

HR 1636

IP7984

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.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 120

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, AUGUST 9, 1974

No. 121

House of Representatives

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 3 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. 14328. 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 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. INOUYE, Mr. CHILES, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. MATHIAS, and Mr. BELLMON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 6, 1974, be corrected. They were improperly transcribed and printed.

The first sentence in the second paragraph of the third column on page H7706 of the RECORD should read as follows:

"It is not always wisely spent, but it must be admitted that money is the lifeblood of the Government."

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

There was no objection.

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

H 7983

August 9, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 7985

(Mr. YOUNG of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

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
Abzug
Adams
Anderson, Calif.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Archer
Arends
Ashbrook
Bafalls
Barrett
Bauman
Beard
Bell
Bergland
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Boggs
Roland
Brademas
Bray
Breckinridge

Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burgener
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, John
Burton, Phillip
Butler
Byron
Camp
Carney, Ohio
Carter
Cederberg
Chappell
Clancy

Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Cleveland
Cochran
Cohen
Collier
Collins, Ill.
Collins, Tex.
Conlan
Conte
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Crane
Cronin
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert
W., Jr.
Daniels
Dominkick V.
Danielson
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.

Delaney
Dellenback
Denholm
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dingell
Dorn
Downing
Drinan
du Pont
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Foley
Ford
Forsythe
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Froehlich
Fulton
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gettys
Gialmo
Gilman
Ginn
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grover
Gude
Guyer
Haley
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanley
Hanrahan
Hastings
Hawkins
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.

Helms
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Hinsshaw
Holt
Holtzman
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Huber
Hudnut
Hungate
Hunt
Ichord
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Jordan
Kath
Kastenmeyer
Kazen
Kemp
Ketchum
Kluczynski
Koeh
Kuykendall
Lagomarsino
Landgrebe
Latta
Leggett
Lehman
Litton
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lujan
Luken
McCloskey
McCollister
McCormack
McEwen
McFall
McKinney
Madden
Madigan
Mahon
Mann
Martin, N.C.
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Mayne
Mazzoli

Meeds
Melcher
Metcalf
Mezvinsky
Miller
Minish
Mink
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Moakley
Montgomery
Moorhead,
Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Neill
Parris
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peysers
Pike
Poage
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pritchard
Quillen
Rallsback
Randall
Rangel
Rees
Regula
Reuss
Riegle
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.
Roe
Rogers
Roncallo, Wyo.
Roncallo, N.Y.

Rooney, Pa.
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rousselot
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Scherle
Schroeder
Sebelius
Seiberling
Shiple
Shoup
Shriver
Shuster
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.

Spence
Stanton
J. William
Stanton,
James V.
Stark
Steele
Steelman
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Studds
Sullivan
Symington
Symms
Talcott
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Teague
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornton
Tliernan
Towell, Nev.
Traxler
Ullman
Van Derlin
Vanik

NAYS—1
Harrington
NOT VOTING—106

Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N.C.
Armstrong
Ashley
Aspin
Badillo
Baker
Bennett
Biaggi
Blackburn
Blatnik
Bolling
Bowen
Brasco
Breaux
Burke, Calif.
Carey, N.Y.
Casey, Tex.
Chamberlain
Chisholm
Clawson, Del.

Conable
Conyers
Culver
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Dellums
Devine
Diggs
Donohue
Dulski
Duncan
Edwards, Ala.
Esch
Flynt
Frey
Gibbons
Gooding
Grasso
Gray
Griffiths
Gross
Gubser
Hanna

Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hays
Heckler, Mass.
Hogan
Holifield
Hutchinson
Jarman
King
Kyros
Landrums
Lent
Lott
McDade
McKay
McSpadden
Macdonald
Mallory
Maraziti
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Michel

H 7986

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 9, 1974

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
Quie	Thone	Wyman
Rarick	Treen	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Adabbo 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. DeF 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. Mallary.
 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. Hollifield.
 Mr. Aspin with Mr. Hogan.
 Mr. Bennett with Mr. Quie.
 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. WHITTEHURST) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

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 construc-

tion. 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 806, 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 officers 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. WHITEHURST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITEHURST. 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 subcommittee 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 subcom-

mittee 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 asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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 system 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 approved 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 anti-submarine 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 anti-submarine warfare patrol aircraft; captor weapons system, which is a remote unattended anti-submarine 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 anti-submarine 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 committee's 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

August 9, 1974

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

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 gentleman 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 asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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 general provisions to authorize the Secretary of Defense to assist counties and com-

munities 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 asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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 air base 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 air bases, 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 mer-

its 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 combat fighter aircraft which would be deployed under various contingency situa-

tions, 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 asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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 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 academies' 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. RANDALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANDALL. 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

August 9, 1974

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 pull-out 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, \$19,073,000.
 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, \$7,643,000.
 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, \$1,853,000.

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, \$5,364,000.

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, \$2,048,000.

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.

August 9, 1974

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, \$8,011,000.
 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, \$3,188,000.
 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 92-546, 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 "\$570,439,900" and inserting in place thereof "\$523,433,000" and "\$582,266,000," 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 asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

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. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. 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 million 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.

August 9, 1974

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

(Mr. PRICE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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. BRAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks).

Mr. BRAY. 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 northwestern 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. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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 irrationally 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. O'NEY) 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. FRASER addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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. HARRINGTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRINGTON. 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. OBER) 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 ques-

tion 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 re-supply 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 asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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 4 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 gov-

ernment-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 "Field" 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 asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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 exceeded 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 exceeded 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.

August 9, 1974

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

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.

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

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

(Mr. KING addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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. CARNEY of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. 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

Eielson 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 \$6,000 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 broadest 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, \$640,000.

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

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, \$2,368,000.

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, \$55,049,919:

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, \$44,658,442.

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, \$260,000.

(2) The Department of the Air Force, two hundred spaces, \$888,000.

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

August 9, 1974

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. 629), 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 (e), 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. 1135).

(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 \$22,180,000 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. 1135), as amended.

(h) Test facilities Solid State Radar in the amount of \$7,800,000 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; \$337,000; \$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, 1158), 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 89-538 (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, Elyson, 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, Elyson,

thence north 3 degrees 55 minutes west along the east boundary of NETPDC a dis-

tance of 725.3 feet more or less to the point of beginning; from said point of beginning, continue north 8 degrees 55 minutes west along the east boundary of NETPDC a distance of 629.1 feet more or less to a point,

thence north 0 degrees 27 minutes west along the east boundary of NETPDC a distance of 633.3 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 26 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 24.8 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 538.6 feet more or less to a point,

thence south 44 degrees 35 minutes west a distance of 290.1 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 2682 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 have 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	Burlinson, Tex.	Dominick V.
Bafalis	Burlinson, 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	Ciancy	Derwinski
Blackburn	Clark	Devine
Boggs	Clausen,	Dickinson
Boland	Don H.	Dingell
Bolling	Cleveland	Dorn
Brademas	Cochran	Downing
Bray	Cohen	Duncan
Breckinridge	Collier	du Pont

Eckhardt	Long, La.	Roush	Harsha	Mitchell, Md.	Stanton,
Edwards, Ala.	Long, Md.	Rousselot	Hawkins	Montgomery	James V.
Ellberg	Lujan	Roy	Hays	Murphy, Ill.	Stephens
Erlenborn	McClory	Runnels	Hogan	Murphy, N.Y.	Stuckey
Eshleman	McCloskey	Ruppe	Hoffield	O'Brien	Teague
Evans, Colo.	McCollister	Ruth	Kyros	Owens	Thompson, N.J.
Evins, Tenn.	McCormack	St Germain	Landrum	Pepper	Thone
Fascell	McDade	Sandman	Lent	Podell	Treen
Findley	McEwen	Sarasin	Lott	Powell, Ohio	Udall
Fish	McFall	Sarbanes	McKay	Quie	Vander Jagt
Fisher	McKinney	Satterfield	McSpadden	Rarick	Ware
Flood	Macdonald	Schroeder	Mallary	Rees	Wiggins
Flowers	Madden	Sebelius	Maraziti	Reid	Williams
Flooy	Madigan	Seiberling	Melcher	Rooney, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
Ford	Mahon	Shipley	Milford	Scherle	Wilson,
Forsythe	Mann	Shoup	Mills	Schneebell	Charles, Tex.
Fountain	Martin, Nebr.	Shriver	Minshall, Ohio	Snyder	Wyman
Prellinghuysen	Martin, N.C.	Shuster			
Frey	Mathias, Calif.	Sikes			
Froehlich	Mathis, Ga.	Sisk			
Gaydos	Matsunaga	Skubitz			
Gettys	Mayne	Slack			
Gialmo	Mazzoli	Smith, Iowa			
Gilman	Meeds	Smith, N.Y.			
Ginn	Mezvinsky	Spence			
Goldwater	Michel	Stagers			
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	Thornon			
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	Peyster	Wampler			
Hunt	Pickle	Whalen			
Hutchinson	Pike	White			
Ichord	Poage	Whitehurst			
Jarman	Preyer	Whitten			
Johnson, Calif.	Price, Ill.	Widnall			
Johnson, Colo.	Price, Tex.	Wilson,			
Johnson, Pa.	Quillen	Charles H.,			
Jones, Ala.	Rallsback	Calif.			
Jones, N.C.	Randall	Winn			
Jones, Okla.	Regula	Wolf			
Jones, Tenn.	Reuss	Wright			
Jordan	Rhodes	Wyatt			
Karth	Riegle	Wydler			
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	Zwach			
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
Biaggi	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.

