

H.R. 3372

A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, to provide for the Federal funding of land and easement acquisitions and the construction and improvement of necessary roads and scenic viewing facilities in order to develop a national scenic and recreational highway program.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 145. Development of a prototype of a national highway program.

"(a) (1) The Congress finds—

"(A) that there are significant esthetic and recreational values to be derived from making places of scenic and natural beauty and historical, archeological, or scientific interest accessible to the public;

"(B) that there is a deficiency in the number and quality of scenic roads, parkways, and highways available to the motoring public;

"(C) that with increased population, greater leisure time and higher percentage of privately owned automotive vehicles, more families than ever are seeking suitable areas in which to drive for pleasure and recreation;

"(D) that the growth of cities and large metropolitan centers has decreased the quantity of open-space and recreational areas available to the general public, especially urban dwellers; and

"(E) that substantial economic, social, cultural, educational, and psychological benefits could be gained from a nationwide system of attractive roadways making possible widespread enjoyment of natural and recreational resources.

"(2) It is therefore the purpose of this section to provide assistance to the States and to other Federal departments and agencies having jurisdiction over Federal lands open to the public in order to develop highways throughout the Nation to satisfy such needs and to prove the actual national feasibility of such a system through direct Federal participation in the improvement and construction of the Great River Road and attendant facilities and to further provide for Federal participation in the celebration of the tricentennial of the discovery of the Mississippi River.

"(b) As soon as possible after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish criteria for the location and construction or reconstruction of the Great River Road by the ten States bordering the Mississippi River in order to carry out the purpose of this section. Such criteria shall include requirements that—

"(1) priority be given in the location of the Great River Road near or easily accessible to the larger population centers of the State and further priority be given to the construction and improvement of the Great River Road in the proximity of the confluence of the Mississippi River and the Wisconsin River;

"(2) the Great River Road be connected with other Federal aid highways and preferably with the Interstate System;

"(3) the Great River Road be marked with uniform identifying signs;

"(4) effective control, as defined in section 131(c) of this title, of signs, displays, and devices will be provided along the Great River Road;

"(5) the provisions of section 129(a) of this title shall not apply to any bridge or tunnel on the Great River Road and no fee shall be charged for the use of any facility constructed with assistance under this section.

"(c) For the purpose of this section the term 'construction' includes the acquisition of areas of historical, archeological, or scien-

tific interest, necessary easements for scenic purposes, and the construction or reconstruction of roadside rest areas (including appropriate recreational facilities), scenic viewing areas, and other appropriate facilities determined by the Secretary for the purpose of this section.

"(d) Highways constructed or reconstructed pursuant to this section (except subsection (g)) shall be maintained by the appropriate state or local jurisdiction and shall remain within their present highway system designation except with respect to such provisions of this title as the Secretary determines are not consistent with this section.

"(e) Funds authorized for each fiscal year pursuant to subsection (h) (1) shall be apportioned among the ten States bordering the Mississippi River on the basis of their relative needs as determined by the Secretary for payments to carry out the purpose of this section.

"(f) The Federal share of the cost of any project for any construction or reconstruction pursuant to the preceding subsections of this section shall be 80 per centum of such cost.

"(g) The Secretary is authorized to consult with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies having jurisdiction over Federal lands open to the public in order to enter into appropriate arrangements for necessary construction or reconstruction of highways on such lands to carry out the purpose of this section. To the extent applicable criteria applicable to highways constructed or reconstructed by the States pursuant to this section shall be applicable to highways constructed or reconstructed pursuant to this subsection. Funds authorized pursuant to subsection (h) (2) shall be used to pay the entire cost of construction or reconstruction pursuant to this subsection.

"(h) There is authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (1) not to exceed \$20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and 1975, for allocations to the States pursuant to this section, and (2) not to exceed \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and 1975, to carry out the provisions of subsection (g)."

Sec. 2. The table of contents of chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"145. Development of a prototype of a national scenic and recreational highway program."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Mr. O'NEILL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

DELEGATE ANTONIO B. WON PAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I request permission to insert into today's RECORD a resolution from the 11th Guam Legislature hailing the election of the territory's first Delegate to the House of Representatives, my good friend and colleague, ANTONIO B. WON PAT.

Delegate WON PAT has served his people well, as many of you here know. For over two decades TONY WON PAT has been

coming to Washington as an emissary before the Federal Government for his constituents. During the years TONY has made countless appearances before congressional committees in his efforts to gain additional benefits for Guam. And, the amazing record of his accomplishments as a result of his hard work is a tribute to TONY WON PAT.

As this resolution indicates, the legislature and the people of Guam are proud of the tremendous progress, both politically and economically, which they have made in the past few years, and rightly so. It is hard for those of us who enjoy the full benefits of our American citizenship to realize just how far our fellow Americans in the Western Pacific have come. Less than 6 years ago, even though they too were American citizens, the people of Guam not only lacked representation in Congress, but they were denied the right to choose their own Governor and Lieutenant Governor. Moreover, Guam was not included in the overwhelming majority of Federal grant programs, thereby placing a serious stumbling block in their progress.

