 feet more or less to a point,

thence south 24 degrees 12 minutes west a distance of 17.4 feet more or less to a point,

thence south 45 degrees 25 minutes east a distance of 536.6 feet more or less to a point, thence south 44 degrees 35 minutes west a distance of 990.1 feet more or less to the point of beginning, containing 12.46 acres more or less.

(b) All expenses for surveys and the preparation and execution of legal documents necessary or appropriate to carry out the foregoing provisions shall be borne by the Gulf Coast Council, Boy Scouts of America.

SEC. 610. (a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to assist counties and communities located near the Trident Support Site Bangor, Washington, in meeting the costs of providing increased municipal services and facilities to the residents of such areas, if the Secretary determines that there is a substantial increase in the need for such services and facilities as a direct result of work being carried out in connection with the construction, installation, testing, and operation of the Trident Weapon System and that an excessive financial burden will be incurred by such governmental entities as a result of the increased need for such services and facilities.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall carry out the provisions of this section through existing Federal programs. The Secretary is authorized to supplement funds made available under such Federal programs to the extent necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, and is authorized to provide financial assistance to governmental entities described in subsection (a) of this section to help such entities pay their share of the costs under such programs. The heads of all departments and agencies concerned shall cooperate fully with the Secretary of Defense in carrying out the provisions of this section on a priority basis.

(c) In determining the amount of financial assistance to be made available under this section for any service or facility, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the head of the department or agency of the Federal Government concerned with the type of service or facility for which financial assistance is being made available and shall take into consideration (1) the time lag between the initial impact of increased population in any area and any increase in the local tax base which will result from such increased population, (2) the possible temporary nature of the increased population and the long-range cost impact on the permanent residents of any such area and (3) such other pertinent factors as the Secretary of Defense deems appropriate.

SEC. 611. Section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of subsection (a) a new paragraph:

"(6) Any termination or modification by either the grantor or grantee of an existing license or permit of real property owned by the United States to a military department, under which substantial investment has been or are proposed to be made in connec-

tion with the use of the property by the military department."

SEC. 612. (a) The Secretary of the Army, or his designee, is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of Louisiana all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that certain real property located in Saint Tammany Parish, Louisiana, containing one thousand seven hundred and ten acres, more or less, known as Camp Villere, being the same property presently under license to the State for National Guard use, and known as Audited Installation Numbered 22975 in the files of the Office of the District Engineer, Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District.

(b) The conveyance required to be made pursuant to paragraph (a) shall be made without monetary compensation but shall be in consideration of, and subject to, the following terms and conditions:

(1) The conveyed property shall be used primarily for the training of the Louisiana National Guard and for other military purposes of the Louisiana National Guard.

(2) Any revenue derived by the State from any other uses of the property shall be used for the maintenance and improvement of the property or be shared with the United States as prescribed by the Secretary. The State shall maintain such records and furnish such reports with respect to such revenue as are prescribed by the Secretary.

(3) The State shall protect the timber, water resources, gravel, sand, soil mineral deposits, and other natural resources of the conveyed property in accordance with sound conservation practices and to the satisfaction of the Secretary.

(4) In time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress, or national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President, and upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that the conveyed property, or any part thereof, is useful or necessary for national defense and security, the Secretary, on behalf of the United States, shall have the right to enter upon and use such property, or any part thereof (including any and all improvements made thereon by the State), for a period not to exceed the duration of such war or emergency plus six months. Upon termination of such use, the property shall revert to the State, together with all improvements placed thereon by the United States, and be subject to the terms, conditions, and limitations on its use and disposition which apply without regard to this paragraph. The use of the property by the United States pursuant to this paragraph shall be without obligation or payment on the part of the United States, except that the United States, if required by the State, shall pay the fair market rental value for the use of any improvements on the property which are constructed with State funds and, upon completion of such use, will restore any such improvements to the same condition as that existing at the time of initial occupancy by the United States under this paragraph. At the option of the Secretary, cash payment may be made by the United States in lieu of such restoration; except that the value of any improvements erected by the United States during its occupancy and left on the property shall be offset against the obligation of the United States to restore improvements constructed with State funds.

(5) There shall be reserved from the conveyance such easements and right-of-way for roads, water flowage, soil disposal, waterlines, sewerlines, communications wires, powerlines, and other purposes, as the Secretary considers necessary or convenient for the operations, activities, and functions of the United States.

(6) All mineral rights with respect to the conveyed property, including gas and oil, shall be reserved to the United States, together with the right to permit such reasonable exploration and mining operations as

will not interfere with the primary use of the property.

(7) Such other terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

(c) Upon a finding by the Secretary that the State is violating or failing to comply with any term or condition imposed by subparagraph (1), (2), or (3) of paragraph (b) of this section, the Secretary is authorized immediately to reenter and take possession of the property described in paragraph (a), whereupon title to such property shall revert to the United States and control thereover may be asserted by the Secretary without any further act or legal proceeding whatsoever. Any improvements, fixtures, and buildings placed on the property by the State during its period of use shall become the property of the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

(d) (1) Any surveying and related costs incurred incident to the carrying out of this section shall be borne by the State.

(2) Appropriate provisions to implement the terms and conditions of this Act shall be included in the instrument of conveyance.

Sec. 613. Titles I, II, III, IV, V, and VI, of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1975".

Mr. PIKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title VI 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 New York?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 37, line 18, strike out the figure \$545,813,000" and substitute the figure "\$545,873,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title VI? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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) Army National Guard of the United States, \$53,800,000.

(b) Army Reserve, \$38,600,000.

(2) For the Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$19,867,000.

(3) For the Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air National Guard of the United States, \$26,000,000.

(b) Air Force Reserve, \$14,000,000.

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 and 9774 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. Chapter 133, title 10, United States Code, as amended, is further amended by striking out the figure "\$50,000" in paragraph (1) of section 2233a, Limitation, and inserting the figure "\$100,000" in place thereof.

SEC. 704. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Authorization Act, 1975".

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title VII? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker 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. 16136) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1297, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 322, nays 30, not voting 82, as follows:

[Roll No. 472]

YEAS—322

Abdnor	Brinkley	Collins, Ill.
Adams	Brooks	Collins, Tex.
Alexander	Broomfield	Conable
Anderson	Brotzman	Conlan
Calif.	Brown, Calif.	Conte
Anderson, Ill.	Brown, Mich.	Corman
Andrews, N.C.	Brown, Ohio	Cotter
Andrews,	Broyhill, N.C.	Coughlin
N. Dak.	Broyhill, Va.	Crane
Annunzio	Buchanan	Cronin
Archer	Burgener	Daniel, Dan
Arends	Burke, Calif.	Daniel, Robert
Ashbrook	Burke, Fla.	W., Jr.
Ashley	Burke, Mass.	Daniels,
Aspin	Burleson, Tex.	Dominick V.
Bafalis	Burlison, Mo.	Danielson
Barrett	Butler	Davis, S.C.
Bauman	Byron	Davis, Wis.
Beard	Camp	Delaney
Bell	Carter	Dellenback
Bennett	Casey, Tex.	Denholm
Bergland	Chamberlain	Dennis
Bevill	Chappell	Dent
Blester	Clancy	Derwinski
Blackburn	Clark	Devine
Boiland	Clausen,	Dickinson
Bolling	Don H.	Dingell
Brademas	Cleveland	Dorn
Bray	Cochran	Downing
Breckinridge	Cohen	Duncan
	Collier	du Pont

Eckhardt	Long, La.	Roush
Edwards, Ala.	Long, Md.	Roussellot
Ellberg	Lujan	Roy
Erlenborn	McClary	Runnels
Eshleman	McCloskey	Ruppe
Evans, Colo.	McCollister	Ruth
Evins, Tenn.	McCormack	St Germain
Fasell	McDade	Sandman
Findley	McEwen	Sarasin
Fish	McFall	Sarbanes
Fisher	McKinney	Satterfield
Flood	Macdonald	Schroeder
Flowers	Madden	Sebellus
Foley	Madigan	Seiberling
Ford	Mahon	Shipley
Forsythe	Mann	Shoup
Fountain	Martin, Nebr.	Shriver
Frelinghuysen	Martin, N.C.	Shuster
Frey	Mathias, Calif.	Sikes
Fruehlich	Mathis, Ga.	Slisk
Gaydos	Matunaga	Skubitz
Gettys	Mayne	Slack
Gialmo	Mazzoli	Smith, Iowa
Gilman	Meeds	Smith, N.Y.
Ginn	Mezvisky	Spence
Goldwater	Michel	Staggers
Gonzalez	Minish	Stanton
Green, Pa.	Mink	J. William
Gross	Mitchell, N.Y.	Steed
Grover	Mizell	Steele
Gude	Moakley	Steelman
Gunter	Mollohan	Steiger, Ariz.
Guyer	Moorhead,	Steiger, Wis.
Haley	Calif.	Stratton
Hamilton	Moorhead, Pa.	Stubblefield
Hammer-	Morgan	Studds
schmidt	Mosher	Sullivan
Hanley	Moss	Symington
Hanna	Murtha	Symms
Hanrahan	Myers	Talcott
Hastings	Natcher	Taylor, Mo.
Hébert	Nedzi	Taylor, N.C.
Heckler, Mass.	Nelsen	Thomson, Wis.
Heinz	Nichols	Thornton
Henderson	Nix	Tiernan
Hicks	Obey	Towell, Nev.
Hillis	O'Hara	Traxler
Hinshaw	O'Neill	Ullman
Holt	Parris	Van Deerlin
Horton	Passman	Vander Veen
Hosmer	Patman	Veysey
Howard	Patten	Vigorito
Huber	Perkins	Waggonner
Hudnut	Pettis	Walsh
Hungate	Peyser	Wampler
Hunt	Pickle	Whalen
Hutchinson	Pike	White
Ichord	Poage	Whitehurst
Jarman	Preyer	Whitten
Johnson, Calif.	Price, Ill.	Whitnall
Johnson, Colo.	Price, Tex.	Wilson,
Johnson, Pa.	Quillen	Charles H.,
Jones, Ala.	Railsback	Calif.
Jones, N.C.	Randall	Winn
Jones, Okla.	Regula	Wolf
Jones, Tenn.	Reuss	Wright
Jordan	Rhodes	Wyatt
Karth	Riegle	Wylder
Kazen	Rinaldo	Wylie
Kemp	Roberts	Yates
Ketchum	Robinson, Va.	Yatron
King	Robison, N.Y.	Young, Alaska
Kluczynski	Rodino	Young, Fla.
Koch	Roe	Young, Ill.
Kuykendall	Rogers	Young, S.C.
Lagomarsino	Roncallo, Wyo.	Young, Tex.
Latta	Roncallo, N.Y.	Zablocki
Leggett	Rooney, Pa.	Zion
Lehman	Rose	Zwack
Litton	Rostenkowski	

NAYS—30

Abzug	Frenzel	Pritchard
Badillo	Harrington	Rangel
Bingham	Hechler, W. Va.	Rosenthal
Burton, John	Helstoski	Roybal
Burton, Phillip	Holtzman	Ryan
Carney, Ohio	Kastenmeier	Stark
Clay	Landgrebe	Stokes
Drinan	Luken	Vanik
Edwards, Calif.	Metcalfe	Waldie
Fraser	Miller	Young, Ga.

NOT VOTING—82

Addabbo	Clawson, Del	Fulton
Armstrong	Conyers	Fuqua
Baker	Culver	Gibbons
Blaggi	Davis, Ga.	Goodling
Blatnik	de la Garza	Grasso
Bowen	Dellums	Gray
Brasco	Diggs	Green, Oreg.
Breaux	Donohue	Griffiths
Carey, N.Y.	Dulski	Gubser
Cederberg	Esch	Hansen, Idaho
Chisholm	Flynt	Hansen, Wash.