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 479]

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
Annuazio	Bray	Carter
Archer	Breckinridge	Casey, Tex.
Arends	Brinkley	Chamberlain
Ashbrook	Brooks	Chappell
Aspin	Brotzman	Clancy
Badillo	Brown, Calif.	Clausen,
Bafalis	Brown, Mich.	Don H.
Bauman	Brown, Ohio	Clay
Beard	Broyhill, N.C.	Cleveland
Bell	Broyhill, Va.	Cochran

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.

April 8, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

E 2195

Mr. Speaker, I am calling upon the Navy today to cancel a sizable number of the 30 DD-963 destroyers.

Careful reading of the GAO's analysis discloses that Litton is trying to build too many ships at one time. The shipyard is crowded, undermanned, and completely fouled up—the shipyard workload must be reduced. The only way to do that is to reduce the number of destroyers to be built. Otherwise, the costs of each ship will skyrocket upward as delays mount.

The GAO reported that if foulups inside the shipyard are not resolved it will cause eventual slippage in delivery schedule and increases in contract costs.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Navy concedes in its latest report to Congress that some of the destroyers may be up to 5 months late.

Congress has already approved funds for the ships and the Navy is seeking an additional \$463.5 million for the final seven ships in this year's Defense Department's budget. I believe Mr. Speaker, that at least the last seven ships should be canceled and possibly more. It is interesting to note that the cancellation of the last seven ships would only involve a fee of \$152,000 which is much less than the probable cost overruns.

The potential \$500 million overrun is based upon estimates of the cost of so-called electronic warfare equipment, a decoy system, special sonar, new helicopters, missile and guns which are not included in the current Navy estimate. These various weapons are listed as "space and weight"—systems that were originally planned for inclusion on the ship but are not in the Navy's budget.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe that the Navy is hoping to cover up these cost overruns by paying for the increased costs from outside regular shipbuilding funds. Eleven months after a ship is delivered to the Navy any additional costs including the installation of new weapons are paid from appropriations other than shipbuilding. After these ships are delivered the needed weapons will be added but not counted as part of the cost of the ships. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, the Navy's action is a cheap trick designed to deceive Congress.

At another point in the report the GAO said that certain parts of the ships, which are theoretically built in large modules are being completed out of sequence which makes the orderly construction of the ships impossible in Litton's so-called mass production shipyard. In fact, in the case of assembly work the situation has become worse in the past year.

Mr. Speaker, there is now no question that unless we cut the number of DD-963's we are headed for full-scale disaster on this program.

NO AMNESTY WITHOUT EQUITY

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1974

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, the House Judiciary's Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties, and the Administration of Justice held hearings

on the question of granting amnesty to those who evaded the draft during the Vietnam war.

This question has aroused a great deal of controversy and I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial by Mr. Smith Hempstone which expresses the views of the majority of the American people:

[From the Washington Star-News, Mar. 20, 1974]

NO AMNESTY WITHOUT EQUITY

(By Smith Hempstone)

In North Vietnam last week, the United States was dickerer for the return of the mortal remains of the last 11 American prisoners of war known to have died under the rigors of Communist captivity. At the same time, half a world away, in obscene juxtaposition, a House subcommittee chaired by Rep. Robert W. Kastenmeier, D-Wis., was holding hearings on amnesty for those who refused to serve in that war.

The arguments of the pro-amnesty lobby remain basically what they have always been: The Vietnam War was an unjust war, hence those who deserted or dodged the draft were justified in so doing; the artful dodgers' self-exile has been punishment enough; amnesty has always been granted after a war and one is needed now to heal society's wounds. To all of which one can only reply: Horsefeathers!

The notion that the thousands who deserted or refused to serve were somehow endowed with a higher morality than the millions who disrupted their lives, obeyed their country's call and risked maiming or death is both impertinent and illogical.

All wars embody a measure of injustice. But the state has a right to insist on the obligation of its citizens to serve it, and no man has the privilege of picking his war. Clearly an individual has the right to refuse to take human life, but there are plenty of stretchers to be carried on the battlefield by those of such sensitivity.

It is even possible to admire those who on principle chose jail or alternative service to donning a uniform. But the gorge rises at the suggestion that men who spent the war comfortably living off remittances from Mom and Pop in Toronto coffee houses are the cream of their generation. It simply isn't so.

As for the argument that the gun-shy streakers have suffered enough by their separation from their native land, their exile was of their own choosing. The penalty does not begin to match that paid in blood by some of those who had to go in their stead. One can only hope, for their sake and for their adopted country, that they make better Canadians than they did Americans.

Although the revisionist historians of the left would have us believe amnesty has followed every American war, this is not the case. There has never been a general, unconditional amnesty—which is what the white-feather gang is demanding—after any American war.

After World War II, President Truman pardoned slightly less than 10 percent of 15,805 draft dodgers. After the Korean War, scarcely a popular conflict, there was amnesty for neither deserters nor draft-dodgers.

The main point is that the militant evaders are less interested in forgiveness than in vindication. They want America to accept their image of themselves and their version of history, and this no self-respecting nation can grant.

This is not to say that society should be harsh or unforgiving. The case can certainly be made that an immature and perhaps low IQ teen-aged draft-dodger from a home in which obligations to one's country were not stressed is less culpable than the middle-aged radical chic professor, chaplain or polemicist who, knowing the penalty, urged him to switch rather than fight.

So as Sen. Robert Taft Jr., R-Ohio, and former Secretary of the Army Robert F. Froehle have suggested to the Kastenmeier subcommittee, some form of conditional amnesty, on a case-by-case basis and contingent upon alternative service, would not dishonor the dead or split the country.

Case-by-case treatment by amnesty review boards such as those set up after World War II would be a slow process. But the offense, against their country and their peers, of which the draft-dodgers and deserters stand accused, is a grave one.

They and those who urged them to turn their backs on their country have to understand that America is big enough to give its repentant sons a second chance. But not so craven or misguided as to vindicate them, to say that they were right and those other, braver sons who fought and died were wrong.

THE DEBATE OVER DIEGO GARCIA

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the debate and vote last week in the House on the question of a base on Diego Garcia did not settle the question. It remains to be seen, not only what the Senate and the conference committee will do, but also what the Government of the United Kingdom will do, since no agreement for the expansion has been entered into.

Last Thursday, April 4, the Wall Street Journal carried an article by Richard J. Levine which in my view fairly summarizes the arguments for and against the Diego Garcia base. Perhaps I am prejudiced, but it seems to me that the negative arguments greatly outweigh the positive ones.

The article follows:

THE DEBATE OVER DIEGO GARCIA

(By Richard J. Levine)

WASHINGTON.—Diego Garcia is a tiny coral island in the middle of the Indian Ocean, lying a thousand miles off the southern tip of India and halfway around the world from Washington.

Isolated and uninspiring, the small hunk of British real estate would seem an unlikely candidate for attention in this crisis-oriented capital.

But a Pentagon plan to build a naval support base on Diego Garcia—unveiled in the aftermath of the Middle East war and the Arab oil embargo—has begun to generate a lively though limited foreign policy-national security debate here. Nixon administration officials see the proposed base as a logical and effective means of protecting America's interests in that part of the world, offsetting growing Soviet naval power. But some in Congress fear the base could lead to a U.S.-Soviet naval race in the Indian Ocean, an area that has been largely spared superpower rivalry, and eventually add billions of dollars to Navy shipbuilding budgets without enhancing U.S. security.

While U.S. Senators call for Washington-Moscow talks on naval limitations in the Indian Ocean, many of America's friends and foes denounce the Diego Garcia plan. In the end, the debate could provide important clues to how serious Congress is about playing a larger, more forceful role in foreign policy as America emerges from its painful decade in Vietnam.

"From our experience in Indochina, we know too well the cost of early, easy con-

gressional and State Department acquiescence to Pentagon demands," says Sen. Claiborne Pell (D., R.I.), a leading opponent of the base plan. "We must profit from our past errors. Our handling of this authorization request for Diego Garcia offers such an opportunity."

NARROW ISSUES

Unfortunately, much of the debate thus far has focused on such relatively narrow issues as the comparative number of U.S. and Soviet "ship days" in the Indian Ocean and the length of the runway on the island. Often lost in the din of detail are the basic questions raised by the Pentagon plan—whether the U.S. should be involved in the project at all; whether, or how, U.S. interests are served by increasing the Navy's still limited presence in this far-off ocean; whether, as one former Pentagon planner put it, "we would be willing to let events take their course around the rim of the Indian Ocean."