Largely due to the dedicated efforts of one man, TONY WON PAT, and with the generous understanding of the Congress, Guam today participates in over 100 aid-in-grant programs, elects its own chief executive, and last November the people of Guam voted to send its foremost spokesman, Delegate WON PAT, to serve with us in the House.

As an old friend of the Guam Delegate, I welcome him as our colleague, as I am sure so do my fellow Members.

The Guam Legislature's resolution follows:

ELEVENTH GUAM LEGISLATURE, 1972 SECOND REGULAR SESSION—RESOLUTION NO. 667

Introduced by F. T. Ramirez, W. D. L. Flores, J. B. Butler, J. R. Duenas, T. C. Charfauros, J. A. Perez, A. A. Sekt, A. L. Cristobal, L. S. N. Paulino, A. C. Sanchez, F. R. Santos, P. J. Bordallo, O. L. Delfin, F. G. Lujan, and G. M. Bamba.

Relative to commending the Honorable Antonio B. Won Pat upon his election as Guam's first non-voting delegate to the United States Congress and declaring the election of Guam's representative in Congress as one of the milestones in Guam's attainment of local self-government.

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

Whereas, the territory of Guam was ceded to the United States as a result of the Treaty of Paris of December 10, 1898, which ended the Spanish-American War; and

Whereas, the island of Guam was administered by the United States Navy for almost fifty years, its indigenous people having the status of nationals of the United States; and

Whereas, the Organic Act of Guam enacted by the United States Congress in 1950 established civil government on Guam and bestowed American citizenship upon its inhabitants, the Congress of the United States thus granting the people of Guam a substantial measure of self-government; and

Whereas, another milestone in the territory's constitutional development was achieved in 1968, with the passage by the United States Congress of the Elected Governorship Bill for Guam, which resulted in the election of Guam's first elected Governor and Lt. Governor in November of 1970; and

Whereas, H.R. 3237 enacted by the 92d Congress of the United States in 1971 ex-

tended representation to the territory of Guam in the United States House of Representatives; and

Whereas, Honorable Antonio B. Won Pat was elected in November of 1972 to hold the prestigious office of Guam's first non-voting delegate to the House of Representatives; and

Whereas, the members of this Legislature recognize that the cornerstone of our democratic system of government is the concept of self-government in which the people determine their own form of government; and

Whereas, it is the consensus of this Legislature that the people of Guam desire closer ties with their fellow citizens in the American Mainland and that, having gained a voice in the halls of the United States Congress, Guam has made substantial and undeniable progress toward the attainment of this goal; and

Whereas, the people of Guam who now enjoy this measure of self-determination and self-government consider any requirements for periodic reports to foreign powers or to the United Nations relative to their political, economic, and social status as an intrusion and infringement on their dignity and rights as a self-governing people; now therefore be it

Resolved, that the Eleventh Guam Legislature on behalf of the people of Guam does hereby commend the Honorable Antonio B. Won Pat upon his election in November of 1972 as Guam's first elected Non-Voting Delegate to the United States Congress; and be it further

Resolved, that the Eleventh Guam Legislature on behalf of the people of Guam does hereby declare any requirement for making periodic reports to any foreign power or to the United Nations on its political, economic and social status to be an infringement on Guam's present level of self-rule and demeaning to the people of Guam and does hereby assert that any such requirement should therefore be terminated forthwith; and be it further

Resolved, that the Speaker certify to and the Legislative Secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Honorable Antonio B. Won Pat, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of State, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the President of the Senate, to the Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the Chairman, Senate Committee on

Interior and Insular Affairs and to the Governor of Guam.

Duly and regularly adopted on the 17th day of November, 1972.

A. C. SANCHEZ,
Acting Speaker.
F. G. LUJAN,
Acting Legislative Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. HOGAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET REQUEST FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members of the House, I am pleased to submit details on the fiscal 1974 budget request for military construction. The total of the request for a new obligational authority is \$2,937,900,000. This compares with an appropriated amount for fiscal 1973 for \$2,323,221,000.

As indicated, the total increase in funds is almost \$615 million. Of this, \$432 million is for military construction and \$183 million for family housing.

The number of new family housing units requested this year is 11,688. This compares to the 11,720 funded directly last year and the 11,938 new units programed from all funds last year. The Army has greatly increased its new family housing units as compared to last year, whereas the other services have declined. Nevertheless, the amount programed for new units in fiscal year 1974 is \$357,604,000, an increase of approximately \$50 million over the previous year. This is largely due to proposals to upgrade the

type of housing being constructed and to meet cost increases. The amount for improvements and minor construction of family housing is to increase by \$5.6 million from fiscal year 1973 to fiscal year 1974. Last year the committee added \$13 million to the minor construction program, so that overall there are significant increases in this important area. There are also major increases for operation—\$40 million—and maintenance—\$45 million. There is a significant increase in leased units from approximately 14,000 units in fiscal year 1973 to about 16,700 units in fiscal year 1974.