Harsha	Mitchell, Md.	Stanton,
Hawkins	Montgomery	James V.
Hays	Murphy, Ill.	Stephens
Hogan	Murphy, N.Y.	Stuckey
Hollifield	O'Brien	Teague
Kyros	Owens	Thompson, N.J.
Landrum	Pepper	Thone
Lent	Podell	Treen
Lott	Powell, Ohio	Udall
McKay	Quie	Vander Jagt
McSpadden	Rarick	Ware
Mallory	Rees	Wiggins
Maraziti	Reid	Williams
Melcher	Rooney, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
Milford	Scherle	Wilson,
Mills	Schneebell	Charles, Tex.
Minshall, Ohio	Snyder	Wyman

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Mitchell of Maryland against.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.
Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Hawkins against.
Mr. Teague for, with Mr. Conyers against.
Mr. Podell for, with Mr. Dellums against.
Mr. Blaggy for, with Mr. Digs against.
Mr. Kyros for, with Mr. Rees against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Montgomery with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Breaux with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Mallory.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Hogan.
Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Goodling.
Mr. Dulski with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Owens.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Maraziti.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. O'Brien.
Mrs. Grasso with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Powell of Ohio.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Treen.
Mr. McKay with Mr. Schneebell.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Lott.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Thone.
Mr. Bowen with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Ware.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution extending best wishes to President Gerald R. Ford.

PERMISSION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENDING THE BEST WISHES OF THE CONGRESS TO PRESIDENT GERALD R. FORD

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 108) extending the best wishes of the Congress to President Gerald R. Ford.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 108

Whereas Gerald R. Ford was a Member of Congress for twenty-five years; and
Whereas he is known to the Congress as a good and faithful friend; and

Whereas he assumes today the Office of President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress extends to Gerald R. Ford its sincere best wishes, its assurances of firm cooperation and its fervent hopes for success in office.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Senate concurrent resolution.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device; and there were—yeas 329, nays 0, not voting 105, as follows:

[Roll No 473]

YEAS—329

Abdnor	Bennett	Buchanan
Abzug	Bergland	Burgener
Adams	Bevill	Burke, Fla.
Alexander	Blester	Burleson, Tex.
Anderson,	Bingham	Burlison, Mo.
Calif.	Blackburn	Burton, John
Anderson, Ill.	Boggs	Burton, Phillip
Andrews, N.C.	Boland	Butler
Andrews,	Bolling	Byron
N. Dak.	Brademas	Camp
Annunzio	Bray	Carter
Archer	Breckinridge	Casey, Tex.
Arends	Brinkley	Chamberlain
Ashbrook	Brooks	Chappell
Aspin	Brotzman	Clancy
Badillo	Brown, Calif.	Clausen,
Baflis	Brown, Mich.	Don H.
Bauman	Brown, Ohio	Clay
Beard	Broyhill, N.C.	Cleveland
Bell	Broyhill, Va.	Cochran

Cohen	Hungate	Rhodes
Collier	Hunt	Rinaldo
Collins, Ill.	Ichord	Roberts
Collins, Tex.	Jarman	Robinson, Va.
Conable	Johnson, Calif.	Robinson, N.Y.
Conlan	Johnson, Colo.	Rodino
Conte	Johnson, Pa.	Roe
Corman	Jones, N.C.	Rogers
Coughlin	Jones, Tenn.	Roncalio, Wyo.
Crane	Jordan	Roncalio, N.Y.
Cronin	Karth	Rooney, Pa.
Daniel, Dan	Kastenmeier	Rosenthal
Daniel, Robert	Kazen	Rostenkowski
W., Jr.	Kemp	Roush
Daniels,	Ketchum	Rousselot
Dominick V.	King	Roy
Danielson	Kluczynski	Roybal
Davis, S.C.	Koch	Runnels
Davis, Wis.	Kuykendall	Ruppe
Delaney	Lagomarsino	Ruth
Dellenback	Landgrebe	St Germain
Denholm	Latta	Sandman
Dennis	Lehman	Sarasin
Dent	Litton	Sarbanes
Derwinski	Long, La.	Satterfield
Devine	Long, Md.	Schroeder
Dickinson	Lujan	Seiberling
Dingell	Lukens	Shirley
Dorn	McClory	Shoup
Downing	McCollister	Shriver
Duncan	McCormack	Shuster
du Pont	McDade	Slkes
Eckhardt	McEwen	Sisk
Edwards, Ala.	McFall	Skubitz
Edwards, Calif.	McKinney	Smith, Iowa
Ellberg	Macdonald	Smith, N.Y.
Erlenborn	Madden	Spence
Eshleman	Madigan	Staggers
Evins, Tenn.	Mahon	Stanton,
Fascel	Mann	J. William
Findley	Martin, Nebr.	Stanton,
Fish	Martin, N.C.	James V.
Fisher	Mathias, Calif.	Stark
Flood	Mathis, Ga.	Steed
Flowers	Matunaga	Steele
Foley	Mayne	Steelman
Ford	Mazzoli	Steiger, Ariz.
Forsythe	Meeds	Steiger, Wis.
Fountain	Metcalfe	Stratton
Fraser	Mezvisinsky	Stubblefield
Frelinghuysen	Michel	Studds
Frenzel	Miller	Sullivan
Frey	Minish	Symington
Froehlich	Mink	Symms
Fuqua	Mitchell, N.Y.	Talcott
Gaydos	Mizell	Taylor, Mo.
Gettys	Moakley	Taylor, N.C.
Glaime	Mollohan	Thomson, Wis.
Gilman	Moorhead,	Tiernan
Ginn	Calif.	Towell, Nev.
Goldwater	Moorhead, Pa.	Traxler
Gonzalez	Morgan	Ullman
Green, Pa.	Mosher	Van Derlin
Gross	Moss	Vander Veen
Grover	Murtha	Vanik
Gude	Myers	Veysey
Gunter	Natcher	Vigorito
Guyar	Nedzi	Waggonner
Haley	Nelsen	Waldie
Hammer-	Nix	Walsh
schmidt	Obey	Wampler
Hanley	O'Hara	Whalen
Hanna	O'Neill	White
Hanrahan	Parris	Whitehurst
Harrington	Passman	Whitten
Hastings	Patman	Widnall
Hawkins	Patten	Winn
Hébert	Pepper	Wolff
Hechler, W. Va.	Perkins	Wright
Heckler, Mass.	Pettis	Wyatt
Heinz	Peyser	Wydler
Helstoski	Pickle	Wylie
Henderson	Pike	Yatron
Hicks	Poage	Young, Alaska
Hillis	Preyer	Young, Fla.
Hinshaw	Price, Ill.	Young, Ga.
Holt	Price, Tex.	Young, Ill.
Holtzman	Pritchard	Young, S.C.
Horton	Railsback	Young, Tex.
Hosmer	Randall	Zablocki
Howard	Rangel	Zion
Huber	Regula	Zwach
Hudnut	Reuss	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—105

Addabbo	Breaux	Clawson, Del
Armstrong	Broomfield	Conyers
Ashley	Burke, Calif.	Cotter
Baker	Burke, Mass.	Culver
Barrett	Carey, N.Y.	Davis, Ga.
Biaggi	Carney, Ohio	de la Garza
Blatnik	Cederberg	Dellums
Bowen	Chisholm	Diggs
Brasco	Clark	Donohue

Drinan	Lott	Ryan
Dulski	McCloskey	Scherle
Esch	McKay	Schneebeli
Evans, Colo.	McSpadden	Sebelius
Flynt	Mallory	Slack
Fulton	Maraziti	Snyder
Gibbons	Melcher	Stephens
Goodling	Milford	Stokes
Grasso	Mills	Stuckey
Gray	Minshall, Ohio	Teague
Green, Oreg.	Mitchell, Md.	Thompson, N.J.
Griffiths	Montgomery	Thone
Gubser	Murphy, Ill.	Thornton
Hamilton	Murphy, N.Y.	Treen
Hansen, Idaho	Nichols	Udall
Hansen, Wash.	O'Brien	Vander Jagt
Harsha	Owens	Ware
Hays	Podell	Wiggins
Hogan	Powell, Ohio	Williams
Holifield	Quile	Wilson, Bob
Hutchinson	Quillen	Wilson,
Jones, Ala.	Rarick	Charles H.,
Jones, Okla.	Rees	Calif.
Kyros	Reid	Wilson,
Landrum	Riegle	Charles, Tex.
Leggett	Rooney, N.Y.	Wyman
Lent	Rose	Yates

So the Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES ON MONDAY, AUGUST 12, 1974, TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 594) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 594

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, August 12, 1974, at 9 p.m. for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next the Speaker be authorized to declare recesses, subject to the call of the Chair.

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

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF AUGUST 12, 1974

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the distinguished majority leader to inform the House, if he is in a position to do so, as to the program for the balance of this week and the program for next week; and if possible, as to any plans the leadership might have for an August recess.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RHODES. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I shall be happy to respond to the distinguished minority leader.

The program for the House of Representatives for the week of August 12, 1974, is as follows:

Monday is District day, no bills. We will take up H.R. 14214, the health revenue sharing and health services, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

Following that, we will take up H.R. 5529, motor vehicle and schoolbus safety amendments, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

Following that, we will have S. 1728, War Claims Act Amendment, open rule and 1 hour of debate.

We will have a joint session at 9 p.m. to hear the President of the United States.

On Tuesday, we will take up H.R. 15544, Treasury-Postal Service appropriations, fiscal year 1975, conference report. Following that, H.R. 15155, conference report on public works appropriations, fiscal year 1975.

Then, H.R. 15405, conference report on Transportation appropriations, fiscal year 1975.

Then, we will take up H.R. 15264, Export Administration Act, open rule with 1 hour of debate.

This is the bill which was to have followed the military construction bill today but has been put over to next Tuesday.

On Wednesday, we will have H.R. 9989, real estate settlement procedures, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate. Following that, H.R. 12859, Federal mass transportation, subject to a rule being granted.

On Thursday and the balance of the week we will have:

H.R. 2, pension reform, conference report;

S. 3066, Housing and Urban Development, conference report;

H.R. 16168, State Department authorization, subject to a rule being granted; and

H.R. 15487, foreign investment study, under an open rule, with 1 hour of debate.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

At the present time, unless an emergency arises, we are not planning a Friday session for next week.

The minority leader asked a question with respect to the recess. After talking with the President of the United States and asking what his plans for the immediate future would be, it has been decided by the leadership on both sides of the aisle that at the close of business on Thursday, August 22, we will go into recess until noon Wednesday, September 11.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, AUGUST 12, 1974

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House ad-

journs today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

THE RESIGNATION OF PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today at noon Richard M. Nixon resigned as the 37th President of the United States and Gerald R. Ford was sworn in as the 38th President. Like most of you, I have mixed emotions about this unique period in our Nation's history.

What is there to say? What's done is done and I am greatly saddened by it all. Richard Nixon has been my friend and I will remember that. I will remember him as the President who ended the war in Vietnam, and brought our POW's home; who made the first giant strides toward open relations with China and Russia; who has done so much to diffuse the tinder box in the Middle East; and who, as a consequence of all this, has started us on the road to a generation of peace without the need to continue drafting our young men. I will remember a President who made the people of the South feel that they had a President who cared about them. And I will remember him as the first President to provide for construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. He even put his personal support behind this important project by coming to Mobile in 1971 to help us commemorate the start of construction.

Yes, I am very sad today that things have turned out as they have. But, I will remember the best in Richard Nixon, including his decision that resignation would be in the best interest of his country.

Now we can put behind us the obsession with Watergate and all its connotations as bad as they were, and get on with the pressing problems facing our Nation.

We know President Ford in this House. We know him as an excellent legislator who served here for some 25 years—about 9 of those years as minority leader. We know him as Vice President of the United States, and now our very good friend has risen to the highest office in the land. I have a tremendous respect for his ability to provide this country with great leadership. I believe he will get

us moving again and I pledge him my full support.