Specifically, the Defense Department is asking Congress for \$32.3 million to expand an existing communications station on Diego Garcia into a base capable of refueling and restocking U.S. warships, including aircraft carriers, operating in the Indian Ocean. The base would be manned by about 600 men and would enable the Navy to increase its Indian Ocean deployments—either routinely or in a crisis—without weakening its forces in the Western Pacific.

Yesterday the Senate Armed Services Committee postponed "without prejudice" a request for \$29 million for Diego Garcia construction contained in a supplemental budget bill for the Pentagon—a setback that is likely to be challenged by administration supporters in the full Senate. And today the House is scheduled to vote on a proposal to delete the same \$29 million from a companion measure.

To justify the U.S. buildup, the Nixon administration has stressed the expanding operations of the Soviet Navy in the Indian Ocean (which Navy men expect to accelerate with the reopening of the Suez Canal) and the increasing reliance of the U.S. on Persian Gulf oil that must be transported across the Indian Ocean. "Our military 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," declares James Noyes, Deputy Defense Secretary for Near Eastern, African and South Asian Affairs.

By Pentagon standards, the Diego Garcia request is a mere pittance, less than one-third the price of a modern destroyer. Moreover, Defense Department and State Department officials have sought to downplay the potential long-range significance of the naval base by referring repeatedly to their plans for a "modest support facility."

Still, a number of lawmakers and outside experts remain uneasy, fearful that congressional approval of the construction money could prove a fateful step down an unmarked road toward yet another expensive and, conceivably, dangerous security commitment. Adding to their concern is the small-step-by-small-step pattern of U.S. involvement in the Indian Ocean: first a few warships; next a communications station; then a support base. Where, they worry, is it leading?

Despite administration assertions to the contrary, U.S. interest in the Indian Ocean has been rather limited until recently. Only three years ago, Ronald Spiers, then director of the State Department's Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs, could tell Congress: "The Indian Ocean area, unlike Europe and Asia, is one which has been only on the

margins of U.S. attention. Never considered of great importance to the central balance of power, it has been on the edges of great-power rivalry."

Since 1948, the U.S. presence in this part of the world has consisted mainly of the Middle East force—a flagship based in the Sheikdom of Bahrain and two destroyers that make periodic port calls. That such a modest force was considered adequate testifies to the low strategic importance Washington attached to the world's third largest ocean.

U.S. interest began building in the early 1960s. One result was the British Indian Ocean territory agreement between the United Kingdom and the U.S. in 1966, under which Washington acquired the basic right to build military facilities on Diego Garcia. Washington's interest quickened in 1968, with the British announcement of plans to withdraw military forces east of Suez and the appearance of the first Soviet warships. Since then, the Soviets have steadily increased their naval forces, and current navy estimates give them a four-to-one advantage over the U.S. in the Indian Ocean.

Soviet ships have also gained increasing access to port facilities. For example, Russian vessels currently use the expanded Iraqi port of Umm Qasr and the former British base at Aden; meanwhile, the Soviets are expanding their naval facilities at the Somali port of Berbera. "The Soviets possess a support system in the (Indian Ocean) area that is substantially more extensive than that of the U.S.," asserts Adm. Elmo Zumwalt, Chief of Naval Operations.

As the Soviet presence increased, the U.S. responded by sending carrier task forces into the Indian Ocean twice in 1971, in April and again in December, during the Indo-Pakistan war. Last October, a few months after the Diego Garcia communications station opened and as the Mideast ceasefire was taking effect, the Defense Department unexpectedly moved a task force headed by the carrier Hancock into the Indian Ocean.

On Nov. 30, Defense Secretary James Schlesinger, disclosing that the Hancock would be replaced by the Oriskany, announced that in the future the Navy would establish a "pattern of regular visits into the Indian Ocean and we expect that our presence there will be more frequent and more regular than in the past." Since then, major U.S. vessels have been in the ocean without letup.

Why? Administration officials offer a variety of explanations—to counterbalance Soviet "influence" on states around the Indian Ocean; to maintain "continued access" to vital Mideast oil supplies; to insure freedom of the seas; simply to demonstrate our "interest" in that area of the world.

The State Department emphasizes the diplomatic value of the Navy. "A military presence can support effective diplomacy without its ever having to be used," says Seymour Weiss, director of State's politico-military affairs bureau. Privately Pentagon officials, not surprisingly, place greater weight on the military value of warships in the Indian Ocean. The increasing U.S. Navy operations, a Navy man says, are needed "to show we are a credible military power in that part of the world."

But critics of the Diego Garcia proposal are troubled by these explanations, which, they believe, raise more questions than they answer.

GUNBOAT DIPLOMACY

Some critics wonder whether the presence of larger numbers of U.S. warships in the

Indian Ocean will, as Naval Chief Zumwalt claims, help preserve "regimes that are friendly to the U.S." in the area. "Gunboat diplomacy doesn't really seem to work" in this age, argues a government analyst. Internal problems and economic assistance, he believes, have a much greater bearing on the political course followed by foreign governments. What is clear is that several states in the area—including Australia, New Zealand, India, Madagascar and Sri Lanka (Ceylon)—have publicly opposed the Diego Garcia support base, arguing that the Indian Ocean should be a "zone of peace."

Furthermore, there are some military experts who doubt that Soviet ships in the Indian Ocean pose a serious threat to Western tankers carrying precious Arab oil. In the opinion of Gene La Rocque, a retired rear admiral who often criticizes Pentagon policies, an attack on, or interference with such shipping "doesn't appear to be a plausible action on the part of the Soviet Union when one takes into account such important factors as relative military power, time and distance and the alternative means of exerting influence and power at the disposal of the Soviet Union."

Other military analysts have argued that it is highly improbable the Soviets would attack Western ships since such a hostile act would likely trigger the outbreak of a major war between the superpowers. Geoffrey Jukes, an Australian analyst has written: "It is difficult to envisage a situation, short of world nuclear war, in which the Soviet government would be prepared to place the bulk of its merchant fleet at risk by engaging to 'interfere' with Western shipping in the Indian or any other ocean."

Much more likely, critics of the Diego Garcia plan stress, is a repetition of the recent Arab oil embargo, a political act designed to achieve political aims. It is argued that the presence of sizable naval forces can, at best, have only a minimal impact in such a situation.

Finally, there is the unsettling prospect that a base at Diego Garcia, coupled with increased naval deployments in the Indian Ocean, will provide the Navy in years to come with new rationales for an "Indian Ocean fleet" and ever-bigger shipbuilding budgets, especially for carriers and escorts. The Navy, a Pentagon insider notes, "has been panting on the edges of the opportunity" represented by enlarged Indian Ocean commitments.

A CALL FOR NEGOTIATIONS

To prevent a costly U.S.-Soviet naval race, which might not enhance either nation's security, Sen. Pell and Sen. Edward Kennedy (D., Mass.) have jointly introduced a resolution calling for negotiations between the superpowers on limiting naval facilities and warships in the Indian Ocean.

As in the past, the U.S. remains reluctant to agree in writing to any restrictions on its use of the high seas. Moreover, U.S. officials say efforts to follow up a Soviet hint in 1971 of interest in naval limitation talks failed to produce a response from the Kremlin.

Still, in view of the potential long-range costs and dangers involved in an expanded naval presence in the Indian Ocean, it would seem worthwhile to pursue the matter further. For, as Sen. Kennedy has said, "It may in time prove necessary and desirable for the U.S. to compete with the Soviet Union in military and naval force in this distant part of the globe. But before that happens we owe it to ourselves, as well as to all the people of the region, to try preventing yet another arms race."

Senator CHURCH. I would want to hear it from the Secretary, himself.

SHERMAN. The President seems determined to go on with his trip to Moscow. Are you worried that he may be timing his trip to Moscow in June for maximum political advantage here in the fight over impeachment?

Senator CHURCH. Well, I don't know what his motives are, but one would have to observe that as the impeachment proceeding is now moving along, it's quite possible that sometime in June the House would be voting on an impeachment resolution, assuming that the Judiciary Committee recommends such a resolution favorably to the House.

SHERMAN. Would you oppose his going at a time like that?

Senator CHURCH. Well, I would think it would be a very awkward time for him to go, but I don't want to prophesy what the House Judiciary Committee will do. I'm merely speculating.

BENTON. I'd like to revert Mr. Sherman's question. Is detente going to be a casualty of the impeachment proceedings, do you think, Senator?

Senator CHURCH. Not unless the Russians choose to make it so. There is no reason in this country why it should. We are dealing here with the Presidency, after all, not the man who occupies the Presidency, and if it were to happen that Mr. Nixon were to be removed from office, we'd have a President of the United States stepping into his place. So unless the Russians choose to use this as an excuse, or treat it as a reason for not going forward with detente, I don't think that it should be, or need be, an obstacle.

HERMAN. Some of the observers in the Soviet capital in Moscow have said that the Russians now seem for the first time to have some understanding of congressional power and Congress' part in our government, which sounds like a healthy thing. Have you heard anything to that effect?