A major increase in military construction is for Army bachelor housing facilities. This program has been increased from \$238 to \$412 million from fiscal year 1973 to fiscal year 1974, an increase of \$174 million.

There is another lesser increase of \$27 million in the medical category. The total requested for fiscal year 1974, which is \$118 million, would have been considerably higher had not the new generation hospital proposed at Travis Air Force Base been slipped from fiscal year 1974 to fiscal year 1975, because of the complexity of the planning involved. There is likewise no construction money for the Combined Armed Services Medical School. This is largely due to the fact that DOD apparently has not defined the manner in which the school will be organized.

Pollution abatement funds are to increase for the Navy and decrease for the other services.

The overall picture for military construction for 1974 poses a healthy increase over previous programs and recognition of the fact that there is a requirement for improved living, working, and training facilities for the military services if morale and retention goals are to be achieved.

I have prepared a table showing a comparison of funding for 1973 and funding requests for 1974 by agency and item:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION ACT, 1974

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, 1973	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority, 1974	Increase (+) or decrease (-), 1974 budget compared with 1973 appropriations	Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, 1973	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority, 1974	Increase (+) or decrease (-), 1974 budget compared with 1973 appropriations
Military construction, Army.....	\$413,955,000	\$664,900,000	+\$250,945,000	Military construction, Air Force Reserve.....	\$7,000,000	\$10,000,000	+\$3,000,000
Military construction, Navy.....	517,830,000	685,400,000	+167,570,000	Total, military construction.....	1,355,841,000	1,787,500,000	+431,659,000
Military construction, Air Force.....	265,552,000	291,900,000	+26,348,000	Family housing, Defense.....	1,064,046,000	1,250,567,000	+186,521,000
Military construction, Defense agencies.....	36,704,000	19,100,000	-17,604,000	Portion applied to debt reduction.....	-96,666,000	-100,167,000	-3,501,000
Transfer, not to exceed.....	20,000,000	20,000,000	-----	Subtotal, family housing.....	967,380,000	1,150,400,000	+183,020,000
Military construction, Army National Guard.....	40,000,000	35,200,000	-4,800,000	Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority.....	2,323,221,000	2,937,900,000	+614,679,000
Military construction, Air National Guard.....	16,100,000	20,000,000	+3,900,000				
Military construction, Army Reserve.....	38,200,000	40,700,000	+2,500,000				
Military construction, Naval Reserve.....	20,500,000	20,300,000	-200,000				

THE VERY SAD PROBLEM OF AMERICAN MIA'S AND THEIR FAMILIES

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the moment of truth is fast approaching for the families of American MIA's. Prisoners of

war lists thus far published by the Communists show a shockingly large number who still are unaccounted for. It is a very sad commentary that many and quite probably the majority of the 1,300 who are carried as missing in action will not be found. It is to the families of these brave men that the sympathy of all America should go out. These are days

of terrible trial to wives, children, mothers, fathers, sisters, and brothers of the missing.

Some of those listed as missing will, of course, eventually be accounted for and some of them will be returned to their homes. Surely, there are those who are in the hands of the Vietcong or the Pathet Lao or in remote areas in South

Vietnam or Laos. Still others may be in hiding in small villages as yet unaware of the cease-fire.

The brave families who still must sit and wait for word while others around them rejoice at the virtually certain return of their loved ones are truly the heroic figures of this tragic war. Every family in our country which is held in this terrible suspense should be helped and comforted by all those around them.

TO PROTECT CONFIDENTIAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION

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

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, on behalf of 13 colleagues and myself, legislation to give news reporters and their editors near-absolute privilege to protect confidential sources of information.

Frankly, I am appalled that this legislation is necessary. It should not be. The first amendment in the Bill of Rights states quite clearly that freedom of the press is not to be abridged. But a serious threat has arisen as a result of Supreme Court action last year. The threat appears even more ominous in the current climate of repression against the news media.

As Members know, the Supreme Court ruled 5 to 4 that a reporter has no automatic right to refuse to appear before a grand jury; to refuse to divulge information gained in confidence, and to refuse to name the source of the information. The result was to legitimize an open subpoena season on investigative reporters. All too often the pursuit of a reporter's source assumes greater importance than an investigation of the abuses the story may have revealed.

Certain other relationships in our society are deemed sufficiently important to be classified as privileged communications. These include communication between husband and wife, between doctor and patient, and between lawyer and client. As a lawyer and former prosecutor concerned about the free flow of information in our society, I believe the reporter-source relationship is at least as important as these other privileges.

It was horrifying to me that the Supreme Court did not recognize the reporter-source privilege as a commonlaw right, let alone a constitutional right. It is all too easy to visualize the chilling effect on the news media.