PRESIDENT NIXON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have just watched President Nixon leave the White House. Like millions of Americans, I am very sad—as though a member of my family had just passed away.

As he said his goodbys, Richard Nixon wept. I pray to God that President Nixon's tears could be joined with the oceans of tears wept this day throughout our land to flow across America like the tide, washing away bitterness and hate wherever it might dwell.

My respect for Richard Nixon and the unselfish ways in which he served his country is in no way diminished.

If we do, in fact, enjoy the generation of peace, which he so sincerely sought, it will only be because of his dedicated efforts.

His place in history is preserved as long as history itself is preserved. History will record that Richard Nixon ended America's involvement in our longest and costliest war—a war in Vietnam that was begun by someone else.

History will record that it was Richard Nixon who ended the "cold war" which kept the threat of nuclear destruction ever present in our lives for nearly three decades.

With so many outstanding accomplishments to his credit, then how do we explain this dramatic heartbreaking end to such an illustrious public career?

There is so much involved in this national tragedy that it staggers the imagination. It is impossible to effectively explain how circumstances of this magnitude could have gotten out of control—but there is no doubt—get out of control they did.

Maybe we expect too much from our Presidents—we elect them, then we expect them to wave a magic wand, immediately curing all the ills of the Nation and the world. But, rather than help our Presidents face the challenges, too many lurk for every opportunity to criticize, to accuse, to attack.

What we sometimes demand of our Presidents would require not only all the power of a total dictator, but even some of God's own divine power. And yet, often when a President attempts to do that which we demand, using only the human resources available to him, the attackers begin.

God has a plan—a purpose for our Nation—a plan that requires a certain unity on the part of Americans. Maybe in that plan Richard Nixon was destined to be a sacrifice—a sacrifice that would bring us to our senses—a sacrifice that would make us realize what we have been doing to ourselves in recent years.

Since the early 1960's, this Nation has been wracked by turmoil, discord, disunity, heartbreak, and pain. The list is long: The assassination of President Kennedy, the assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy; the assassination of

Martin Luther King; the attempted assassination of Presidential candidate, Gov. George Wallace; the driving from office of President Lyndon B. Johnson; the riots that have destroyed so much private and public property; the burning and looting of some of our Nation's cities; explosion of a bomb in the Capitol of the United States; attempts to shut down our National Government through violence and take over of Federal buildings in Washington, D.C.; the campaign to try to convince us that "God is dead;" and the hate and rancor that has too often spilled over on the floors of Congress. These, plus the lack of trust between people in government, added to accusations and convictions of leaders in high councils of government, including Members of Congress on charges of corruption, are distressing revelations of our times.

Maybe Richard Nixon was destined to be a sacrifice to teach us that Presidents, although expected to perform superhuman tasks, are themselves only human.

Yes, human, with the same feelings, the same desires, the same emotions, and the same faults that every one of us have.

Our Presidents need our help—not our hate. Our Presidents need our compassion—not our vindictiveness. Our Presidents need our understanding—not our condemnation.

MOMENTOUS EVENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the events of recent days are among the most momentous in this Nation's history.

Richard Nixon has become the first President of the United States to resign his office before completing his term, and Gerald Ford has become the first President of the United States to ascend to that great office without having first been a candidate for national office.

For millions of Americans, whose emotions and passions have been spent in the course of this long turmoil of the spirit, this is a time of both sorrow and relief.

Mr. Nixon's decision to resign his office, rather than subject the Nation to the ordeal of an impeachment trial, is an admirable and patriotic act which merits the praise and the respect of all Americans.

Throughout the course of his long and eventful career, Richard Nixon has served his country with great skill and dedication, and his many accomplishments—especially in working toward a safer and more peaceful world—will be long remembered and deeply appreciated by millions of people, here at home and around the globe.

And the Nation will soon come to know Gerald Ford, as I have known him, as a man of the highest integrity, as a Government leader of great talent and industry, as a patriot who loves his country deeply and who proclaims that love unashamedly.

He brings to the Presidency outstanding gifts of training and temperament which, I believe, will serve him and serve

the country well during his tenure in this high office.

As we move through this sad but orderly transition of leadership, the weaknesses common to men and the strength inherent in the law stand in sharp contrast. And if we learn no other lesson from this time of personal tragedy and national trial, we must learn anew—and teach our children—that our greatest faith and our highest allegiance must be with the law and the Constitution, which have sustained us and saved our Nation.

We cannot tie ourselves and our country to the fortunes of one man alone, for we know now beyond doubt that if he goes astray, our own path as a people will be fraught with uncertainty and peril.

It is symbolic of the strength of this Republic that an orderly transfer of power can be accomplished with dignity and statesmanship, and as we move forward under President Ford's leadership, let us pray that our strength will sustain us, that goodwill may banish rancor from our land, that compassion may rule our hearts, and that the future may bring a welcome peace to the American soul.

HOUSE ACTION NECESSARY ON IMPEACHMENT ARTICLES AND EVIDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, listening to Mr. Nixon's resignation statement last night, I felt pride in the strength and integrity of the American constitutional system. For this resignation was the equivalent of a removal of the President from his office by the Congress because of high crimes and misdemeanors. It was not, as Mr. Nixon claimed, a voluntary resignation; it was a resignation forced by the circumstance that Mr. Nixon had been informed the day before that he had no chance to escape impeachment and removal by the House and the Senate.

But I also felt shame that a President of the United States could still apparently feel no contrition for the disgrace he had brought to his high office or the damage he had done to the confidence of the American people in their system of government. Those feelings are tempered by appreciation and relief for Mr. Nixon's graceful, orderly passing of power. There was no lashing out at enemies or bitter statements. This sense of relief combines with brighter hopes for the future and an eagerness to return to working cooperatively on the Nation's pressing problems.

Many people will now want to forget all about Watergate, to leave to the courts and the Special Prosecutor whatever tidying up needs to be done.

But we must not forget Watergate, as Mr. Nixon asked us to do. We still do not have all the facts pertinent to the charges of misconduct in office which all members of the House Judiciary Committee now feel represented impeachable

offenses. It is extremely important that the American people know the full story—what happened—how did it happen—who was involved—and why it happened.

I understand that many Members of this body are pressing for some action by the full House to accept and perhaps approve the Judiciary Committee's findings in the committee's report which we will have early next week. These Members hope to wrap up the question of impeachment quickly and quietly and make a record which will serve as a guide to future Presidents.

But all the questions have not been answered, and the full story of Watergate is not known. Until the full story of Richard Nixon's involvement in the Watergate coverup and abuse of Presidential powers is known, history and the American people may forever suffer an incomplete understanding of these traumatic events and the lessons they must teach.

At a minimum, the tapes that that committee has subpoenaed must be produced. The Congress must take appropriate action to assure that all pertinent Presidential records are preserved and laid open, so that the American people can know the full facts of the shame inflicted on all of us, and may through their representatives take steps to show that they reject the immorality of that shame. In addition, we should consider legislation requiring that all Presidential papers, documents, tapes, and so forth, be turned over to the National Archives so that they be made available to the Congress and the public. In this instance, the past practice of allowing departing Presidents to take their papers with them and dispose of them as they wish should not be followed.

I expect many of my colleagues will find their political instincts make them cringe at these ideas. Partisans will charge harassment and vindictiveness.

Completing the record of Watergate is no such thing.

As to the possible prosecution of Richard Nixon for the crimes he has committed, that is a matter that the Congress may properly leave to our judicial system, and more particularly to the Special Prosecutor. There is no reason why Mr. Nixon should be given immunity, any more than any of his subordinates who conspired with him.

As this page in history is turned, we may all welcome Gerald Ford to the White House. While we may expect to differ with him on many issues, it will be a welcome change to have as our President a person we can trust to uphold the Constitution and to tell the truth.

THE 1974 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in our country and other parts of the Free World, the 15th anniversary of Captive Nations Week was successfully observed by free citizens who raised their voices in behalf of the human and national rights of the

captive nations and peoples in Eastern Europe, within the Soviet Union, in Asia, and in Cuba.

If anything else, the singular contribution of the week has been its stress on the need for a general and incisive reevaluation of our present type of detente policy and its effects not only upon the captive nations but upon our own national security interests.

As indications of this contribution to the public forum and as further evidences of the week's success, I submit for the considered reading of our Members and our citizens the following examples of the week's events:

The proclamation of Mayor Richard J. Daley of Chicago; the editorial "Captive Nations Week" in The New York Sunday News of July 14; a perceptive editorial in the Washington Catholic Standard of July 11, titled "Perennial Reminder"; resolutions of the Chicago Captive Nations Week Committee; a Public Affairs release written by Gen. Thomas A. Lane on "Second Yalta Betrays Captive Nations"; and the "Lest We Forget" list of captive nations in the June, 1974 issue of International Digest:

[Office of the mayor city of Chicago]

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, in accordance with Congressional enactment, Captive Nations Week will be observed during the period of July 15 through July 20; and

Whereas, under auspices of the Captive Nations Friends Committee the annual parade will be held on State Street, beginning at noon Saturday, on July 20; and

Whereas, many people of nations made captive by the imperialistic policies of Communism are linked by bonds of family relationships to citizens of this community; and

Whereas, it is appropriate for all freedom-loving people to demonstrate to the populations of the captive nations support for their just aspirations for liberty and national independence; and

Whereas, it is commendable in every way that citizens of the United States, in appreciation of their constitutional guarantees of freedom should extend sympathy and hope of liberation to those whose rights have been constricted by Communist aggression:

Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Daley, Mayor of the City of Chicago, do hereby proclaim the period of July 15 through July 20, 1974, to be CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK IN CHICAGO and urge general participation in the special events arranged for this time.

Dated this 26th day of April, A. D. 1974.
Richard J. Daley, Mayor.

[From the Sunday News, July 14, 1974]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

—is being observed, starting today, throughout the U.S. as it has been every third week in July since Congress so decreed in 1959.

At a time when our government is pursuing a policy of detente with the Communist oppressors of these enslaved peoples, Captive Nations Week may appear to some Americans an anachronism, a relic of the Cold War.

But we cannot turn our backs on those miserable, suffering millions—those "huddled masses yearning to breathe free"—without being false to all we believe, and to all for which America has stood from its founding.

In this area, the observance begins today with a 10 a.m. Mass in St. Patrick's Cathedral, followed by a march up Fifth Ave. to a rally at the Central Park Mall. We hope that citizens from the metropolitan area will turn out to swell the cry: Set these people free.

[From Catholic Standard, July 11, 1974]

PERENNIAL REMINDER

Captive Nations Week (July 14-20) is the perennial reminder of an ongoing reality. Millions of people throughout the world are still being denied the right to life in a free society. This takes on an even greater significance in the light of the present discussion of detente.

Dr. Lev. E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, long recognized as an outstanding authority on the background and fate of those who suffer the tyranny of national captivity, has prepared a detailed in-depth analysis of the subject in connection with the 15th anniversary of Captive Nations Week. In his paper entitled, "The Illusions of Detente," he points out that any effort toward detente without the dissolution of the factors which underlie these illusions "will only court disaster for us and the Free World."

At the present time, and despite the existence of the United Nations, 27 nations and groupings of people are under Communist domination. This denies to millions of people the fundamental rights guaranteed by the United Nations Charter. A number of nations have been held captive since 1920. Others became subject to this tyrannical rule subsequent to the creations of the United Nations, and as late as 1960. No nation or people once so subjected has ever regained freedom.

We recognize the enormity of the responsibility facing President Nixon and his Secretary of State, Dr. Henry Kissinger, in their dealings with the Soviet Union in the age of potential nuclear warfare. However, nothing in the reports of their recent state visit to the Soviet Union indicates any change in the basic attitude of the Soviet leaders with respect to the freedom of their people. Apparently the President did not raise the issue despite the deep concern felt by so many people in this country.