Senator CHURCH. Well, I think that they make their observations. There was a time a few years ago when they didn't even believe that the Senate actually had the power not to ratify a treaty, so I believe that they are beginning to have a better understanding of our constitutional system, and that would be healthy.

HERMAN. Thank you, Senator Church, for being with us today on Face the Nation.

ANNOUNCER. Today on Face the Nation Senator Frank Church, Democrat of Idaho, was interviewed by CBS News Correspondent Nelson Benton, George Sherman of the Washington Star-News, and CBS News Correspondent George Herman. Next week another prominent figure in the news will Face the Nation.

DIEGO GARCIA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the subject of the tiny island of Diego Garcia is becoming a rather major issue between those who are definitely opposed to it and those who feel that we must have it because of the strategic importance of the Indian Ocean. Although my basic reason for supporting the desire to have this base in that ocean is based on military need, I think I can defend it equally as well by citing the cost savings to us if we do not have to make the 4,000-mile trip from Subic Bay to the Indian Ocean.

Improving the logistic support facilities in Diego Garcia will lead to substantial cost avoidance in supporting our renewed naval deployments into the Indian Ocean. These deployments, interrupted by the Vietnam conflict, are conducted at the direction of the National Command Authority when our national interests so require. The increasing importance of

our sea lines of communications in this vital area make it imperative that we have the ability to support a naval force there when necessary. Although this support can come from Subic Bay, in the Philippines, some 4,000 miles distant, cost avoidance of \$400 million to a \$1 billion in 10-year logistics support costs can be realized if Diego Garcia, only 2,000 miles distant, is equipped for logistic support as currently proposed by the Navy.

In addition to the fact that the United States has vital interests in the area independent of Soviet actions, is the fact that the Soviets already have established a logistic support base in the Indian Ocean far exceeding our own, and are expanding it even more. This, coupled with the major benefits accruing to them from the opening of the Suez Canal, will lead to a major strategic shift in the region which we can ignore only at our peril. Provision of logistic support facilities in Diego Garcia can, to some extent, reduce our vulnerability to the strategic implications of this ongoing Soviet expansion.

Finally, the Soviets have the added advantage of being able to bring substantial power to bear in the area by land, whereas any influence we may need to bring to bear must principally be by sea. We cannot afford to deny ourselves the ability to deploy such naval forces as we may need in the future.

What the Navy is proposing for Diego Garcia is primarily a capability for logistics support of forces that may be sent into the Indian Ocean in contingencies, or for periodic deployments. It is a prudent precautionary move to ensure that we have the capability to operate our forces in an area of increasing strategic importance to the United States and its allies. Not only is it in our best interests to be able to maintain the types of presence in the Indian Ocean which were interrupted by the Vietnam conflict, but the increased dependence of our economy—and that of the Free World—on the Sea Lines of Communications—SLOC's—through the Indian Ocean make it prudent for the United States to maintain an option of protecting those SLOC's.

The purpose of the improvements the Navy has proposed for Diego Garcia is simply to enable us to use it as a logistics support base. Logistic support of our ships in the Indian Ocean today comes from Subic Bay in the Philippines, more than 4,000 miles away. The improvements to Diego Garcia, which would have relatively low political visibility, would enable us to shorten the logistic line to 2,000 miles. For an initial investment of approximately \$35 million, plus \$1 of \$2 million per year increased operating costs, we can avoid expenditures of \$400 million to \$1 billion in additional 10-year logistics costs. At the upper limit, provision of logistic support facilities at Diego Garcia could save us the procurement and support costs of one full underway replenishment group.

Our interests in the Indian Ocean clearly require the ability to maintain a U.S. presence there at the direction of the National Command Authority,

whether or not the Soviets maintain a presence of their own. Since 1968, we have seen a pattern of steady buildup both in the Soviet naval presence, and in Soviet capabilities for the support of military operations in the Indian Ocean.

We must presume that the Soviets' plan for expansion of these capabilities are based on perceptions of their own interests and objectives in the region and are not driven predominantly by U.S. activity in the area. This is borne out by the fact that the rate of Soviet buildup has increased steadily throughout the period, while our own activity has remained at a relatively low level.

As a result of this Soviet buildup, the Soviets possess a support system in the area that is substantially more extensive than that of the United States. For example, they have established fleet anchorages in several locations near the island of Socotra, where an airfield provides a potential Soviet base for reconnaissance or other aircraft. In addition, they have established anchorages in other areas around the Indian Ocean littoral as well.

They have built a communications station near the Somali port of Berbera to provide support for their fleet. At the same time they have increased their use of, and are expanding naval facilities at Berbera, which currently include a restricted area under Soviet control, a combined barracks and repair ship and housing for Soviet military dependents. In addition, they engaged in building a new military airfield near Mogadiscio, which could be used for variety of missions.

Soviet naval combatants and support ships have had access to the expanded Iraqi naval port of Umm Qasr, where facilities are being built with the assistance of Soviet technicians. Those facilities appear to be considerably more extensive than any which would be required for Iraqi needs alone.

The Soviets have been extended the use of port facilities at the former British base at Aden, and air facilities at the former Royal Air Force field nearby. They maintain personnel ashore in both locations. In addition, they use the port of Aden for refueling, replenishment, and minor repairs.

Since 1971 Soviet naval units have been engaged in harbor clearance operations at Chittagong, Bangladesh.

In addition to their regional support facilities in the Indian Ocean, the Soviets are embarked on a worldwide program to expand bunkering and visit rights for their naval, merchant, and fishing fleets. Since Soviet merchant vessels are frequently employed for logistics support of Soviet naval forces, the establishment of merchant bunkering facilities expands the Soviet Navy's logistics infrastructure. The Soviets have recently secured bunkering rights in Mauritius and Singapore and have made approaches to other Western and non-aligned countries.

In summary, Soviet support initiatives and the tempo of their naval activity in the Indian Ocean since 1968 have expanded at a deliberate pace which cannot be related, either in time or in scope,

The Arab governments have discovered that oil is a political weapon. The present price of oil has nothing to do with economics. It costs twenty cents a barrel to raise this oil; they're selling it at a posted price of \$11.65 a barrel—350 per cent above what it was just twelve months ago. This price is a political price. They found that they can make it stick in the western world, because we have to have Arab oil, particularly western Europe and Japan.

So in that new situation, it's foolish to think that the companies can successfully bargain any more with the Arab governments on oil prices. And the latest indications are those prices may go up again in June rather than come down. Under these circumstances, I believe our government which has some leverage with these Arab nations—our government—must take a much more direct role in attempting to bring these prices down.

SHERMAN. But then, are you in favor of turning the oil companies into, in fact, public utilities, which would bypass the question of antitrust laws anyway—

Senator CHURCH. No, I would be against that, George, because that's just dodging the issue. We'd be regulating monopoly, and that never works very well. I would be in favor of taking those measures that would inject as much competition, as much free market, back into the system as possible.

BENTON. Senator, I'd like to ask you a philosophical question along this free market area, if I could. Secretary of the Interior Rogers Morton was speaking this week to the National Petroleum Council which, as you know, is a group of industry advisors to the government, and he said that the government, and my inference from what he says was that he meant the Congress is becoming an adversary to the free enterprise system. Is it in such actions as you were talking about—is the government becoming an adversary to the free enterprise system?

Senator CHURCH. By adversary, you mean an opponent to?

BENTON. Yes.

Senator CHURCH. No, though in some ways I think there is justification for that charge. I'm pleading a different case. Instead of treating oil as a monopoly, which it shouldn't be, and then trying to regulate it, and then finding, as we usually do, that the regulation is soon indistinguishable from the interests of the regulated—that the regulators are taken in by the regulated—I say make it competitive instead, and make sure it stays competitive. The government can do that, the government can be a referee that makes free enterprise stay free. But my experience has been that the bigger businesses get, the more they preach free enterprise and the less they want to practice it. It should be the government's job to see to it that they continue to practice it.

SHERMAN. But how do you—it seems to me there is an inconsistency here, or perhaps I just don't understand it—you're saying that the oil companies themselves admit they no longer have the strength to deal with the Arab governments, and they're taking over the oil, in fact. So that means they are becoming less and less powerful. At the same time, you say that somehow the U.S. government should bolster them, without becoming intricately involved in their operations—in their negotiations—

Senator CHURCH. Well, let me explain. I can understand how you might have been led to that confusion. First of all, the companies have not only admitted that they have no bargaining power left. They have no economic incentive to bring down the price. Why should they? They have discovered that the more the price goes up, the bigger their profits get. The profits of ARAMCO went up almost in the same degree, 350 percent, with the actual posted price, and the profits of the major oil companies in this country, the owners of ARAMCO, have gone up to un-

precedented levels in the last year. So that, if they are profiting as they are, so hugely from the hijack prices, what incentive do they have to bring them down? For that reason alone, an obligation falls on the government of this country to play a more direct role in negotiating these prices downward again, because they are political prices—they are not economic prices. They don't operate within the parameters of the marketplace.