An investigative reporter now faces an agonizing dilemma: Am I prepared to go to jail to protect this source? Which leads to the next question: Is this story really worth the trouble? How many stories revealing abuse of power or wrongdoing in our society will end up spiked on a desk or dust-covered in a reporter's drawer—never to reach the public because of a lack of privilege to protect the source? How many informants will entrust their careers and the well-being of their families—when they can't predict what a reporter will do if faced with the choice of revealing the informant or going to jail? The logical extreme of this vision is journalism output of stultifying bland-

ness designed not to offend the sensibilities of the local district attorney. It must never be allowed to happen if this country is to survive as a free society.

In last year's decisions the Supreme Court did point out that Congress may enact legislation to give news personnel the privilege to protect sources. I believe the legislation we are introducing today can offer sufficient protection.

Basically, the bill would offer news-persons absolute privilege, with the stipulation that this privilege could not be used as a defense in a civil libel suit. There are significant differences, however, between our bill and other news shield legislation.

First, it is spelled out that the privilege extends to editors or supervisors of the reporter who may have knowledge of confidential material or sources. Much of the investigative reporting in this country is done on a "team" basis and this language is to cover the possibility of the editor being subpoenaed without privilege.

Second, the bill specifically closes the loophole opened by a court in Los Angeles when reporter William Farr temporarily left the news media. It was on this basis that he was jailed for refusing to reveal the source of a story in the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner. Our bill covers a reporter regardless of whether he left the news media after the story appeared.

Our bill also covers material gathered for the story but left unpublished or not broadcast.

There is no provision in this bill setting criteria for a U.S. district court order to remove privilege under certain circumstances. It was our feeling after reviewing recent rulings that as few loopholes as possible should be left.

I urge favorable consideration for our bill.

PERENNIAL FISCAL PROBLEMS

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, as we begin this 93d Congress under a cloud of fiscal uncertainty we are hearing a lot about how the Congress needs to reassert its authority over the budgetary processes of the Federal Government, and how the House and Senate need to stand up on their hind legs and take back the control they have lost over Federal appropriations.

One of the perennial fiscal problems we face is our inability to process the annual appropriation bills before the start of the new fiscal year to which they apply. During the past 8 years, only six of nearly 100 regular appropriation bills became law before the beginning of the new fiscal year. The 91st and 92d Congresses saw none of these bills approved in time.

Now, there are many valid reasons for these delays, not the least of which is the ever increasing amount of time required to review a Federal budget that becomes more complex each year. But, the fact is that every funding bill delayed past July 1 creates confusion and hardship at all levels of government, and leaves schools, hospitals, and communities all over the country in a fiscal limbo.

I think one of the best places to begin fiscal reform is right here, by changing the Federal fiscal year to coincide with the regular calendar year, and today 90 of my colleagues and I are introducing legislation to accomplish this.

This change from a July-June Federal budgetary period to a January-December one would eliminate much of the present confusion, extend our fiscal deadline, and bring the system into line with the realities of our present congressional schedule and workload.

The current situation is disruptive not only for the Federal budgetary process, but also for the managing and planning of State and local budgets throughout the country. The Federal Government is not the only place where administrators are by law accountable on a split calendar year basis. All but three of the States use the same fiscal year as the Federal Government. This at one time may have been convenient, but any convenience has long since ceased to exist.

Public understanding of the fiscal process is another victim of our present system. The split year really lends itself well to the kinds of shell games some folk seem to enjoy playing with the budget. It is difficult enough for Members of Congress who are closely associated with the budgetary process to understand the complexities of split-year accounting, but for much of the general public, the whole system is a complete mystery.

I know that I do not have to explain to any other Member of Congress the results of the failure of our present system. We have all heard from the educators when the education bills are late; we have heard from the hospital administrators, from the builders, from our State and local officials, and from many others when appropriation bills have been delayed.

Of course, when we have a veto situation, as with the fiscal 1973 Labor-HEW bill, these problems are compounded, but the point is, if we could put our own fiscal house in order here in Congress, we would be in a much better position to deal with such contingencies.

The difficulties we face in this area of fiscal timing have no single source, but have developed because of a number of substantial changes which have occurred in Congress, and in the Federal Government in recent years. Above all, these problems are not the result of obstinacy, of procrastination, or of intentional delay. They are of quite a different nature.

Take the budget for example. I have served in this body since 1957, and have been closely associated with its operations since 1949. During that time I have seen the Federal budget move from around \$41 billion annually to where it is today.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I have watched and waited while authorization bills were stalled in committee, necessitating a rush of tardy appropriations during the legislative logjam that occurs near the end of a late-running session of Congress.

One of the principal reasons for this is that the large number of annual authorizations and the proliferation of Fed-

eral programs in all areas have required longer and longer periods for consideration of both authorization and appropriation bills.

As the role of the Federal Government expands, it becomes more and more difficult for Congress not only to obtain the kind of information we need to legislate and to appropriate wisely, but also to digest it, to analyze it in order to arrive at any meaningful conclusions on which to base policy decisions, and this process simply takes more time than we are allotted under our present Federal fiscal year system.

In recent years, some appropriation bills have not been enacted until the 12th month after the budget was presented. Major appropriation bills may require nearly a year for enactment, and on the average over the past decade, the largest ones have required about 8 months. We are, in effect, already operating on a calendar year basis.