According to Dr. Dobriansky, Dr. Kissinger defines detente as "a process of managing relations with a potentially hostile country in order to preserve peace." This is nothing more than "peace at any price." It presumes, as well, the existence of conditions that in fact do not exist. Such a peace simply provides the condition for further additions to the already over-long list of captive nations. But even allowing for the possibility of success with such a pragmatic approach, Dr. Dobriansky points out that hard-nosed power plays of this type leave no room "for the moral forces of idealism, human rights, freedom, national independence, etc." It is perhaps the most absurd illusion concerning detente.

Despite our imperfections, this nation is founded on moral idealism to a degree unsurpassed in the history of man. The continuing impact of American idealism on the captive nations," says Dr. Dobriansky, "is boundless and is one of the greatest of our weapons against the Kremlin totalitarians." With this we must agree. Nor can this nation in her dealings with the "captor" nations forget even for a moment, the sad fate of the captive nations.

[Chicago Captive Nations Week Committee]

RESOLUTIONS

Whereas, in 1959 President Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Congress of the United States designated the third week in July as Captive Nations Week in order to focus world attention on the plight of those nations who have lost their national independence as the result of direct and indirect aggression of world communism; and

Whereas, the national independence of the (28) Captive Nations are: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, China (mainland), Cossackia, Croatia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Latvia, Lithu-

ania, North Korea, North Viet Nam, Outer Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tibet, Turkestan, Ukraine, Idel-Ural and other nations suppressed by their communist masters; and

Whereas, the Soviet Union has lulled the Western Powers into a false sense of security, and while talking "detente" has reached a pinnacle of military might and soon will surpass that of the United States; and

Whereas, it is horrifying to realize that one-third of mankind is already enslaved by communist tyranny—that threatens the security of the free world, communist propaganda has been allowed to carry on its deceptive work towards the weakening of the will for defense, the United States at this critical period for the entire free world to assume the role of real leadership, able to cope with these frightening facts; and

Whereas, the government of the Soviet Union has spread their propaganda throughout the United States and the rest of the free world for the purpose of blinding the people of the West towards its genocide of non-Russian Nations under its occupation; and

Now, therefore, be it resolved; the Chicago Captive Nations Week Committee, that special efforts must be made by the United States, towards an awakening of all these moral forces, humane ideas and values, the sacred rights of all the nations based on principles of democracy, self-determination, and sovereignty within their respective ethnic boundaries, must become the goal of the policy; and

Be it further resolved; the farce of "Patronage" diplomacy, secret talks, the wining and dining, the exchanging of diplomatic gifts, with the masters of the slave empires, will not bring about the pursuit of the God-given sacred rights of freedom for all captive nations of the world, the cries for freedom can still be heard, in spite of the diplomatic festivities; and

Be it further resolved, that the United States government stop building up the communist empire by selling it military and other equipment and trade, and that the media give greater coverage to the dissidents in the Soviet Empire. The Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn case illustrates, the power of public opinion and the role that the media can play in eliminating individual persecution and eventually, stopping the genocide of the enslaved nations; and

Be it further resolved, that this Committee desperately urge the establishment of the permanent Captive Nations Committee (House Resolution 211) and Freedom Academy, which has been long overdue; and

Be it further resolved, that the Captive Nations Committee, request the United States government to reaffirm its support for the aims and aspirations of the people of these captive nations in behalf of the restoration of freedom and democracy in these communist dominated countries.

VIKTORS VIKSNINS,

Chairman.

ALEXANDER KOEPP,

Estonia.

DR. GEORGE RADOYEVICH,

Serbia.

DR. ROMAN KOLYLCEKY,

Ukraine.

DR. NICHOLAS FERJENCIK,

Czechoslovakia.

LI-SUNG PANG,

China.

SABIN TORLO, Jr.,

Croatia.

J. WITKOWSKI,

Poland.

NICK ZYZISNUSKI,

Belarus.

ILMARS BERGMANIS,

Latvia.

JUOZAS BELILINAS,

Lithuania.

LASZLO MOGYOROSSY,

Hungary.

WILFRIED A. KERNBACH,

Germany.

[From Public Affairs, July 14, 1974]

SECOND YALTA BETRAYS CAPTIVE NATIONS

We begin Captive Nations Week in the backwash of the Moscow Summit—a study in contrasts. The original Captive Nations Week was inaugurated in the Eisenhower Administration, when the country regarded liberation of the captive countries as the sensible object of U.S. policy. But today, these are the forgotten peoples. Detente is designed to silence their cries.

When we examine the story of our ethnic Americans, we must be impressed by their lack of political effectiveness. Combined, they represent a powerful sector of the electorate. They have a common interest in U.S. foreign policy. But they are ineffectual because they are the captives of the political parties.

Both political parties court the ethnic vote, but only with promises. At election time they seek the support of the ethnic societies with expressions of sympathy and pledges of devotion to their interests. But in the international arena, U.S. officials have repudiated their promises to the captives to win the approbation of the masters. Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill promised the Four Freedoms but gave them Yalta.

The fate of the nations behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains hinges on the foreign policy of the United States. No one expects the United States to go to war to force liberation. But it seems reasonable to expect the United States and other free countries to have a continuing bias for freedom and therefore to further the liberation of the Captive Nations by all practical means. As President Nixon returns from a Second Yalta, similar in all essential respects to the first, we have the repetition of history, a sacrifice of the Captive Nations to advance the selfish interest of trade with the tyrants.

How can this be so? How can this nation so largely drawn from European nations now under the heel of communism or threatened by it court the oppressors and ignore the cries of the oppressed? Are our German, Polish, Hungarian and other ethnic societies so tied to Democratic or Republican apron strings that they accept supinely such betrayal of their true interests? Or are their leaders so witless as to be hoodwinked by the pretensions of peacemaking in which the betrayal is concealed.

Or are these ethnic Americans reluctant to press for policies in which they have a special interest? They should not be. The policy of appeasement and betrayal pursued by U.S. foreign policy for forty years has been deeply injurious to our national interests. Those Americans who by their special heritage are endowed with clear vision of the error have a civic duty to expose and oppose it with all the resources at their command.

There is no hope for the Captive Nations except in the re-direction of U.S. foreign policy. That change of course will not be taken by our business interests which are drooling over the prospect of trade with the Soviet Union and Red China. It probably will not happen short of catastrophe unless a powerful coalition of our ethnic societies severs association with both political parties and forms a separate block committed to the restoration of freedom in the communist-ruled states.

How ironic it is that the voices for restoration of civilized rule in the Captive Nations should come out of Russia itself, from the oppressed and suffering people and not from their cousins who live in freedom and comfort in the West! Does freedom undermine courage? Is it a luxury which blurs the mind and softens the will? Why else do we trifle with Watergate and ignore the agon-

izing oppression suffered by one-third of the world's people? Captive Nations Week asks us.

[From International Digest, June, 1974]

"LEST WE FORGET"—CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK
JULY 14-20

These nations have fallen under the yoke of Communist tyranny since the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 and remain in chains today:

Year of Communist takeover

People or nation:	
Armenia	1920
Azerbaijan	1920
Byelorussia	1920
Cossackia	1920
Georgia	1920
Idel-Ural	1920
North Caucasias	1920
Ukraine	1920
Far Eastern Republic	1922
Turkestan	1922
Mongolian People's Republic	1924
Estonia	1940
Latvia	1940
Lithuania	1940
Albania	1946
Bulgaria	1946
Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, et cetera, in Yugoslavia	1946
Poland	1947
Rumania	1947
Czechoslovakia	1948
North Korea	1948
Hungary	1949
East Germany	1949
Mainland China	1949
Tibet	1951
North Vietnam	1954
Cuba	1960

A MUST AND A SUGGESTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the temporary abatement in the drawn-out furor and upheaval that has characterized our governmental life the past few years brought about with the swearing in of Gerald R. Ford as the 38th President of the United States must not lull us into smugness and a fatal indifference to the imperative need to repeal the 25th amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Indeed, the foremost priority must be given this task of removing a mischievous—almost pernicious—appendage to the basic law of the land.

To those who are almost ecstatic about how all that has so unhappily transpired "proves how our system does work," some volunteering to point out how there are no soldiers on the streets and no violent men intent in wresting away control of our Government, et cetera. I must remind that a lot of this has been due to luck, happenstance, and the momentum of common institutionalized life, not zealous guarding of the weal.

I must needs remind them that had the individual in the Presidency been a less antagonistic character, or a more charismatic and loved personality, we might not have fared half as well.

Yet, despite the euphoria of the moment, there hangs over our national collective heads a sword of Damocles: The 25th amendment.

Back in 1966 when the resolution proposing this amendment was entertained in the House to my astonished disbelief, I stated that this type of law reminded me of a throwback to the Roman Senate days of intrigue and conspiracy and venal and bold and ambitious men. In vain did I attempt to conjure the vision of what could happen under the aegis of this amendment in our own Republic at some future time of stress and malaise. I never dreamed the day would have come upon us so soon.

The dormant bomb that is the 25th amendment is still ticking, and Mr. Speaker, until we defuse it by repeal, we are in mortal danger. I urge my colleagues to join me in considering most seriously the repeal of this fatally defective proviso.

Now for a serious and good faith bit of advice, by way of recommendation to our former colleague, now President Gerald Ford. Mr. President, today you have appealed to the Nation for forgiveness and a spirit of contriteness and harmony. In keeping with that request, I respectfully submit that you soberly and seriously consider a Presidential pardon to John Dean, and maybe two or three others, such as E. Krogh, because had it not been for the courage of a Dean, we would never have been apprised of the malodorous practices that have enveloped high national governmental life and brought us to such low state.

Consider for a moment that the saving feature of our society is always we have had men whose conscience has finally prodded them to rise above their ambition and selfish strivings—even at the risk of obloquy—and sounded the alarm. Dean did not perjure himself either. His was an American conscience crying out its remorse. He deserves justice and compassion; he defied the mendacious tyrant. His story was proven true by the torrent of events and climaxed at the eleventh hour by the former President's admission that he, Nixon, had lied—and John Dean had told the truth.

President Ford, I respectfully and humbly submit to you just as a starter to prove the sincerity of your national plea by forgiving John Dean.

THE DEPARTURE OF PRESIDENT NIXON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, last evening at 9:05 p.m., our President, Richard M. Nixon, announced his decision to resign from the high public office to which he had been elected less than 3 years ago. The heart of this Nation and the hearts of its people—myself—included—skipped a beat as those fateful words were uttered. There was no feeling of relief or jubilation, but rather a sense of painful and perhaps stoic acceptance.

This is not the time to second guess the wisdom or propriety of his decision. It must be received as it was given—in the expectation that the action was in the best interest of the Nation. Yet, at

this early date, something very important can be gleaned from the events of the past 2 years. It is the strength of our form of government. Today, we shall have a new President, and soon we are to have a new Vice President, neither of whom has been elected to those offices through the usual electoral process. Nonetheless, they will be accepted without question. There has been no violent overthrow of power. There has been no toppling of our democratic institutions. This country's form of government and its people have withstood a serious onslaught not only by some of the actions of Mr. Nixon himself, but also, and more critically, in the last 2 years, by the very process of obtaining the truth. The strength of our Nation has been illuminated throughout the world.

Why is it that we still believe in and adhere to those words set down in the Constitution nearly two centuries ago? Perhaps that question, if answerable at all, will be considered by the historians and psychologists of the future. But there can be no doubt that in bad times as well as good it is those articles, phrases, and clauses to which we cling for guidance and structure.

It is the Constitution and through it our form of government for which we have struggled and must continue to struggle to preserve. It is an often quoted phrase that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." It must be admitted by those who now hold public office as well as by the public in general that in the recent past we have been less than vigilant in our preservation of our institutions. We have taken our system of government for granted. We have taken advantage of it, and now we all must share in the sadness of Richard Millhous Nixon. None of us are above the ramifications of what has transpired in the past 2 years. It may be too soon to say that our Constitution has withstood its greatest test, but it is certain that this peaceful transfer of power speaks highly for the ability of this Nation and its leaders to cope with the most heart-rending of problems.