HERMAN. Just so I know where we stand on this because I have a rather simple mind. Do you think that the world is running out of oil, and that oil is—and all energy forms are becoming shorter, therefore perhaps prices should be up a little?

Senator CHURCH. The world will run out of oil—no question about that. But right now—

HERMAN. In a foreseeable time?

Senator CHURCH. But right now, the world is not short on oil. The oil is there, the oil would supply the market. The problem is not, in the immediate future, a shortage of oil. The problem is price and we shouldn't pretend that the lifting of the Arab oil embargo has changed the problem one iota. It may mean that the shortage for a little while—the squeeze on the United States—will be less severe, but the price: think of its impact on the Western World! It is going to increase the cost of fuel supplies between \$55 and \$65 billion in this year alone. Now that's a price that Western Europe and Japan and the United States and the other industrial nations will have to pay. Its effect, in terms of inflation, its effect in terms of the adverse impact on our balance of payments, its effect in drying up the flow of capital to the underdeveloped world, is absolutely staggering. Now that is the oil crisis; that is the economic consequence of this reckless decision to suddenly increase the posted price of oil in the Middle East 350 percent within a year's time.

HERMAN. I'm not sure but that was interrupted you when you were giving us your recommendations.

Senator CHURCH. Yes, well, where were we?

HERMAN. Well, we started with the government should take a little bit more control.

Senator CHURCH. I hope that it wouldn't have to be for a long period of time, but as long as the price of oil is going to be used as a political weapon by the Arab countries against the Western World, the United States government has to see it in those terms, and the United States has to try to do something about it. After all, we presumably have more leverage than the oil companies with the Arab countries. We've given them \$3 billion in economic and military aid over the past 12 years, and we are now preparing to assist Egypt in clearing the Suez Canal, and quite possibly in other economic development programs.

HERMAN. So you are proposing some kind of American government pressure against the Arab nations?

Senator CHURCH. I'm proposing that we recognize that this is a highjacked price with disastrous consequences, and that the federal government do something about negotiating with the Arab countries in an effort to bring this price down, since we have leverage that the companies themselves have admitted they no longer possess.

HERMAN. What's our leverage?

Senator CHURCH. I've just suggested part of it.

HERMAN. But getting back to what you would do specifically, in terms of your committee, in terms of the Congress, are you considering yourself a budding sort of trust-buster in this sort of thing? Do you think the Congress of the United States should enact legislation which is going to break up this monopoly situation?

Senator CHURCH. George, first of all, we do have antitrust laws on the books, and we want to make sure that the arrangements in the Middle East, of American companies—

along with their pipeline arrangements and marketing arrangements in this country—do not violate these laws. That's number one. Secondly, we should pass new laws to deal with the conglomerate problem. The laws that we presently have on the books don't deal with big companies that get into fields other than their particular field. Now the oil industry is getting into coal; the oil industry is at work out west. You know what they are doing out there, on the public domain? They are getting leases from the federal government on geothermal resources.

HERMAN. They are also way into uranium.

Senator CHURCH. Yes, they are way into uranium. Now are we going to let oil buy up all of its competition in this country? Doesn't the government have some obligation to see to it that the free enterprise system remains competitive where fuel supplies are concerned? Certainly it does. And then the third thing we must do is change the tax laws so that the incentive will not be, as it has been, to go abroad, and thus make us dependent, ever more dependent upon foreign sources for fuel—sources which we cannot control, but to bring oil companies home. But, to turn the incentive of the tax laws around, we'll have to do a lot more than the tap-on-the-wrist treatment that apparently the Ways and Means Committee is now considering for the oil industry.

HERMAN. When we consider problems of this magnitude in this country, we have an inclination to think of it in terms of the polarization between the Soviet Union and the United States. Some people think that's a preoccupation with us. Does this oil problem with the Middle East stand outside of the question of detente and our relations with the Soviet Union?

Senator CHURCH. Well, it doesn't stand outside but it stands at the periphery. I would think. There are other questions between the United States and the Soviet Union of much greater magnitude that go to the heart of detente—questions such as normalized trade, and the possibilities of securing some kind of limitation on nuclear arms. These questions go to the heart of detente; I would think that the oil matter lies out somewhere near the periphery.

HERMAN. I note the Soviet Union's urgings to the Arab countries to continue the embargo, and its lack of effect upon them, apparently.

Senator CHURCH. Yes, the Soviet Union wants to keep as much influence as it can with the Arab countries. After all, it has invested a great deal in supporting their military forces, and it has hoped to increase its influence in that part of the world. But I commend Secretary Kissinger for his skillful diplomacy, and I think that the chances are better today for some kind of settlement between the Arab countries and Israel than they have been for many years.

BENTON. Senator Church, Secretary Kissinger just got back from Moscow, and we first heard that his—

Senator CHURCH. And then got married and went to Mexico.

BENTON. That's true.

Senator CHURCH. Thus demonstrating he's one of the few men in this administration with any energy to spare. (Laughter.)

BENTON. First we heard that the negotiations were not very good and then we start hearing, well, they weren't so bad. In your role as chairman of the subcommittee, I believe, on arms control, do you have any intelligence as to how the negotiations in Moscow really went? Are we better off?

Senator CHURCH. I haven't yet had a chance to discuss this with the Secretary. Until he comes back from his honeymoon, we'll have to wait for these details. He's promised to come to the Foreign Relations Committee and to give us a detailed accounting of what transpired in Moscow.

HERMAN. Can't anyone else brief you?

to any comparable expansion of U.S. activity. The Soviets' logistics arrangements are designed to support their own strategic objectives in the area.

Underlying all of this is Soviet recognition that any nation which has the capability to project substantial naval power into the Indian Ocean automatically acquires significant influence not only with the littoral countries, but with countries outside the area whose economies depend on the free use of its sea lanes.

The Soviets' logistics infrastructure is already sufficient to support a much greater Soviet presence than the one which now exists in the Indian Ocean, and Soviet presence in the Indian Ocean can be expected to continue to grow, irrespective of anything we do at Diego Garcia.

The opening of the Suez will complete the major actions necessary to making the Soviet Union a major Indian Ocean power. With the Suez open, the deployment distance for the Soviets will be reduced from about 5,600 miles from Vladivostok or over 11,000 miles from the Black Sea, to less than 4,000 miles from the Black Sea. This reduction, coupled with the proliferation of actual and potential support activities along the littoral will enable the Soviets to expand their Indian Ocean force at will. The opening of the Suez will effect a major strategic change to the benefit of the Soviets. Provision of logistic support facilities in Diego Garcia can, to a small extent, reduce our vulnerability to the strategic implications of this ongoing Soviet expansion into the area.

Finally, the geopolitical asymmetries between the United States and the Soviet Union must be kept in mind in assessing the relative importance to the two countries of the capability to operate naval forces in the region. The Soviet Union dominates the Eurasian landmass. It has borders with some key Middle Eastern and South Asian countries. Its land-based forces can already be brought to bear in the region. The United States, on the other hand, can project its military power into the area only by sea and air, and over great distances. The Soviet Union, in sum, has the geographical proximity necessary to influence events in the Indian Ocean littoral, without the employment of naval forces if necessary. We do not. Limiting our capabilities to operate naval forces effectively in the region would not be in U.S. interest; and would clearly put us at a disadvantage in the region.

In summation, it is in our national interest to have the capability to support naval forces in the Indian Ocean—at the direction of the National Command Authority—whether or not the Soviets continue to increase their forces there. It is a wise investment to provide logistic support capability at Diego Garcia. Second, the Soviets have already established a logistic support base in the Indian Ocean far exceeding our own, and are expanding it even more. This, coupled with the major benefits accruing to them from the opening of the Suez Canal, will lead to a major strategic shift in the region which we can ignore only at our peril. Finally,

the Soviets have the added advantage of being able to bring much power to bear in the area by land, whereas any influence we may need to bring to bear in the future must principally be by sea. We should assure ourselves the ability to support our own naval presence in this area to the extent necessary to protect our own interests.

COST AVOIDANCE SUPPLEMENTARY CALCULATIONS

(\$ millions--FY74 \$)

Diego Garcia costs:		FY75	FY76			
Initial		29	5			
Lower limit cost avoidance ¹ :						
Forces/cost:		FY75	FY76	FY77		
AO procurement ² :		1/55	1/55	1/55		
Upper limit cost avoidance ³ :						
Forces/cost:		FY75	FY76	FY77	FY78	FY79
AO procurement ⁴ :		1/55	1/55	1/55		
AE procurement:		1/80				
PF procurement:		1/60	1/60	1/60	1/60	1/60

¹ Without improving the facilities at Diego Garcia, the logistic support for the increased peacetime capability for Indian Ocean deployments could be attained through procurement of these additional forces.

² Procurement costs only are shown. Operating costs of \$7.5M per ship per year are incurred commencing at 10C.

³ Without improving the facilities at Diego Garcia, the logistic support for the increased wartime capability for Indian Ocean deployments could be attained through procurement of these additional forces.