As we look at the problems associated with changing the fiscal year to coincide with the calendar year, it is apparent that the benefits of such a shift far outweigh the disadvantages.

Perhaps more to the point, there are no compelling reasons why such a change should not be made, and many good reasons why it should.

For instance, many businesses have a natural fiscal year, which ends at the seasonal low of their activities. In the administration of Federal finances, however, there is no natural period for receipts and expenditures.

Tax collections and other receipts reach their low point in October, with other lows in March, May, and July, and peaks in April, June, September, and intermediate levels in other months.

Expenditures reach low points in February and July, but tend more toward 2- or 3-month highs rather than monthly peaks.

Obligations data show a different month-to-month pattern from receipts or expenditures. One review of obligations, for instance, showed that the high months for defense obligations were January, June, and November, and that the high months for nondefense obligations were April and June, followed by September and November.

These patterns occur despite the fact that the fiscal year ends with June.

But, if there is no natural fiscal year for the U.S. Treasury, there definitely is one for the U.S. Congress. That year starts with the beginning of each session in January and ends with the close of the session—usually December now.

No one who has been associated with the work of the Congress will deny that we all tend to think in terms of winding up a session, and cleaning up or clearing the legislative decks for the new one. This is the self-imposed deadline we work toward, the end of the natural period for the conduct of the congressional business—including the business of appropriation.

If we cannot use the argument that the present fiscal year is natural, neither can we raise the objection that it should not be changed because of tradition.

Over a hundred years ago Congress ran into a similar problem when they met in December and tried in the next 3 or 4 weeks to pass all appropriation bills for a fiscal year beginning January 1.

This system worked for a time, but when the activities of the Federal Government increased and the budget expanded and became more complex, Congress kept falling further and further behind.

So, in 1842, the fiscal year was pushed 6 months ahead to begin on July 1. Why should we now hesitate to make a similar needed change?

The shift from the split year to a calendar year would not be without problems, of course. Some Members may feel that they would not be able to exert the impact they would like on Federal fiscal matters, since in the first session of each Congress, the Government would be operating on funds appropriated by a previous session of Congress.

Another problem relates to the budget and the economic report. The budget would have to be delayed until the spring if it is to contain any information about the finances of the previous fiscal year.

Congress rarely gets organized until well into February anyway, and the budget delay would also afford the Appropriations Committees more opportunity for independent examination of special fiscal problems which they feel need more attention, prior to receipt of the line-item justifications.

The economic report might become a semiannual or quarterly report, and in this way the timespan for economic forecasting and advance planning might be reduced.

There are likely to be problems for State and local governments in adjusting to a change in the Federal fiscal year, but again, the obvious benefits to administration and long-range planning would outweigh the disadvantages of such adjustments.

I will be the first to concede that simply changing the dates of the fiscal year would do little to solve some of the more basic authorization-appropriation problems we face.

Aside from allowing Congress to "make an honest woman" of our fiscal process by legitimatizing what we are doing now in actual practice, the principal benefits of changing the fiscal year would be in helping those whose operations are dependent on Federal funds to plan better, and hopefully, to utilize our tax dollars more wisely and effectively.

I do not believe that this, in itself, is an inconsequential goal.

There are many aspects of the authorization-appropriation process which need improvement, even drastic overhauling. The quality of the budgetary information on which Congress must base its funding decisions, for example, and the whole question of how we can accurately measure program effectiveness, need attention. The problem of how to project budgetary needs for the next fiscal year with any kind of preciseness is another problem that currently plagues the executive branch as well as the Congress. And perhaps the biggest problem,

of course, is how Congress can deal with the level of the total budget, as well as the individual items.

Clearly, all these problems demand our attention and our conscientious efforts if we are to adequately fulfill our responsibilities as legislators.

But, we have to crawl before we can walk, and looking at the situation very realistically and practically, I believe the place to start is with a change in the dates of the Federal fiscal year. The time is right, the climate is right, and the need is clear, so I urge my colleagues to support the proposal we are presenting this afternoon.

NO RETURN TO VIETNAM

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which provides that, after the release of all American prisoners of war and a full accounting for all our missing in action, no further expenditures may be made for U.S. military involvement in Indochina without specific congressional approval. This restriction applies to all funds, including those which were appropriated prior to the signing of the Paris cease-fire agreement.

This bill is identical to S. 578 which was introduced in the Senate on Friday, January 26, by Senator CASE and Senator CHURCH. I am honored to have as cosponsors of this legislation Mr. ADDABO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Miss JORDAN, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MEZVINSKY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VAN DERLIN, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. YATRON.

The American public welcomes the end of the lengthy and tragic U.S. involvement in the Indochina fighting, and in my judgment it wants no recommitment of our military forces in Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia once our POW's are home and our MIA's are accounted for. However, unless this Congress takes the initiative in reasserting its rightful role, the road will remain open to the President to reinvolve American military forces in the Indochina struggle.