Repeatedly over the past 2 years, commentators both here and abroad have wondered just how much the American people can endure. The answer now seems clear. The American people can endure all that is necessary. There is a growing suggestion that the people have become increasingly cynical of their elected officials. Regardless of the truth of that observation, their belief in the domestic form of government itself has been exposed and strengthened.

Furthermore, the work of the House Judiciary Committee in its deliberations concerning the grounds for impeachment of Mr. Nixon cannot be slighted. The willingness of those 38 men and women to pursue the facts with courage, intelligence, and dignity was transmitted to the entire Nation on nationwide television. Mr. Nixon was not driven from the White House as the result of a partisan "witch hunt." His decision to resign was executed in the midst of the appropriate constitutional process of impeachment. It was an awesome power which was not lightly included by the framers in this document. However, the greatness of that

power could not reasonably prohibit its implementation. The propriety of that proceeding has been brought out by subsequent revelations.

Less than 2 weeks ago, those Representatives cast their votes either for or against the impeachment of a President of the United States. It is fair to say that at the time, not one of them anticipated that their action would become the end and not the beginning of that constitutional process. Unknown to them, they were given the tremendous burden of defining for posterity the meaning of the "checks and balances" system that is the very heart of our democratic institutions. It was they who set at least general limitations on the power of the Presidency. It is because of them that future Presidents will be on notice of the responsibilities of their office and the ability of Congress to hold them to account for serious abuse of that office. It is through them that the nebulous term "high crimes and misdemeanors" received some clarification. It can only be said that they did their job well, and for that everyone must be grateful.

Today Gerald Ford becomes the 38th President of the United States, and today the work of the Nation and this Congress begins anew—to work together to solve the problems of the economy, the arms race, and a myriad of others. The Nation may be shaken, but it is not shattered. It need not be emphasized, for it should go without saying, that this Nation and this Congressman intend to pledge allegiance to him as President and will endeavor to cooperate with him to every extent possible, and with due respect to that office which came to him at such great cost—the price of eternal vigilance.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF HERBERT HOOVER'S BIRTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MEZVINSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of our 31st President, Herbert Clark Hoover. West Branch, Iowa, a town near my home, will be the site of a celebration to commemorate his birth. On this occasion, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the extent of this great humanitarian's public service.

Although Herbert Hoover is best remembered as President from 1929–1933, some of his greatest accomplishments were achieved in his non-Presidential years.

Three times he was called upon to oversee the distribution of food to starving people all over the world—after the Boxer Rebellion in China and after the First and Second World Wars in Europe. He used great skill and compassion in assuring that millions of the hungry survivors of the war-ravaged nations of the world were fed.

After Mr. Hoover had been in public service for nearly five decades, he continued to work for the public in spite of his advancing years. As Chairman of the Commission for Reorganization of the Executive Branch—1947–49—and its

successor, the Second Commission on Reorganization—1953-55—he made important contributions to the efficiency of the executive branch of the Government.

As we consider this centenary of Herbert Hoover's birth, we remember him as a great Iowan and a tirelessly dedicated public servant.

"WHY I LOVE AMERICA" PROGRAM BUILDS TRUST AND CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CHAPPELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest needs in America today is to create a better thinking and working relationship between our young people of high school age and the civic and business leaders in their communities. This is especially needed today at a time when many events have shaken the very foundation of public trust and confidence upon which our political institutions have been built. Now, more than ever before, we must find ways to instill in our young people an appreciation for the ideals upon which our Nation was built and to encourage people in all segments of our communities to rededicate themselves to these ideals.

One outstanding example of how to help bring about this patriotic reawakening is the "Why I Love America" program, begun in DeLand, Fla., in my congressional district. Its objectives are to create a better thinking and working relationship between loyal, young Americans at the community level and their civic, business, church, and fraternal leaders. These objectives have been attained by: First, training high school students to speak to adult community organizations about the virtues of our free society and the free enterprise system—acknowledging the need for change but emphasizing the basic strengths of the system; second, motivating other students to write essays on the subject, "Why I Love America"; and third, motivating artistically inclined students to create inspiring and patriotic-type posters which are displayed throughout their community. The program has received a warm response from the DeLand community including civic groups, parents, and the news media.

The "Why I Love America" program was the brainchild of Barry Crim, a retired lawyer and educator, who saw the need for greater confidence in our Government and for more meaningful dialogue between high school students and community leaders. I have been privileged to work closely with Mr. Crim on this program since its beginning in 1971. It was initially sponsored by the DeLand Kiwanis Club and the DeLand Area Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Crim, a native of Georgia, wanted to provide this patriotic service to the young people and adults in his home area. He solicited the support of the Rotary Club of Warm Springs and Manchester, Ga., which sponsored the second "Why I Love America" program, which was endorsed in a

statewide proclamation by Governor Jimmy Carter.

Florida's Governor Reubin Askew has proclaimed this week of August 5-12, 1974, as "We Love America Week" in Florida as yet another endorsement in behalf of the "Why I Love America" program. In his proclamation, Governor Askew notes:

It is essential that we "light a candle, not just condemn the darkness of political immorality" by implementing a positive, patriotic program at the local government level to underscore and emphasize a rededication by each of us to the true patriotic ideals of our forefathers and to the principle upon which our political institutions are based.

"Why I Love America" is just such a patriotic program.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to give recognition here to some of the patriotic citizens who implemented and promoted the "Why I Love America" program.

From DeLand—Ralph H. Bowles, Forrest E. Breckenridge, William R. Cambron, Mrs. Sue Collier, Mrs. Elsa S. Corning, Dermott Dessert, Dr. Joseph R. Estes, James H. Ford, Ned Grimes, Caywood Gunby, Richard Heard, James R. Lawrence, Glen W. Martin, John H. McEwen, Miss Harriet Roberts, Miss Debbie Rogers, Mike Ross, Dean Smith, Robert Smith, Miss Karen Taylor, Robert B. Weaver, and Mrs. Evelyn West. From nearby communities—Ed Dunn and Kiwanis Lt. Gov. Paul Shuler of Daytona Beach; Judge Douglas Stenstrom of Sanford; Col. Mace Harris, Orange City; Roy M. Foster, Lake Helen; and Past Kiwanis Governor Russell Cole of Orlando. From Georgia—Marvin Enquist and Jim Cole of Warm Springs and James Evans and Cecil Hamby of Manchester. I commend each of these individuals for their support of the "Why I Love America" program.

Mr. Speaker, there is a need for this program in every community in America. I have watched the tremendous response in DeLand to the student speakers, the essay and poster contests, and the feeling of patriotism and loyalty which swells within the community as the goals and dreams of America are communicated through art and the spoken and written word of our great young people. I commend the "Why I Love America" program to communities throughout America. Further information may be obtained from Mr. Barry Crim, 434 North Colorado Avenue, DeLand, Fla. 32720.

I request that a copy of Governor Askew's proclamation be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the recent revelations of public corruption and immorality at all levels of government have seriously eroded the confidence of the American people in the political leaders of our Nation, and

Whereas, these revelations have shaken the very foundation of public trust upon which our political institutions have been built, and

Whereas, there is no more noble nor necessary goal than to work to immediately restore the confidence and trust of the American people in our political institutions and leaders, and

Whereas, it is essential that we "light a candle, not just condemn the darkness of political immorality," by implementing a

positive, patriotic program at the local government level to underscore and emphasize a rededication by each of us to the true patriotic ideals of our forefathers and to the principle upon which our political institutions are based, and

Whereas, the DeLand Area Chamber of Commerce, the DeLand Chapter of the American Association of Retired Persons, and the Patriotic Education, Inc., organizations are sponsoring an oratorical presentation for all high school and college age students in the Greater DeLand Area with the theme, "Why I Love America," and

Whereas, the week beginning August 5-12, 1974, will be observed by these organizations and other interested citizens as a time to emphasize true patriotism to our Nation;

Now, therefore, I, Reuben O'D. Askew, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Governor of the State of Florida, do hereby proclaim the period of August 5-12, 1974, as We Love America Week in Florida, and urge all of our citizens to join together in allegiance to our Nation and to the precepts upon which our political institutions and system were founded.

A REAFFIRMATION OF FAITH IN OUR POLITICAL SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I think this is an appropriate time for me to express some thoughts on the events of the last 24 hours.

We can all be gratified that the President last night made probably the most statesmanlike speech in his entire career. He did not choose to divide us. Rather he tried to unite us.

I think we can also be proud that he chose to emphasize the tremendous achievements of his own administration and the lofty goals which he aspired to and, I assume, still does.

It is tragic indeed that a nation has to come to the point where its Chief Executive is forced by public opinion and by, as he put it, the loss of support in Congress, to resign before the end of his term. Yet I think this would not have occurred had the President not failed to realize that it is not alone high ideals and high goals and high ends that a President or a political leader must have, but he must also be scrupulous about the means which he employs to achieve his ends. The tragedy of Richard Nixon is that his choice of means did not always equal his high ends. That is a lesson for all of us in political life and, of course, life in general.

It was also gratifying today to hear our new President, Gerald Ford, in his inspiring and straight-from-the-shoulder inaugural speech to the country. We can be proud of that speech. I sent him a telegram expressing my pride and my support for his efforts to lead us to peace, to solve the Nation's problems, to bring us together again, and to restore the faith of the people in our political system.

Mr. Speaker, our political system has proved that it is strong. The events of the last weeks and hours have been a triumph for our Constitution and for the genius of our Founding Fathers, who foresaw the need for constitutional provisions to meet the very kind of situa-

tion which we have faced during the last few months. Because the Founding Fathers understood history and human nature, the concepts they created still work.

But they also work because a great many people in the Committee on the Judiciary and in the Congress have been dedicated to making them work and have been faithful to the pledge, in their oath of office, to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.

I have heard many comments by Members of this body and by people in my district and elsewhere that the proceedings of the Committee on the Judiciary restored the faith of the people in the House of Representatives and in the Congress. I am gratified to have been a part of those proceedings. If we did help restore the people's faith in our institutions, it is because the members of that committee as a whole showed their dedication to the Constitution and to the laws of the country and to their duty, as Members of Congress and regardless of party affiliation, to uphold the law, follow the truth wherever it may lead, and let the chips fall where they may.

We can be gratified that we have had a reaffirmation by the people and the Congress of the concept that no man is above the law.

Finally, I think we can be gratified in the character of the leadership we have had in our committee. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), the chairman of the committee, has received universal acclaim for his fairness, his courage, his wisdom, and his patience.

I do not think anyone can quarrel with his leadership of our committee, his selection of an outstanding professional staff, and the fairness and courtesy with which he has treated all Members.

If there were to be a monument to the 93d Congress, it should be in the work of the Committee on the Judiciary, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) which has renewed our self respect and the faith of the people in our institution.

AMERICAN CAUSE

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, editorial comments in major newspapers reveal significant interest in a new organization which is known as American Cause. It is essentially composed of those who seek to encourage confidence in American and who wish to stress the positive side of our great country, in contrast to the barrage of negative charges which has caused concern and even despair in so many areas.

Two editorials which have been brought to my attention are of particular interest. They are from the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner of July 4, and the Washington Star-News of July 17. I submit them for reprinting in the RECORD:

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, July 4, 1974]

FOURTH OF JULY—REBIRTH OF PATRIOTISM

America's 198th birthday is an appropriate occasion for the birth of an organization sworn to defend the U.S.A. from those committed to destroying this nation.

Under the guidance of former Sen. George L. Murphy, a bipartisan organization was conceived and developed that is dedicated to the preservation of traditional American values and restoring and protecting the basic elements of our political philosophy.

Headquartered in Washington, D.C., the newly-born organization, will be known as American Cause. It will accomplish its goal of countering the widely-disseminated negative elements about this society through coordinating the efforts of organizations that believe in the basic American philosophy.