⁴ Procurement costs only are shown. Average operating costs for all ships of \$8.0M per ship per year are incurred at 10C.

SOLAR ENERGY AND THE FARM

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, my senior colleague from South Dakota, Senator McGOVERN, recently testified before the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences in support of S. 2658, the Solar Energy Heating and Cooling Demonstration Building Act.

As a member of that committee I was impressed with Senator McGOVERN's suggestion for accelerating solar research on the farm. He proposed that a provision be added to S. 2658 to establish a solar energy agricultural research center which would provide for the investigation, monitoring, and analysis of the many ways in which agriculture can benefit from accelerated solar research. He proposed that such a center be attached to the EROS center in Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

That idea is in line with the amendment I have offered to S. 2658 which would allocate 30 percent of the solar demonstration buildings for construction in rural areas. It is my view that, if solar energy is to win the acceptance of the average American citizen, it must first be proven that it is both economical and practical in daily application. Senator McGOVERN's suggestion provides an excellent means of establishing that proof.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator McGOVERN's testimony together with supporting material be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the testimony and material were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GEORGE McGOVERN

Mr. Chairman, what the table game of Monopoly was to the depression ravaged America of the 1930's, the energy crisis has become to the profit hungry fuel industries of the 1970's. Each industry is borrowing,

buying, expanding, and re-doubling its efforts to grab a lion's share of the profits for oil, for gas, and for nuclear energy. Energy-short Americans are flooded with assurances that if they will only pay a little more, sacrifice a little longer, and submit to just a little more destruction of our mountains, plains, and water, America can become self-sufficient in fuel by 1980. I, for one, am convinced that the people of this country are fed up with playing games on energy. They want straightforward and economy-minded answers to the fuel shortage. That answer may be forthcoming if Congress adopts the solar energy legislation we are considering today.

I welcome the opportunity to add my support to S. 2658, the Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Building Act. This measure is practical in the sense that it puts the advantages of solar energy into immediate operation. And it is forward looking to the extent that it provides on-going research efforts on which we can make informed judgments on future energy planning. In short, it is a responsible means of dealing with the energy crisis on an effective, forceful basis while giving much needed support to solar energy research.

Solar energy is one of the most sensible investments we can make in solving the fuel crisis. It is in unlimited supply, it is non-polluting, and it is available worldwide, right now, if only we will come to terms with the need for improved technology.

The enormous versatility of solar energy is demonstrated by the quantity of projects currently under way which harness the energy of the sun to domestic needs.

For example, a federal office building under construction in Manchester, New Hampshire will use solar cells in a variable flow temperature heating system. The General Services Administration and the National Bureau of Standards will monitor the solar technology designed into the building and evaluate its performance for future reference.

On the University of Delaware campus, an experimental house "Solar One," is already operating with a solar heating system. When fully equipped, solar energy will provide up to 80% of the total energy requirements of the house.

In Washington, D.C., Harry Thomason, a retired patent attorney, has earned wide acclaim for his solar powered homes. According to news reports, his first solar home, built in 1959, had a three year average heat bill of \$6.30 per winter.

The Pennsylvania Power and Light Company has also developed a solar heating system. It uses two heat pumps and a system of solar collectors plus a series of heat exchangers to heat the two story, 1,700 square foot structure.

And, in Providence, Rhode Island, a 19th Century foundry is being converted into an office building with solar energy providing the heat.

This is an impressive list of independent initiatives to make sunlight the more productive servant of man. But the list goes on in countries throughout the world. The Australian Minister for Science, William Morrison, has decided to coordinate all the more or less casual investigations of solar energy into one integrated, imaginative program under the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. It is thought that 40 billion Australian dollars, equivalent to \$60 billion in U.S. currency, will be needed to provide solar heat for 25% of the Australian homes by the end of the century.

An excellent summary of solar research initiatives is contained in a television broadcast prepared by the BBC entitled, "The Sunbeam Solution." I have previously inserted a transcript of that broadcast in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I recommend it to my colleagues as an excellent statement of what can be done when a serious effort is made to harness the energy of the sun.

In Arizona, Wisconsin, Colorado, Florida, California and New Mexico, projects ranging from a newsletter called "Solar Energy Digest" to investigations into orbiting solar energy-collecting satellites and solar energy farms are signs of the awakening interest in solar research. Each of these projects gives added incentive to passage of the Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Building Act. The work of the Committee on Science and Astronautics in the House and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences in the Senate, matched to the pioneering efforts of NASA in developing this legislation, have given those of us in Congress the opportunity to produce a truly useful energy solution.

One of the most significant features of the legislation before us is Section 7 which provides for projects and activities with respect to apartment buildings, office buildings, factories, and agricultural structures. The projects I have already described, point to the value of the legislation we are studying. Private homes, factories, and office buildings are either under construction or renovation which use the power of the sun to make them cleaner and more efficient places in which to live and work.

But it seems to me that some further attention must be given to agriculture in this promising legislation. I would hope that the suggestion I will offer will not only reinforce the agricultural section of this legislation, but will help to increase general support for the bill as well.

Earlier this year, I wrote to the Agricultural Research Service to inquire about solar energy application to farm needs. Mr. Gerald E. Carlson, Laboratory Chief, at the Department of Agriculture sent my office a letter which said in part, "Because of your letter, I intend to query . . . (our research reporting service) to get a more complete and detailed listing of solar energy research in the department." Mr. Carlson said in addition,

"In my opinion, solar energy can be used to alleviate demands on fossil fuels in a number of ways in agricultural application. Solar energy, in addition to being used for grain drying, could be used for low temperature storage and transport of agricultural commodities, for heating and cooling of animal shelters as well as farm residences and for heating and cooling of greenhouses. As technology develops on the use of solar energy for production of electricity, then other farm applications certainly will be developed."

On January 9, 1974, G. W. Isaacs, Head of the Agricultural Engineering Department at Purdue University, supported the Department of Agriculture view in a letter to me. He said, in part, "As you well know, we are using large quantities of fossil fuel, particularly critically available LP gas for crop drying. A major portion of this energy requirement could be supplied by solar energy." Mr. Isaacs included a preliminary project proposal entitled "Use of Solar Energy to Reduce Fuel Requirements for Corn Drying." I ask that this proposal be included at the conclusion of my remarks.

A further demonstration of the practical application of solar energy to farm needs is reflected in a preliminary proposal to the National Science Foundation submitted by two professors at South Dakota State University in Brookings, South Dakota. Dennis L. Moe, Head of the Agricultural Engineering Department at SDSU, together with Associate Professor Mylo A. Hellickson, have drawn up a preliminary proposal which has three main objectives: (1) the application of solar powered systems for corn drying; (2) application of solar powered systems for farrowing house heating using thermal storage and control systems to optimize solar energy utilization; and (3) integration of these systems to maximize solar collector utilization. I ask unanimous consent that

this imaginative proposal be included at the conclusion of my remarks as an example of sound and sensible solar-agricultural research.

My investigation into farm-related uses of solar energy has uncovered several other independent projects. For example, at Kansas State University, research has been conducted into the use of the sun in drying sorghum grain. Michigan State University's Agricultural Engineering Department has conducted studies of solar energy availability, collection and storage for farm use. The University of Minnesota's Department of Mechanical Engineering has been working on the design of solar collectors and the use of the energy for drying crops. In Brookings, South Dakota, Bill Peterson, Extension Agricultural Engineer at South Dakota State University, has designed a system which uses solar heat to dry shelled corn in the bin. The system uses thin aluminum lithographic plates from the DeSmet News and transparent plastic to dry corn at a cost of 2.4 cents per bushel.

One of the most exciting efforts into the promise of solar energy is underway in Canada, where researchers at McGill University are clearly aware that the first beneficiary of solar energy development can be the farmer. According to a Brace Research Institute publication, they have already achieved some significant results. They include:

—the development of an accurate low cost instrument for the measurement of daily solar radiation;

—the development of several large agricultural crop dryers utilizing solar energy;

—the development of a low-cost, small-scale, wind-powered water pumping unit;

—the development of a 32 ft. diameter windmill suitable for water pumping and other applications; and

—the combination of solar stills with greenhouses for use in arid areas, to conserve fresh water.

In addition, they intend to proceed with the development of sound and relevant engineering equipment for the resolution of man's water and food requirements in rural, arid regions.

The Brace Research Institute is currently putting together a Manual on Solar Agricultural Dryers under a grant from the Canadian International Development Agency. The manual will consist of a theoretical evaluation of the air heating and drying processes and will include illustrated descriptions of different equipment which has been developed all over the world. As a result, the reader, in whatever area a solar energy dryer might serve a function, might be able to construct models which fit both his requirements as well as those dictated by climate and the type of material to be dried. These efforts were undertaken by the Brace Institute in order to find a solution to the problem of water desalination in underdeveloped countries. But they have paid rich dividends in solar technology and I am confident that similar efforts conducted in the United States would benefit our country as well, until recently one of the most underdeveloped nations in terms of domestic solar energy research.