The present cease-fire in Indochina represents a very fragile peace, for its success depends upon the cooperation of adversaries who are fundamentally opposed to each other and who have been willing to continue their armed conflict for two decades. The cease-fire agreement leaves unanswered the basic question of how the peace will be enforced.

President Nixon has made the ominous suggestion that the United States would "see to it" that the agreement

It was a great success for the Russians and for the giant grain dealers who arranged the sale, but it was a serious, although temporary disaster for nearly everyone else involved. I say temporary because I believe that we can learn much from this event.

If the United States is going to have the opportunity in the foreseeable future to sell its agricultural production throughout the world, then sound economic policy dictates that we stop holding land out of production. Why pay for nonproduction at a time when demand for American food and fiber is at an all time high?

Artificial limits on production, without controls on exports, force the American housewife to compete with her sisters in other countries who are willing to pay much more for food than she is.

Let me hasten to add that I support the effort to increase farm income because increased farm income is the only logical way to keep large numbers of Americans in agriculture. I am committed to keeping American agriculture in the hands of the millions, not the few. Whether they fully appreciate it or not, the housewife and the small farmer share a common interest in this matter.

Serious shortages of agricultural production cause artificial price increases of substantial proportions, while overproduction results in sharp declines in farm income. Understandably so, we have been concerned about the adverse effects of overproduction in the past. However, I believe that agricultural policy for the years to come should be based as much on our best understanding of what the world marketplace will buy as on our recollections of the past.

Consider for a moment some of the dilemmas Congressmen face because, the country has no consistent economic policy. We helped to wipe out the national reserves of feed grains because central New York dairy farmers lost their crops due to bad weather last year. I found myself supporting legislation to impose controls on the foreign sales of feed grains and wheat at the same time I was urging the President to life import restrictions on oil. I fought against a policy which encouraged imports of dairy products to meet domestic demand at a time when the Government was doing little to encourage an increase in the domestic production of dairy products.

I happen to believe that it is possible for the United States to adopt an economic policy toward agriculture which will promote strong farm income, encourage sufficient production to meet foreign demand, and still keep the price of a loaf of bread below fifty cents.

If some of the positions have outlined above seem inconsistent, it is because there is no consistent economic policy designed in the short and long run to balance the economic realities of our time. For example, Americans discovered that price controls on agricultural products did not work because they were not addressed to the causes of the price increases. Controls only served to create shortages. And yet today we find the Cost of Living Council trying to hold down the price of fertilizer and the price of milk without action on the factors producing the rising costs.

The United States must end the practise of jumping from one hole in the total economic dike to another, trying to hold back the tide. The economic dislocations we are dealing with cannot be cured by emergency, almost panic, solutions of a temporary nature.

Ladies and gentlemen, I submit that the time is long past due for the President to call his team to work together in support of a sound and consistent policy. What a spectacle we have with the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Director of the Cost of Living Council, the

Secretary of the Treasury, and the Council of Economic Advisers, all going off in their separate directions. Some one has to make a decision about what policy is best for the country as a whole. Some one has to determine the common good, and then bring the troops into line in pursuit of that goal.

I know that you understand and appreciate the need for stability and consistency in the economy, and this means that all segments and all competing forces in the economy must be brought together.

Again, I appreciated having this opportunity to share in this festive occasion. This new building is ample proof of the truth of the words of the then national master, James Draper, who told the Grange in 1886, "for this great work the Grange was organized, and it was not born to die nor will it fall in the accomplishment of its purpose".

Thank you.

CONGRESSMAN HANLEY WILL SPEAK AT GRANGE BUILDING DEDICATION

New York State Grange will dedicate its \$4 million new headquarters building here, on a new street, Grange Place, Sunday, starting at 3 p.m. Principal dedication address will be given by 31st District Congressman James M. Hanley of Syracuse.

Serenaded by the Homer High School Band and welcomed by Master of Ceremonies Richard A. Church of Dryden, the group will also hear from State Senator Tarky Lombardi Jr., Syracuse; Assemblyman L. S. Buford Jr., Auburn; and O. Jerome Davis, Ramsey, Ind., High Priest of Demeter of the National Grange.

A number of presentations will be part of the ceremonies:

Official opening of the new city-built street by Cortland Mayor Morris Noss.

Formal presentation of the new building flagpole by William J. Duncan, director of public relations and advertising for Brockway Motor Trucks.

Gift of a new American flag flown over the U.S. Capitol by Junior Grange Prince and Princess Vernon Smith and Barbara Stepf for East Clay Junior Grange (Onondaga County).

Gift of a Grange emblem flag by the State Grange youth director, Mr. and Mrs. Donald Drake, Cherry Valley, with Prince and Princess Barry Griffith and Phyllis Gleason assisting.

Keys to the building extended by Architect Karl Wendt, Cortland.

Gift of a grand piano from Cortland County Granges presented by Pomona Master Roland Oaks.

Gift of furnishings for the State master's office in the building by Oswego Pomona Grange presented by Oswego Grange Deputy Andrew Porter, Sandy Creek.