At this period in our history, when it's too often considered "profound" or "fashionable" to downgrade the greatness of America, the commitment of an organization to lend its efforts in America's behalf cannot be too highly praised.

Through a bipartisan, congressional advisory committee, American Cause intends to be guided on programs which require public attention. It intends to supply necessary research, speech writers, expert consultants in all fields, credible witnesses before congressional committees, and other means to neutralize the constant barrage of negative charges that is causing a national despair.

Because American Cause believes that some self-appointed liberal "intellectuals," leftist writers, and some members of the press and media are steadily—if not purposely—misleading and confusing the American people, it has pledged to counter this unhealthy situation.

George Murphy and his advisory committee deserve praise and support. Citizens interested in contacting American Cause may reach it by writing to its headquarters, at 905 Sixteenth Street, N.W.; Suite 304; Washington, DC 20006.

[From the Washington Star-News, July 17, 1974]

MURPHY'S "AMERICAN CAUSE"

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

George Murphy called a press conference the other day, but almost nobody came. This was a pity, because the former California senator is a good man, and he was engaged in launching a worthy venture.

The old hoover's purpose was to announce the formation of "American Cause." Though he wouldn't say so directly, American Cause obviously is intended to function as a conservative counter-force to the liberals' Common Cause. It is a consummation, as a certain Scandinavian used to say, devoutly to be wished.

Under the leadership of John Gardner, Common Cause has become one of the best-heeled and most effective lobbies in town. There was a time when Americans for Democratic Action served as front-runner for liberal propositions. When ADA ran out of wind, Common Cause picked up the torch. Now Common Cause is hustling from here to California on everything from consumer protection to the federal financing of elections.

If I voice admiration, I voice envy also. I wish Gardner's outfit were on our side. Respectable American conservatism could use 330,000 contributors pitching in \$6 million a year. Our side has nothing like that.

If you listen for the voice of American conservatism, you will hear the urbane accents of National Review and the homespun strictures of Human Events. You will hear a few columnists and a few newspapers, notably the Wall Street Journal, but in terms of

organizational voices, you will hear very little.

Barry Goldwater's fledgling Free Society Association crashed before it ever flew. Americans for Constitutional Action is inactive. The American Conservative Union has done some first-rate things—its attack on the President's Family Assistance Plan was a masterful job—but ACU has become so identified with Ronald Reagan that it lacks a broad base.

Out on the extreme edges of right field are Liberty Lobby and the John Birch Society, whose suicidal practice is to drown their sensible positions in great baths of hogwash. That's about it.

Will Murphy's American Cause get off the ground? It hurts to say this, but I doubt it.

Conservatives are a funny breed. Politically and ideologically, they are loners. They tend to peer through their microscopes darkly, seeing one issue at a time: gun control, right to work, fluoridation, racial balance busing, arms limitation, pornography.

Thus blinkered, they cannot be distracted by issues on either side. I once knew a rich Southern gentleman, now dead, who proposed to put up \$50,000 to found a conservative organization. There was this hitch: The organization's sole purpose would be to prove that the 14th Amendment never had been ratified.

In launching American Cause, Murphy is tackling this natural perversity of the American right. Liberals have no such problem. They have a splendid motto: United we stand. Ours is different: Divided we fall.

Once Murphy moves beyond the patty-cake issues and plunges into areas of passionate disagreement, he is likely to shatter his constituency before he ever gets it glued together.

Yet the effort is worth a try. Murphy's prospectus rings all the old nostalgic chimes. American Cause would promote "a firm belief in the Constitution, free speech, free practice of religious worship, a responsible and trusted free press, the free enterprise system, the profit incentive, the right of private ownership of property, the maintenance of peace and safety in our communities, and the guarantee of national security from all enemies."

These are admirable goals, broadly appealing, but they are fuzzy around the edges. If American Cause is to compete with Common Cause in the arena of ideas, it will have to sharpen its aim and focus on specific targets.

The unavoidable risk is that some of Murphy's conservative prima donnas, offended at the neglect of their solo projects, will then stalk off the stage and go home.

ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHT SPONSORS OF RESOLUTION URGING WITHDRAWAL OF FOREIGN TROOPS FROM CYPRUS

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on August 2, 1974, on behalf of the gentleman from Maine (Mr. KYROS), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. YATRON), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BAFALIS), and myself and a number of other Members of the House, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 577 and a companion resolution calling for the immediate withdrawal of all foreign troops from the Republic of Cyprus and the restoration of peace by the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I shall on Monday next introduce another resolution, identical to House Concurrent Resolution 577, with additional cosponsors.

This further resolution now brings the total number of cosponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 577 to 108 Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the need for the passage of this resolution is eloquently summarized in the following editorial, of August 8, 1974, from the Washington Star-News, and I ask unanimous consent to insert this editorial at this point in the RECORD.

SLIPPERY TRUCE

The persistent violations of the Cyprus cease-fire agreement are a disheartening commentary on the readiness of the antagonists to reach an early and durable settlement on the island's status. The gunfire, the military maneuvering and the continued endangerment of isolated groups of civilians provide a poor climate for the second round of Geneva talks aimed at ending the crisis.

The aggressiveness of Turkish forces, in enlarging the wedge of territory they control between the outskirts of Nicosia and the north coast around Kyrenia, has presented the most blatant threat to the truce. Greek Cypriot forces have dragged their feet on the cease-fire requirement that they evacuate Turkish Cypriot enclaves elsewhere on the island. They surround and have made hostages of some Turkish communities, and hold thousands of Turkish Cypriot prisoners. Lightly-armed United Nations troops, assigned the thankless job of preventing clashes between Greeks and Turks, have been pushed around unconscionably by both sides, suffering more than a score of casualties in the process.

The solidification of the July 30 cease-fire should be the first task of the diplomats in Geneva. Then the longer-range questions of Cyprus' future can be given proper attention.

Turkey in particular should be made to see the wisdom of quitting while it is ahead. Its successful invasion has enormously enhanced the Turkish Cypriot bargaining position. A reckless military government in Athens, after sponsoring the disastrous coup that overthrew Cypriot President Makarios, has been replaced by a moderate civilian model anxious for a settlement of the long-festering Cyprus question. The Turkish demand for a federation of semi-autonomous Greek and Turkish cantons on the island, with the Turkish minority enjoying possibly an equal say in joint affairs, has a good chance of carrying the day. But if Ankara overplays its hand it could undercut and even bring down the new Athens regime, revive the possibility of direct warfare between Greece and Turkey and delay indefinitely a peaceful solution for Cyprus.

The United States is not an official participant in the negotiations about Cyprus, which immediately involve Greece, Turkey, and Britain as the 1960 guarantors of Cypriot independence, joined by representatives of the new Clerides government in Nicosia. But Washington's considerable influence with Greece and Turkey should be used to close out the prospect of renewed hostilities between the NATO allies and their adherents.

Mr. Speaker, I invite other Members of the House who may not already have done so to join in cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 577, the text of which follows:

Whereas a settlement of the present conflict in the Republic of Cyprus is vital to the peace and security of the eastern Mediterranean and is in the best interests of world peace and stability; and

Whereas a settlement depends upon the right of the Cypriot people to determine their own destiny and the efforts of the United Nations to act as a negotiating body; and

Whereas Resolution 2077(xx) adopted by the General Assembly on December 18, 1965, "calls upon all states . . . to respect the sovereignty, unity, independence, and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus and to refrain from any intervention directed against it"; and

Whereas the continued presence of foreign troops in Cyprus undermines the ability of the Cypriot people to resolve their own crisis and the efforts of the United Nations to restore peace; and

Whereas Resolution 353 adopted by the Security Council on July 20, 1974, "demands an immediate end to foreign military intervention in the Republic of Cyprus" and "requests the withdrawal without delay from the Republic of Cyprus of foreign military personnel present otherwise than under the authority of international agreements. . ."; and

Whereas the declaration on Cyprus signed by the foreign ministers of Britain, Turkey, and Greece, in Geneva on July 30, 1974, calls for a "timely and phased reduction of the number of armed forces" from Cypriot soil; and

Whereas the continued presence of foreign troops in Cyprus violates international agreements and United Nations resolutions, threatens the independence and territorial integrity of the island, jeopardizes peace and stability in the eastern Mediterranean, and imperils the very existence of NATO: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That all foreign troops currently involved in Cyprus be withdrawn immediately so that the United Nations may be permitted to restore peace to the island and the Cypriot people guaranteed the right to determine their own destiny.

Mr. Speaker, I list at this point in the RECORD the cosponsors of the resolution urging withdrawal of foreign troops from Cyprus:

Mr. Brademas, Mr. Kyros, Mr. Yatron, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Bafalis, Mr. Wolff, Mr. Annunzio, Mr. Van Deerlin, Mr. McFall, Mr. Burke of Massachusetts, Mr. Waggoner, Mr. Koch, Mr. Breaux, Mr. Lott, Mr. Ginn, Mr. Clark, Mrs. Boggs, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Johnson of California, Mr. Smith of Iowa, Mr. Foley, Miss Jordan.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California, Mr. Price of Illinois, Mr. Dulski, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas, Mr. Boland, Mrs. Schroeder, Mr. Hechler of West Virginia, Mr. Steed, Mr. Downing, Mr. Macdonald, Mr. John L. Burton, Mr. Howard, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Moss, Mr. Obey, Mr. Yates, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Phillip Burton, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Drinan, Mr. Danielson, Mr. Patten, Mr. Gaimo, Mr. Reuss, Mr. Murphy of Illinois, Mr. Mazzoli, Mr. Mezvinsky, Mr. Long, Mr. McKay.

Mr. Steelman, Mr. Maraziti, Mr. Moorhead of California, Mr. O'Neill, Mr. Minish, Mr. Rinaldo, Mr. Ketchum, Mr. Hanrahan, Mr. Sarasin, Mr. Conte, Mr. Johnson of Colorado, Mr. McCormack, Ms. Abzug, Mr. Moakley, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Dickinson, Mr. Frey, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Steele, Mr. Treen, Mr. Huber, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Adams, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Zablocki, Mr. Preyer, Mr. Hicks, Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Podell, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Roe, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Nix, Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mr. Fascell, Mr. Hinshaw, Mr. King, Mr. Grasso, Mr. Young of Georgia, Mr. Seiberling, Mr. Rees, Mr. Carney, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Mollohan, Mr. Fish, Mr. Moakley, Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania, Mr.

Studds, Mr. Harrington, Mr. Gude, Mr. Stark, Mr. Ellberg.

TIME TO BIND UP THE WOUNDS

(Mr. MILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, with the resignation this morning of Richard Nixon as the 37th President of the United States an extremely difficult period in American history has hopefully come to an end. I am sure that Mr. Nixon did what he felt was in the best interests of the Nation. Nevertheless, the whole ordeal has been a shattering experience to him and his family, to the Congress, and to the entire country. I have known Richard Nixon for a long time and was a supporter of his legislative policies. It is deeply regrettable that this sordid, tragic Watergate matter should compromise his otherwise brilliant career in the public service for a quarter of a century. However, I am confident that history will record his bold initiatives and masterful pursuit of world peace and stability.

As Gerald Ford assumes the Presidency it is time to bind up the wounds of the past 2 years so that our new President can provide the leadership that will unite the country. We must now look to the great problems that face America and which have been too often overlooked by the Government during the controversy of the past 2 years. Foremost among these critical issues is the state of the economy and in particular the rapid inflation that has attacked each citizen's pocketbook. This problem can only be successfully confronted by the full cooperation of the President and the Congress.

I had the pleasure of serving in the House of Representatives when Gerald Ford was the minority leader. I can speak first hand of his abilities and dedication to serving this country. With his many friendships here on Capitol Hill and his knowledge of the workings of the Congress, Gerald Ford will, I am confident, be able to bridge the gap between the executive and legislative branches to insure coordinated efforts in resolving the Nation's problems. I take this opportunity to pledge my full support and cooperation to President Ford as he assumes his new and awesome responsibilities. I hope that all Americans, regardless of their political beliefs, will unite behind our new President and lay to rest any bitterness that remains over the tragic events of recent months.

THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

(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, I have been discussing the status of the American economy in recent radio broadcasts, and I thought that some of my colleagues might like to read my observations.

All of us are painfully aware of the

responsibility we bear to participate in those decisions which will set this country back on an economic course.

The scripts of the three broadcasts follow:

RADIO BROADCAST FOR WEEK OF JULY 22, 1974
Ladies and gentlemen, this is Congressman Jim Hanley speaking to you from our Nation's Capitol.

Recently, Dr. Herbert Stein, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, blamed the public for the current rate of inflation, claiming the taxpayers were reluctant to have a tax increase. I have never heard such nonsense before. This is only one more indication of the Administration's unwillingness to do anything substantive in curbing inflation, or in helping those who are hurt the most by inflation. Inflation is our Number One Problem, and it is a complex problem with no single institution to blame.

This is the first of three talks I will give on the economy. I am devoting this time to explaining why we are experiencing double digit inflation. I will not do the explanation justice, for it is too complex for even an hour lecture, but I do hope to convey the challenge we face.

A study of our present situation best begins with the Economic Stabilization Program put together by the Nixon Administration. The Wage-Price Controls they belatedly implemented were just beginning to work when the Administration decided the situation justified price increases, but not wage increases; thus the demise of Phase II. It was only natural, once given the chance, that the working man attempt to regain his rightful share of the economic pie. This by itself would not have been bad because the U.S. had a strong economy.

It was at this point that for the first time in history the whole world saw the opportunity for economic expansion. Usually, while some countries are experiencing growth, others are experiencing little or no growth. Since late 1972, all countries have been attempting to increase their share of world consumption, without a corresponding increase in production facilities. At the same time, food production did not fulfill expectations as growing conditions deteriorated in certain major agricultural regions of the world. One example of the unforeseen events was the unexplained disappearance of anchovies from the coast of South America in early 1973.

As it turned out, the best substitute for anchovies is soy beans. This led to an increase in the demand for soy beans, and the price of anything containing soy beans went up. I could go on and on, but the basic idea is that our economy has become so complex that many goods which seem to be unrelated are actually close substitutes, or use materials also used in the production of many far ranging commodities. When a shortage occurs in one area, it can affect many areas.

There are still other elements to inflation. The devaluation of the dollar caused a one time increase in the price of all imports. The increase in the cost of energy was extremely large, and has yet to make itself felt throughout the economy. These are price increases which we can do little about. They are simply decreases in all America's standard-of-living relative to the rest of the world.

One of the basic elements of all inflations, and this one is no exception, is that the government has increased the money supply at too fast a rate. This is a result of both fiscal and monetary policies, which have been attempting to improve the quality of life in the U.S. in the short run, while not examining the long run economic implications. Let me explain this point. An economy tends toward equilibrium. Whenever it is at a point away from equilibrium, it tends to correct itself. Thus, anytime there is more money cir-

culating than goods and services cost, the price of these goods and services is bid up. The long run effect of government policies designed to reduce some of our society's inherent inequities has been to cause the money supply to become too large.

The last reason for our high rate of inflation, and the most difficult to deal with, is the fact that inflation snowballs. People begin to expect inflation, and attempt to protect themselves from it; some being better able to protect themselves than others. It is for this reason that inflation must be curbed.

That is the problem. I will discuss solutions next time.

RADIO BROADCAST FOR WEEK OF JULY 29, 1974
Ladies and gentlemen, this is Congressman Jim Hanley speaking to you from our Nation's Capitol.

Curbing inflation is a most difficult process, especially if the policy is to be equitable. Any policy enacted must spread the cost of curbing inflation across the entire populace, and it must insure that the economy maintains its vitality.

After inflation, our most serious economic problem is that we need to renovate much of our capital investment. Certain industries simply do not have the capacity to produce the quantities demanded by consumers. In addition to insufficient capacity, a large proportion of our existing capital investment is old and needs replacement. Congress compensates industry for the cost of replacing old equipment through capital depreciation allowances, and without a doubt, some corporations have been negligent in their planning for such purchases. But the need for more capital expenditures is still there and must be met if we are to maintain a strong economy. Thus, corporations are scrambling for funds to invest and are helping to drive higher interest rates, which were already high, to compensate for inflation.

The result of this has been to throw the housing industry into total chaos. The housing industry is totally dependent on the ability of prospective home owners to acquire mortgages. These mortgages can be given only if savings banks, loan associations, and other thrift institutions have available adequate funds to award loans at interest rates the consumer can afford.

Right now, these institutions which form the backbone of our housing industry are seeing their deposits withdrawn in large quantities as large commercial banks, through their holding corporations, offer higher interest rates to attract funds, which they then loan out to large corporations. This is a most serious threat to our financial system, because our traditional means of financing home ownership faces total collapse if the trend is not reversed.

It is up to the Federal Reserve to hold down the rate of growth of the money supply, but at the same time to use more selective methods of credit and interest rate policy to reduce the great inequities in the current availability of credit. The economy is going to have to go through a period of sluggish economic growth while we curb inflation, and it is the Government's obligation to see that no area of the economy loses complete access to credit. Congress must look at ways to stimulate certain sectors of the economy, while restraining other sectors.

This brings to mind a problem. We need expanded production facilities. Corporations can use either retained earnings or borrowed money to finance their expansions. Presently many are borrowing, and disintermediation is occurring to accommodate their demand, with devastating effects on housing. This would not be occurring if firms were using retained earnings.

Congress is being urged by some to raise corporate income taxes. This assumes that corporations are receiving profits greater

than a reasonable return. If this were true, why aren't these firms using retained earnings, on which they pay no interest, for investment purposes. We do not have this information, and it is one more indication of the fact that the Government does not have adequate statistics on long-range economic conditions, something we need very badly.

It is in this light that the House Committee on Banking and Currency of which I am a member, has been holding hearings on monetary policy, interest rates, and inflation. We have heard testimony from economists, Federal Reserve Bank Presidents, and Dr. Arthur Burns, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve.

As you might imagine, these men hold differing opinions on the exact course monetary policy should proceed, but all agree that such policy should be made with more of an eye to long-run implications.

It is my hope that by holding these hearings, the Committee will be able to bring about a dialogue that is currently lacking in the determination of monetary policy. Doctor Burns is solely responsible for our monetary policy, and while he is a very capable person to have in charge of the Federal Reserve, he is not infallible as is proven by past performances.

It is up to Congress to give the Federal Reserve Board more guidance in policy parameters, since the FED has had a tendency to refrain from anything other than traditional means of managing the monetary aspects of the economy. If the Congress can come up with a better means of managing monetary policy, inflation will be easier to deal with, and all Americans will be better off.

RADIO BROADCAST FOR WEEK OF AUGUST 5, 1974

Ladies and gentlemen, this is Congressman Jim Hanley speaking to you from our Nation's Capitol.

This is the last of my three talks on the economy. I have already discussed the reasons we have double digit inflation and what direction monetary policy should go if we are to achieve a period of economic growth with stable prices. I would now like to outline other changes needed to fight inflation.

First, let me say that economic policy should be determined by the Executive Branch. It is much easier for the Administration to submit one proposal to Congress than it is for the many Members of the House and Senate, with their divergent philosophies, to formulate and agree on a policy. In April, I proposed a resolution calling for the Administration to bring forth a comprehensive policy for dealing with inflation, and Congress has not acted on it. The speech that Mr. Nixon gave on the economy a few weeks ago went in the right direction, but there was nothing substantive. We are in the midst of a situation that threatens to blossom into crisis proportions if action isn't taken soon and, unfortunately, the Administration is giving the problem only lip service. If the Executive Branch refuses to accept its responsibility, then the obligation is passed to the Congress, and we will have to attempt to bring together the many factions.

I was encouraged by the responses to my questionnaire regarding the economy. They showed that you, the citizens, are aware and in agreement that a whole series of coordinated actions are needed to reverse the present inflation-recession economy. Now the problem is to determine which actions should be implemented.

Last week, I discussed the need for monetary restraint and associated policies to cushion the credit situation. Monetary restraint alone cannot cure our economic ills; in fact, alone, it will probably make them worse. The most effective anti-inflation device is a surplus budget. Most projections for our current fiscal year say we will have

another deficit. The best we can probably hope for is a balanced budget.

Some would charge that the Congress is being fiscally irresponsible. Government policy is not made in an economic and social vacuum. Most budget allocations, especially the non-defense appropriations, are there for a good reason. Those who wish to cut the budget in one area will be opposed by others who cannot justify that particular cut, and vice versa. If the budget is going to be cut, it is up to the Administration to come forth with the proposals to decrease appropriations. A tax increase would decrease the inflationary influences of the budget, but we will not see an increase in taxes in 1974. Presently, a tax reform bill is pending before the House Ways and Means Committee. Its main purpose is to close loopholes which allow some to pay little or no tax, when their income is in the tens of thousands of dollars. The bill would also give middle- and lower-income families the tax break they deserve. I will do all that I can to see that this bill does not get lost in any preoccupation Congress might have with the impeachment process.

One of the Government's shortfalls is that all too often it does not look far enough into the future when making decisions. The Budget Reform Act of 1974 gives Congress, for the first time, the ability to analyze the entire budget in relation to the future.

It is my personal view that besides effective anti-inflationary monetary and fiscal policies, we need to devote special attention to the areas of food and energy. Congress is presently considering many energy proposals, but the Government has no long-range policies dealing with food production. That is the primary reason we have seen the market fluctuations become so unpredictable. Without a comprehensive policy to guide him, each producer does what appears to be in his best interest, and an erratic supply is the result. The Department of Agriculture should begin to fulfill its function of maintaining consistent market conditions for food commodities. That is one reason why Congress appropriates funds for the Agriculture Department, and I tire of their inactivity in this respect. It is but another indication of the lack of policy on the Administration's part.

The U.S. has the capability to pull itself out of its economic woes, but it cannot do so without leadership and a comprehensive policy. Although I wish Congress could go it alone, given the gravity of our situation, it cannot do so effectively. I am and will continue to urge the adoption of my resolution calling for the Administration to begin to deal seriously with the problems of the economy.

PRESIDENT FORD NEEDS TO TAKE A HARD LOOK AT THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are indications that the new President, Gerald Ford, plans to put emphasis on the economic troubles which beset the Nation.

If this is correct, I welcome this development and I sincerely hope that the new President will carry out his responsibility over the activities of the Federal Reserve Board. The Federal Reserve, through misguided monetary policies, has been the engine of much of our current inflation and no new economic program will succeed unless the President

is willing to make the Federal Reserve perform in the public interest.

The Federal Reserve's policy of using high excessive exorbitant and usurious interest rates as a means of fighting inflation has been a failure. It has obviously not stopped inflation but has resulted in tragic burdens for the plain people of the Nation and has bankrupted small businessmen and has contributed to a wide range of price increases.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that President Ford will take a hard look at how the Federal Reserve finances its operations. As this House well knows, the Federal Reserve uses the interest payments on the huge portfolio of paid-up bonds which reside in the New York Federal Reserve Bank. These interest payments currently run well in excess of \$4 billion annually and the Federal Reserve is free to finance its far-flung operations out of this fund without audits and without coming to the Congress for appropriations.

The bond portfolio has now grown to more than \$80 billion—something approaching 20 percent of the total national debt. These are bonds that have been paid for with the credit of the U.S. Government and they should be retired and subtracted from the national debt.

If these bonds were retired and removed as an interest-bearing debt obligation of the Federal Government, the Federal Reserve System would be required to come to Congress for appropriations like all other Government agencies. This appropriations process would be an important review of the Federal Reserve's activities and would give the Congress an opportunity to make the system more responsive to the needs of the country.