In light of these developments, I have introduced legislation in this Session of Congress which deals specifically with solar energy and the farm. My bill would establish a solar energy agricultural research center, expand funding for solar-agricultural research, and provide for the investigation of the possibility of granting tax deductions for the installation of solar energy apparatus on the farm.

Today, I want to offer an amendment to the Committee's consideration which, I believe, can directly benefit both the food producer and the food consumer. That amendment is

AMENDMENT TO S. 2658

On page 16 beginning on line 7 add:

Consistent with the emphasis of this bill on the prompt development of practical solar energy application for domestic use \$200,000 of the funds authorized in Section 12 shall be authorized for a feasibility study exploring the design, location and objectives of a central research facility and information exchange center for solar-agricultural research.

Despite the growing interest in solar energy research and despite the continuing difficulty in providing adequate food for the people of the world, the two subjects are not being dealt with in combined fashion. The farmer must rely on chance discovery of developments in solar technology which might aid him in producing more food at lower cost. My amendment would provide funds for the first steps in establishing a central clearinghouse for solar-agricultural data. The center itself could be heated and cooled by solar energy. Consistent with the thrust of this legislation, the building might be located directly in the heart of the food producing section of our country. One possibility might be an addition to the EROS Center in Sioux Falls, South Dakota. The EROS complex lies in the center of the grain producing northern plains and provides ready access to thousands of farmers and many agriculturally oriented universities. Furthermore, an addition to an already existing building would be far more economical than the construction of an entirely new facility. Plenty of scientific talent is already hard at work at the EROS Center and I am confident that they would relish the opportunity to take on an additional challenge.

Mr. Chairman, I support the measure currently before the Committee as one of the wisest and most sensible approaches to the energy crisis. The amendment I have offered is intended to provide a useful and prompt demonstration of solar energy both as a means of heating and cooling and as a field of study from which all of us can benefit. I hope that the Committee will give it ample consideration.

NSF—PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL

SOLAR ENERGY FOR CROP DRYING AND FARROWING HOUSE HEATING

Abstract

Application of solar energy for drying of agricultural crops and heating of livestock confinement buildings is essentially nonexistent even though much of the basic technology needed to develop these systems is currently available. The decrease in the availability of conventional fuels for many applications and especially for agricultural applications necessitates development of alternative energy sources, if the increasing world demands for food and fiber are to be satisfied.

Specific design criteria are needed for the development of efficient and economical solar powered agricultural crop drying and livestock confinement building heating systems. Therefore, a research project, employing the principles of similitude and dimensional analysis, is proposed with the following objectives: (1) application of solar powered systems for corn drying, (2) application of solar powered systems for farrowing house heating using thermal storage and control systems to optimize solar energy utilization and (3) integration of these systems to maximize solar collector utilization.

Research will be performed on scale models and full size corn drying and farrowing house units. Emphasis will be on development of control systems to maximize energy utilization efficiency using low temperature rise solar collectors for both systems and a thermal storage unit for heating the farrowing units. Continuous, time clock and thermostatically controlled air flow systems will be

to be decided. The IMF spokesman did, however, say that they would be prominent hard currencies.

Once they have been chosen, their average or mean movements would determine the worth of the SDR. Apparently there is more debate at the moment about the rate of interest involved than any other aspect of the arrangement. Some reports call for an average market interest rate and others for something less.

When you discuss an idea like this in everyday business terms, even including fancy terminology, it has a down to earth, practical sound. The only thing necessary to expose this kind of thinking for what it really is to put it in another setting. For instance take the SDR. It is only useful if you haven't anything else. It acts like a sort of insurance against an overdraft of your bank account. But as long as you are solvent, not to say wealthy, you can't use it. You can very easily imagine a fairy tale that reads this way:

There was a young man who set out in life to make his fortune. As he left, his fairy godmother gave him a box. "It is a magic box," she told him. "It will never let you die. But you may only open it in utmost need."

Now the classic tale would have him forget all about the box until that moment of dire need when it would save him at last. But the Arabs might put another ending to the story. They might say: "but then as the young man traveled he found that the box grew heavier and heavier. He was unable to make a good living, and heeded the godmother's advice. But finally the weight of the box grew insupportable and he had to make a decision. Upon examination he found the box to contain air." Like air, the SDR is useful only when you haven't any.

When I asked the IMF about how the Arabs could be expected to react to the SDR, I was told that making the SDR attractive to the "new surplus nations" was a problem, but one that had received very little attention.

In the mean time the various hopes and fears build and fall about what the U.S. Government means to do about the gold problem which it fails to admit exists. Pessimists think that gold ownership rights will be returned to the people, and after a sufficient time to allow for purchase and collection, the FDR perfidy will be re-enacted and the Treasury will collect once more at the citizen's expense. Optimists (so to speak) are guessing that gold ownership will be allowed when gold goes over two hundred dollars an ounce or such price as the Treasury considers too steep except for the very few.

There is a practical reason for not worrying about an immediate flight of dollars if gold ownership is permitted. Currency experts have long been telling us that large amounts of gold are illegally owned by Americans and stored abroad. In addition there is a legal method of gold ownership for the big American investor. He can incorporate in Europe and buy gold in his corporation's name. It would be safe to assume that those interested in and able to afford large amounts of gold have already obtained it, legally or illegally. The amount of money spent on gold by the average family does not look like something that would overturn any monetary system. The average family is just about the only entity not permitted in law and in fact to United States businessmen. Even foreign governments actually own the earmarked gold which they store in Federal Reserve Banks. Any civil libertarian should be outraged at the thought.

No case has been adjudicated by the Supreme Court which bears on the very marginal legal foundation upon which citizens who buy gold become felons. The three ruling decisions differ. The United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, in Campbell vs. the Chase National Bank, decided that Congress had the Constitutional

power to control gold itself and subsequently to delegate this control to the Executive Branch in the persons of the President and the Sec. of the Treasury. The Court stipulated only that the Secretary and not the President do the requisitioning. In another case, (Pike et al vs. the U.S., 1962) the appellate court in California's Ninth Circuit has ruled to uphold indictments against gold owners on the theory that the specific emergency powers cited by Roosevelt in 1934 provided the basis for any President to proclaim any emergency and thereafter to restrict the purchase or sale of gold.

The Southern District of California Court came out strongly to the contrary in U.S. vs. Bridle et al, dismissing indictments against bullion owners. The government's defense gave the court a multiple choice—a sort of "pick-your-favorite-emergency" approach. The court was actually told that President Roosevelt's 1933 banking crisis was sufficient grounds, but if the court didn't buy that it could opt for Truman's Korean War emergency, Kennedy's Communist imperialism or a balance of payments emergency. Judge Mathes gave a resounding response:

"To hold that the existence of Communist imperialism authorizes the criminal provisions here in issue would be to condone the methods of the enemy. For if the President of the United States be permitted to create crimes by fiat and ukase without Constitutional authority of Congressional mandate, there is little to choose between their system and ours.

"The years since the 1933 enactment of 12 U.S.C. 95 A have seen wholesale abdication of power by the Congress to the President. It is not the function of the Judicial Department to sit in Judgement upon the wisdom of that trend, but it is both the function and duty of the courts to hold the exercise of delegated Congressional powers strictly within the confines prescribed by the Congress."

One government official was recently quoted as saying at an international meeting that "the price of gold is less interesting than the price of hamburger." Allowing for the fact that it might have been lunchtime, the question is to whom? There is a basic distinction between a credit vehicle like poker chips or monopoly money which is only good as long as the game players continue to participate, and currency which has an intrinsic value.

It is basic to human nature to want currency which not only serves as an exchange rate, but which also provides a convenient manner in which to accumulate wealth. It is for this reason that I strongly oppose opening of the gold window. On the national level we have already seen \$20 million dollars in Treasury gold pass into the hands of other nations at \$35 an ounce. The effect was to soften our currency while turning over a handsome profit to other nations, at the expense of the United States. Now the United States is nothing more than the sum of its people and those people are deprived of gold ownership because they do not believe in the unimportance of gold. This is the Treasury's real, if unstated, position.

But they are going to have to start coping with the opinions of the rest of the world. When Libya last year announced a price for oil of \$6 a barrel, there was another condition for sale—unfortunately overlooked. Payment was required to be in gold-convertible currency, effectively ruling out dollars. (Incidentally Libya recently announced a new price for its oil, \$15 a barrel.)

This is not an isolated position in the Arab world. The Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development, a group of 16 Arab Nations, has recently decided to investigate the establishment of a gold-based international Arab currency. The dinar, as the cur-

rency might be called, would be one possible investment for the oil revenue which is expected to accrue to the Arab nations, amounting to billions of dollars over the next 15 years.

Kuwait's Finance and Oil Minister, Abdulrahman Al'Ateequ, who made the suggestion at the group's second annual meeting held recently in Kuwait, said the fund could "issue bonds consisting of currencies or units of accounts tied to the price of gold at the date of issue and thus provide a guarantee of value and protection against the possibility of devaluation for the Arab investor who employs his funds in these bonds."