A brief dedication ceremony will be solemnized by State Grange Master Robert S. Drake, Woodhull; Lecturer Mrs. Howard Reed, Sauquoit; Secretary Morris J. Halladay, Groton; and Chaplain Bert S. Morse, Marathon.

State officers will be presented by Grange Service and Hospitality Chairman Mrs. Cecelia Pilc, Cowlesville, State Master Drake, assisted by Junior Grange Prince and Princess Phillip Rhodda and Ann Emerson, will cut a ribbon, followed by an officers' reception.

Other Grange participants include Francis Robbins, Schuylerville, leading the National Anthem, and Grange Young Couple Nelson and Mary Eddy, Black River, leading the Pledge of Allegiance.

The principal speaker, Congressman Hanley, has served the 31st District in Congress since 1964. He is a graduate of St. Lucy's Academy, Syracuse, and a member of St. Patrick's Parish. He is married and the father of two children, Christine, 19, and Peter, 17.

He is a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the House Banking and Currency Committee.

As a first term legislator he had his own bill passed by the House of Representatives. The Hanley bill, of the 89th Congress, provides for expanded benefits for dependent parents and children of servicemen who died of service-connected injuries. The 90th Congress created a new standing subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, entitled "Subcommittee on Employee Benefits," and Congressman Hanley was elected as its chairman. On February 16, 1970, the House of Representatives passed the Job Evaluation Policy Act of 1970, culminating three years of efforts on the part of the Subcommittee.

During his first term in office, Mr. Hanley was a strong supporter of Medicare and authored an amendment which substantially improved the legislation. In 1965, the Congressman was instrumental in obtaining funds enabling Le Moyne College, Syracuse, to develop a pilot program, known as "Upward Bound," designed to alleviate the problem of high school dropouts by providing a program allowing unlegislation.

In 1965, the Congressman was instrumental in obtaining funds enabling Le Moyne College, Syracuse, to develop a pilot program, known as "Upward Bound" designed to alleviate the problem of high school dropouts by providing a program allowing underprivileged area students to participate in a summer higher education program at the college. This program has proven most successful and is now administered on a nationwide basis through the Office of Education.

Congressman Hanley has taken a leading role in focusing federal attention on the necessity of a program designed to rehabilitate America's destroyed small lakes. He introduced legislation which would make available Federal money and resources to save the Nation's dying urban lakes, and he was successful in having his legislation approved by the House in the 90th Congress. Although the Senate failed to act on that measure, he reintroduced it in the 91st Congress and it was approved by both Houses.

The Congressman served two terms on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and in 1969 was elected to the Banking and Currency Committee. He is a member of the Subcommittees on Urban Mass Transit, Small Business, and Insurance and Bank Supervision.

In 1973, he was elected Chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Service, which has all jurisdiction over the U.S. Postal Service except labor management relations and facilities.

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GUDE's remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PEYSER) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEMP, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CLEVELAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BAKER, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the re-

quest of Mr. STEELMAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. STEELMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, for 60 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN for 30 minutes, tomorrow, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RYAN) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FUQUA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HARRINGTON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FRASER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DULSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BENITEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FULTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CLARK, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROUSH.

Mr. MAHON, his remarks today.

Mr. ECKHARDT, his remarks preceding the vote on the Labor-HEW appropriations conference report today.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. BIAGGI, his remarks prior to the vote on the motion to recommit on the Labor-HEW conference report today.

Mr. GRAY in two instances, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. FRASER, and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds 4½ quarter pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$888.25.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. PEYSER) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. KEMP in four instances.

Mr. KUYKENDALL in two instances.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Mr. ESHLEMAN.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mrs. HOLT.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.

Mr. HUDNUT.

Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. MARAZITI.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. SYMMS.

Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri in two instances.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. LOTT.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. MICHEL in five instances.

Mr. FROELICH.

Mr. HUBER.

Mr. COLLIER in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STEELMAN) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. RONCALLO of New York in three instances.

Mr. HOGAN.

Mr. PRITCHARD in five instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina.

Mr. ZION.

Mr. SPENCE.

Mr. MIZELL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RYAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SISK.

Mr. COTTER in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. HOLFIELD.

Mr. WAGGONNER.

Mr. MAHON.

Mr. HARRINGTON in five instances.

Mr. BADILLO in two instances.

Mr. KOCH.

Mr. ADAMS.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. STARK in 10 instances.

Mr. SYMINGTON.

Mr. LEHMAN.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. DE LA GARZA.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1081. An act to amend section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, and to authorize a trans-Alaska oil pipeline, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4771. An act to authorize the District of Columbia Council to regulate and stabilize rents in the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 14, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1548. A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1974 for the Supreme Court (H. Doc. No. 93-188); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1549. A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1974 for the Department of Labor (H. Doc. No. 93-189); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1550. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a report on the implementation of section 620(s) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, during fiscal year 1973; to the Committee on Foreign Assistance.