President Ford begins anew and this is a great opportunity to set the monetary house in order in all respects. As a new Chief Executive it would be highly beneficial for President Ford to call for a full-scale, top-to-bottom audit by the General Accounting Office of the Federal Reserve System. This would allow him to begin with a clean slate in the monetary area.

Mr. Speaker, while we are talking about audits, I would also like to call the President's attention to the fact that the Congress has just passed authority for Americans to own and trade gold. This reverses a policy of 40 years and the recent discussions of the gold question have raised lots of new issues. There is in some quarters confusion about how the Federal Government maintains its supply of gold and rumors about various aspects of this question continue to grow.

Therefore, I think it would be wise for some type of broad audit to be conducted of gold supplies owned and controlled by the U.S. Government. Such an audit, if conducted by the General Accounting Office, would do much to allay fears and put an end to rumors about the gold supplies. I hope President Ford will support and insist upon such an inspection by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. Speaker, the President should also consider the immediate implementation of Public Law 91-151—the Credit Control Act of 1969. This law, if triggered by

the President, would give the Federal Reserve the authority to control all aspects of credit including interest rates, maturities and downpayments.

Through the use of this law, credit could be allocated to the areas of greatest need—those areas starved for loan funds such as housing and small business. At the same time the Federal Reserve could use these powers to move credit away from inflationary areas and speculative undertakings.

On Thursday, 21 members of the Banking and Currency Committee—a majority—cosponsored a concurrent resolution calling on the President to use these powers and I hope that President Ford will take a hard look at this approach.

President Ford has indicated a desire to reconcile differences in the Nation and to gain the confidence of the people and I can think of no better way than to produce a consistent and clear plan to bring the Nation out of its current economic mess. And certainly a prime part of this plan must be a reduction in interest rates and an allocation of credit to the sagging areas of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that members of the Banking and Currency Committee will want to consider any new economic plans that President Ford may have. Much time has already been lost in dealing with economic problems and it is essential that we move forward in a meaningful fashion.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 15264

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to advise the House that there is a provision in section 6 of the bill H.R. 15264—amending the Export Administration Act of 1969—which, if enacted in its present form, may have the effect of voiding or nullifying the action of the House and the Senate in the enactment only this July 30 of a related measure, H.R. 15492, the military procurement authorization for 1975, which the President approved this week and is now designated as Public Law 93-365. The Congress wrote into Public Law 93-365, section 709, provisions which would assure its control over and provide effective oversight with respect to the export of goods and technology which would significantly increase the present or potential military capability of identified Communist countries.

Section 709 of the act requires that applications for the export of goods, technology, or industrial techniques to the named Communist countries must be submitted to the Secretary of Defense for review prior to final authorization of such export. If the Secretary of Defense determines that any requests for such export of goods or technology will significantly increase the present or potential military capability of such Communist country, he shall recommend that the President disapprove the application. If the President disagrees with

the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, the President is then required to submit his decision to the Congress. If the Congress within a period of 60 days of continuous session thereafter has not by concurrent resolution disapproved the application, only then may such goods or technology be eligible for export.

Now it is to be emphasized that this congressional control reserved in the Military Procurement Act can be effectively exercised only with respect to goods or technology for which a license or other authority is required. On the other hand, the bill now under consideration, H.R. 15264, contains provisions in section 6 thereof—lines 24, page 9, through line 6, page 10—which would as a practical matter nullify the reservation in the Military Procurement Act. H.R. 15264 would amend the Export Administration Act of 1969 so as not to require an authority, license, or permission to export goods, technology, or information, except to the extent that may be required in the implementation of section 3(2) of the Export Administration Act itself—section 2402(2) of title 50, appendix United States Code. While there is some broad reference to "national security" in this section of the Export Administration Act, it does not appear to me to be clear that there will be preserved a requirement for the maintenance of a licensing system for the implementation of the express policies contained in the provisions of section 709 of the Military Procurement Act—Public Law 93-365—as H.R. 15264 now reads.

In view of the fact that the present bill, H.R. 15264, was reported on June 19, 1974, prior to the enactment of the Military Procurement Act, the omission of a saving reference to Public Law 93-365 is understandable. I, therefore, advise the House that I will offer an amendment to the provisions of section 6 of H.R. 15264 by inserting immediately after the word "act" in line 5, page 10, the words "and section 709 of Public Law 93-365." I would hope that the managers of the bill will accept this amendment as I am sure they do not intend to repeal section 709 of Public Law 93-365.

CHILD CARE—WHO NEEDS IT?

(Mr. MEEDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, the Select Education Subcommittee is currently holding hearings on the Child and Family Services Act of 1974. This legislation seeks to improve the quality and quantity of services available to young children and families with a working mother.

Yesterday's Washington Post carried a summary of recent findings by the Census Bureau indicating that the number of families headed by women has increased by nearly 50 percent since 1960. The median income for this group is only one-half the national average, with nearly 40 percent living under the poverty level.

For the women heading these families, the choice is between work outside the

home and living on a welfare check. For those who choose to work, adequate child care is spotty, frequently unavailable, and expensive if it is high quality.

I believe the statistics cited in the following article underline the need to make supportive services available to families who both need and want them:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 8, 1974]

MORE WOMEN RUN FAMILIES

(By Peter Millus)

The number of families headed by women in the United States increased by more than a million in the last three years—as much as in the preceding 10, the Census Bureau said yesterday.

The bureau, in the first full report it has published on this problem-ridden and growing population subgroup, said one-tenth of all Americans now live in female-headed families, almost one-seventh of all children under 18 and almost one-third of all blacks in the country.

Nearly 40 percent of these 21.3 million people are poor as the government defines poverty—and these people make up fully a third of all poor people in the country. They account for more than half of the black poor. Black and white together, they are probably the largest identifiable group of poor people in the nation.

There were 4.5 million families in the country headed by women in 1960, 5.6 million in 1970. The bureau said there were 6.6 million in 1973, 12 per cent of all families 10 per cent of all white families and 35 per cent of black.

"This very rapid increase over the last several years," the bureau said, "has fostered a growing concern among social scientists and government planners regarding changes in family structure and composition."

"Much has been written, usually speculative in nature, about the general breakdown of family living arrangements in the United States. Theories range from the position that a basic transformation . . . is occurring to the position that recent changes are only momentary and the structure of the nuclear family, as we now know it, will be maintained."

The bureau offered various possible explanations for these changes. "High rates of marital dissolution through divorce and separation certainly have had an impact," it said.

"But there has also been an increase in the number of female heads of families who are single, which may be due in part to the retention of illegitimate children by their mothers and also to the liberalization of adoption procedures whereby single persons may now adopt children."

"Another important factor," the bureau's experts said in their report, "is the increased participation of women in the labor force," which has "led to increased economic independence among many women."

"Other factors possibly related," the bureau said, "are the increased availability of public assistance . . . as well as the changing attitude toward independent living among women today."

The rise of the female headed family has been most pronounced among blacks. Nearly 40 percent of all black children now live in such families. Since 1960, the total of all families in the country has gone up 21 per cent, the number of black female-headed families, 92 per cent.

The bureau said a rising percentage of women who head families are young, divorced and separated or single, and a declining percentage are middle-aged and widowed. More than half these women work, about a third of their families depend entirely on earnings for their incomes, and only about 11 per cent depend entirely on welfare or Social Security for income.

Median income of female-headed families is only about half the national median. In 1972 it was \$5,342 for all female-headed families, \$6,213 for white and \$3,840 for black. The poverty cutoff, according to the government, is now about \$4,500 a year for a family of four.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GOODLING (at the request of Mr. RHODES), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. LOTT (at the request of Mr. RHODES), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. TREEN (at the request of Mr. RHODES), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. O'BRIEN, for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PARRIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KEMP, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. SKUBITZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GINN) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOWARD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KOCH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEZVINSKY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SEIBERLING, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CHAPPELL, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PARRIS) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. WHITEHURST in two instances.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas in four instances.

Mr. HUDNUT.

Mr. HANRAHAN in two instances.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

Mr. BELL.

Mr. WALSH.

Mr. ARCHER in three instances.

Mr. LANDGREBE in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in three instances.

Mr. CARTER in two instances.

Mr. HOGAN in five instances.

Mr. FRENZEL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GINN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FISHER in four instances.

Mr. BRINKLEY.
 Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
 Mr. RARICK in three instances.
 Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.
 Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS.
 Mr. MURPHY of New York.
 Mr. MOLLOHAN.
 Mr. MURTHA in two instances.
 Mr. SYMINGTON in two instances.
 Mr. WON PAT in two instances.
 Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.
 Mr. PATMAN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 12, 1974, 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:

2645. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to assess civil penalties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2646. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the Act [8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(6)]; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1307. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7917. A bill to provide minimum disclosure standards for written consumer product warranties against

defect or malfunction; to define minimum Federal content standards for such warranties; to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act in order to improve its consumer protection activities; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-1275). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 16355. A bill to provide for a program of assistance to State governments in reforming their real property tax laws and providing relief from real property taxes for low-income individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEMP (for himself, Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 16356. A bill to reestablish the fiscal integrity of the Government of the United States and its monetary policy, through the establishment of controls with respect to the levels of its revenues and budget outlays, the issuance of money, and the preparation of the budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 16357. A bill to authorize the establishment of an older worker community service program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 16358. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 to provide for investigations and expenditure analyses of the use of public funds; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 16359. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to provide that inmates of county homes and similar institutions for the elderly who are contributing to their own support and maintenance may qualify for supplemental security income benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 16360. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to permit donations of surplus supplies and equipment to older Americans; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 16361. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to investigate and report to the Congress with respect to whether certain railroad facilities and equipment meet Federal safety standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16362. A bill to establish a Marine Fisheries Conservation Fund; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 16363. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for annual adjustments in the amount of personal ex-

emptions and the amount of the standard deduction to reflect increases in the cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 16364. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to provide for emergency assistance grants to recipients of supplemental security income benefits, to authorize cost-of-living increase in such benefits and in State supplementary payments, prevent reductions in such benefits because of social security benefit increases, to provide reimbursement to States for home relief payments to disabled applicants prior to determination of their disability, to permit payment of such benefits directly to drug addicts and alcoholics (without a third-party payee) in certain cases, and to continue on a permanent basis the provision making supplemental security income recipients eligible for food stamps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 16365. A bill to increase deposit insurance from \$20,000 to \$60,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Georgia:

H. Con. Res. 595. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Richard M. Nixon not be prosecuted for any offense, whether State or Federal, allegedly committed while he was in office as President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H. Con. Res. 596. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Richard M. Nixon not be prosecuted for any offense, whether State or Federal, allegedly committed while he was in office as President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (H.R. 16366) for the relief of M. Sgt. Gary O. Ostlund, U.S. Army, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

468. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, Midwestern Governors' Conference, Lincoln, Nebr., relative to agricultural imports; to the Committee on Agriculture.

469. Also, petition of the Monroe County Legislature, N.Y., relative to supplemental security income benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE—Friday, August 9, 1974

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers and our God, by whose providence this Nation was born and by whom we have been guarded and guided, in this hour of mingled tragedy and hope, lift our lives into the clear light of Thy presence and encompass

us with Thy love. By the miracle of Thy grace transform this time of sorrow and judgment into a season of cleansing and healing.

Deal graciously, O Lord, with our departing President. Accord him appreciation for every noble achievement, forgiveness for every acknowledged wrong, and grant him a new life of usefulness and inner peace. Surround his family with Thy comfort and love.

Grant to Thy servant Gerald Ford, on this day of dedication, a vivid awareness of Thy presence and the assurance of Thy supporting strength. Endow him

plenteously with the sinews of Thy spirit, with moral courage, with wisdom beyond his own, and with power to lead the Republic in reconciliation and unity, in peace and prosperity, in justice and righteousness.

Chastened and cleansed, but full of hope and faith, help us O God, in our private lives and as a people to walk in the ways of Thy commandments, to live by the truth, to do justly, to love mercy and to serve Thee with our whole heart and mind and strength and that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done on Earth. Amen.