The suggestion parallels a recent statement by London banker Mimos Zombanakis, who said that Arab oil-producing nations may insist that gold continue as the principal monetary asset. Mr. Zombanakis said:

"The real problem is to find an asset acceptable to the Arab nations or otherwise they may choose to keep their major asset—petroleum—in the ground. Gold could be the answer, especially if other countries besides the United States make their currencies convertible into gold."

In light of such statements, especially when viewed together with our current energy situation, I find it difficult to understand why the United States continues to stake its financial future on strengthening a system of special drawing rights, supposedly to replace gold as a monetary asset. As Mr. Zombanakis points out, such special drawing rights would be meaningless to nations that have continuous surpluses in their balance of payments, which the Arabs may quite reasonably expect to be their position for some time to come, due to the growing dependence of the world industrialized nations on Arabian oil.

At another recent meeting, held in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, economic and banking experts from five Islamic countries discussed the establishment of an Islamic Development Bank. The functions of the Bank would include the granting of interest-free loans to member countries, and the encouragement of investment in development projects in Muslim countries and communities. Of specific significance, the conference approved an initial capital outlay of one billion units, each equal to 0.88867088 grams of fine gold (SDI). In the terms of current exchange rates, this is \$1,350,000,000. At free market rates for gold, it would amount to over \$3 billion. Obviously the Arabs consider the price of gold of more importance than the price of hamburger.

But in this matter as in others, it is time for the Legislative Branch of the Government to take responsibility into its own hands. The Executive has been holding the reins, but the horses are running away. As I recall, Treasury spokesmen were among those who predicted that demonetizing gold would force the price of gold downward . . . Not a very clever prediction. It would be fair to say in retrospect, that virtually every official step taken with regard to gold in the past decade has been wrong. Is there any need to continue this devastating pattern? Now is the time to redirect this country's domestic and foreign monetary policies. And it seems to me that a logical and fair first step would be to rescind the prohibition against ownership of gold.

SOVIET PRESENCE IN THE INDIAN OCEAN

Mr. McGEE, Mr. President, considerable concern has been voiced in the Senate over plans by the Pentagon to build up its facilities on the British-owned island of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean.

Thus, the purpose of my remarks today

is to begin addressing the reasons behind our proposed response to the Soviet presence in the Indian Ocean. Our concern should not be based upon the fact that the Soviets are increasing their presence there, but rather, our concern should be focused upon the very fact that a world power has penetrated what was once a vacuum. The most desirable situation would be if everyone kept out of the Indian Ocean. We have stayed out and we did not initiate a buildup in that area of the world.

I think it is imperative we keep the balance in that area, a balance which has tipped with the Soviet presence. However, even though the Indian Ocean will never be a first-line defense for the Soviet Union or ourselves, we must realize the presence of a big power can influence the climate of political affairs of all the nations in the area. We would be foolish and irresponsible to believe the Indian Ocean can be dropped off the rolls of world politics completely.

One recognizes that balance of power has become a dirty term in our vocabulary. However, I would hasten to add if the world has changed so drastically in the past 27 years that balance of power is an outmoded concept, someone should advise the Soviets of this. The Soviets are the classical example of the application of balance-of-power techniques. This has been true historically, whether Russia was ruled by the czars or commissars. It is an inescapable fact that Russia has always been expansionist in her foreign policy and has only paused in that posture when she has been counter-balanced. I am not suggesting that the Soviets are attempting to take action which would result in the physical conquering of territories. What I am suggesting is that by extending her sphere of influence, she will have a definite impact on the stability and future political course of this area of the world.

The Soviets have already built up a sizeable presence in the Mediterranean; and with the opening of the Suez Canal, their capability to increase their presence in the Indian Ocean will be enhanced significantly. Already, they have increased their naval activity and political presence in the area. They have gained use of port or air facilities in Iraq, Yeman, South Yeman, Somalia, and India. Attempts have been made at negotiation for port rights in Singapore.

Therefore, the logical response for the U.S. to make is to have a base at Diego Garcia, an unpopulated and, therefore, politically uncomplicated island in the Indian Ocean. It would allow us, in low profile, to be able to balance off more adequately the Soviet presence by our presence.

I would conclude my remarks today by noting the least costly method of averting future consequences which could be highly detrimental not only to U.S. interests, but also the political stability of the area, would be for Congress to approve the administration's request for \$20 million to build up facilities on the island. I do not believe the response is an exaggerated one aimed at so-called ghosts of the past. The world is very real in this regard

and this fact should be recognized, rather than ignored, in the hopes that our fears might not be justified.

BRODER FINDS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS DOING SOME THINGS RIGHT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, David Broder has been one of the more critical observers of the Congress and the administration. He has been recognized for several years now as one of the most perceptive and thoughtful reporters in Washington. He has also written excellent books on what is wrong with American politics and our many shortcomings.

So with all this it was good to read his column in yesterday's Washington Post detailing some of the good things happening in our Government in recent weeks.

Broder points to the budget reform act, to the work of distinguished Administrators—Henry Kissinger, James Schlesinger, George Shultz, and John Dunlop. He also refers to the fight to resist retrogression in the environment fight by Russell Peterson and Russell Train and finds a good word to say for recent action by the Supreme Court.

Praise from a critic is especially cherished so I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SOME GOOD NEWS

(By David S. Broder)

Were we not hard on April Fool's Day, one would be tempted to begin this column in a straightforward way and admit that it is an argument for the unfashionable proposition that there are some good things happening in Washington.

But since anything said in mitigation of the Watergate Wallow is likely to be laughed out of court, perhaps it is more prudent just to cite the evidence and let you draw your own conclusions.

If you accept the assumption that Watergate demonstrated not just the derelictions of a specific set of officials but a breakdown in the system of restraints on which a democratic government rests, then the signs of recovery must be sought in instances of strengthened integrity and responsibility by all officials and agencies of government.

What we need, as political scientist Tom Cronin has pointed out, is not just a strong presidency, but a system that includes a strong President, Congress, courts, parties and people, all serving to discipline each other to the demands of democracy.

That is why it is of more than passing importance that recent weeks have shown signs of strong individual and institutional response in all these areas:

Congress, after more than a year of effort, has taken a very long step toward equipping itself with a mechanism for competent management of future budget decisions.

The Senate last week passed a budget reform act similar in most ways to one passed late in 1973 by the House. Once the two versions are reconciled in conference, work can begin on gearing up the new system.

When in place, it should allow Congress to do something that only the Chief Executive has been able to do effectively for the last 50 years—examine and evaluate the nation's fiscal situation and program-spending priorities on a comprehensive basis and with expert advice.

By creating budget committees, responsi-

ble to the party caucuses in each house, and providing them with staff assistance comparable to that the President receives from his Office of Management and Budget, the new procedure should make Congress again a full partner in the fiscal and spending process.

And by requiring Congress, at the beginning and end of each session, to consider overall spending priorities, the new procedure calls on the lawmakers to exercise a higher degree of responsibility than is involved in grabbing off projects for their own districts.

That Congress accepted this added responsibility with only 23 dissenting votes among the 535 members after an arduous and genuinely bipartisan legislative effort, says something very reassuring about the willingness of senators and representatives to meet the test of this time.

So does the performance of many members of the administration. Although their chief is up to his ears in legal and political troubles, the four Ph.D.'s who are managing crucial parts of the government—Henry Kissinger, James Schlesinger, George Shultz and John Dunlop—continue to operate in a way that may forever bury that tired cliché about the ineptitude of professors in power.

A contribution of special significance in the Watergate era is being made, almost daily, by the two environmental Russells—Chairman Russell E. Peterson of the Council of Environmental Quality and Administrator Russell E. Train of the Environmental Protection Agency.

If one of the lessons of Watergate was the danger of confusing loyalty to the President with loyalty to conscience and constitutional duties, these two presidential appointees have shown they know how to place the things first.

Despite evident White House backsliding and trimming on past commitments to environmental causes, Train and Peterson continue to speak out for and advocate intelligent national policies on land use and environmental protection—forcing the kind of public debate that is badly needed, and occasionally winning a battle for those who will inherit the earth from us.

As a final fillip, the past week found the Supreme Court acting in the unaccustomed role of a defender of the two-party system. The justices, who have often in the past gone out of their way to guarantee the political unreality of their legal conclusions, showed a rare sensitivity to the legitimate role of the two-party system in the unwritten constitution.

While knocking down as unconstitutional stiff fee schedules which served to bar poor people from places on the ballot, they upheld California and Texas statutes giving nominees of the two major parties a preferred status on ballot access and participation in state political subsidies.

Developments like these—and they are not unique—give you encouragement that this 200-year-experiment in self-government has not yet run its course. No April Fool. We may make it.

REPUBLICAN PARTY STRENGTH IN ARIZONA

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, anyone reading the national press might think the Republican Party is in shambles and the GOP ranks are being decimated by defections.

Anyone who believes this might want to take a look at voter registrations in Maricopa County, Ariz.

Republicans now have a voter registration lead of almost 20,000 over Democrats. At the time of the 1972 election,