1551. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve and extend the Public Health and National Health Service Corps scholarship training program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1552. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of financial statements of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation for calendar years 1971 and 1972, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1452; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1553. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of financial statements of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for fiscal year 1973, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 841 (H. Doc. No. 93-190); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

~~Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. Senate Joint Resolution 155. Joint resolution authorizing the securing of storage space for the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Office of the Architect of the Capitol. (Rept. No. 93-639). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.~~

Mr. SIKES: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 11459. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 93-638.) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

~~Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. S. 2503. An act to name a Federal office building in Dallas, Tex., the "Earle Cabell Federal Building". (Rept. No. 93-637). Referred to the House Calendar.~~

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 6862. A bill to name the headquarters building in the Geological Survey National Center under construction in Reston, Va., as the "John Wesley Powell Federal Building". (Rept. No. 93-635). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 9430. A bill to name the U.S. courthouse and Federal office building under construction in New Orleans, La., as the "Hale Boggs Federal Building" and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 93-636). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PIKE: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 2408 (Rept. No. 93-634). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 694. Resolution providing for the

consideration of H.R. 11216. A bill to amend Public Law 93-60 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-630). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 695. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 11333. A bill to provide a 7-percent increase in social security benefits beginning with March 1974 and an additional 4-percent increase beginning with June 1974, to provide increases in supplemental security income benefits, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-631). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 700. A resolution providing for the resolution (H. Res. 128) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to actions which should be taken by Members of the House upon being convicted of certain crimes, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-632). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 701. A resolution waiving points of order against the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11459) and waiving points of order against unauthorized items of appropriation in said bill (Rept. No. 93-633). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 11415. A bill to amend section 6334 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from levy 90 percent of an individual's wages or salary; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 11416. A bill to provide for the establishment within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of a National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect; to provide a program of grants to States for the development of child abuse and neglect prevention and treatment programs; and to provide financial assistance for research, training, and demonstration programs in the area of prevention, identification, and treatment of child abuse and neglect; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COLLINS of Texas:

H.R. 11417. A bill to provide that daylight saving time shall be observed on a year-round basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 11418. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the earnings test and reduce the age of eligibility for benefits under the OASDI program, and to amend title XVIII of such act to eliminate all deductibles and coinsurance and provide coverage for drugs, eyeglasses, dentures, hearing aids, and other items under the medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):

H.R. 11419. A bill to insure that the compensation and other emoluments attached to the Office of Attorney General are those which were in effect on January 1, 1969; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FORSYTHE:

H.R. 11420. A bill to exclude from gross income the first \$1,000 of interest received from savings account deposits in home lending institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENZEL (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. BUTLER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. FISHER, and Mr. WIDNALL):

H.R. 11421. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 and the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for more effective regulation of elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 11422. A bill to establish a New England Regional Power and Environmental Protection Agency for the purpose of assuring adequate and reliable low-cost electric power to the people of New England, protecting and enhancing the environment, and providing a vehicle for research and development programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 11423. A bill to amend title 44 of the United States Code to designate the Daniel Reed Library at the State University College of Fredonia in Fredonia, N.Y., as a depository library; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 11424. A bill to authorize appropriations for the U.S. Information Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 11425. A bill to amend the Duck Stamp Act and other laws to prohibit the charging of any Federal fee to any individual who has attained age 65 for the privilege of hunting, trapping, or fishing; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUDNUT:

H.R. 11426. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to promote public confidence in the legislative branch of the Government of the United States by requiring the disclosure by Members of Congress and certain employees of the Congress of certain financial interests; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 11427. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to prohibit the Secretary of Transportation from imposing certain seatbelt standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 11428. A bill to provide housing for persons in rural areas of the United States on an emergency basis and to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MCCOLLISTER (for himself, Mr. WARE, and Mr. FREY):

H.R. 11429. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to provide temporary authority to suspend certain stationary source fuel and emission limitations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCCORMACK (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. THONE, Mr. STARK, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. TREEN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. OBEY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LUJAN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. CULVER):

H.R. 11430. A bill to provide for the early commercial demonstration of the technology of solar heating by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in cooperation with the National Bureau of Standards, the National Science Foundation, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and other Federal agencies, and for the early development and commercial demonstration of technology for combined solar heating

and cooling; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MCCORMACK (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. YATRON, Mr. FULTON, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. BAPALIS, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. RABICK, Mr. McEWEN, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. RODINO, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. BYRON, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 11431. A bill to provide for the early commercial demonstration of the technology of solar heating by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in cooperation with the National Bureau of Standards, the National Science Foundation, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and other Federal agencies, and for the early development and commercial demonstration of technology for combined solar heating and cooling; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MCCORMACK (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. HUBER, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. RYAN, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SKUBERTZ, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. RHODES, and Mr. CASEY of Texas):

H.R. 11432. A bill to provide for the early commercial demonstration of the technology of solar heating by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in cooperation with the National Bureau of Standards, the National Science Foundation, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and other Federal agencies, and for the early development and commercial demonstration of technology for combined solar heating and cooling; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MCCORMACK (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. OBEY, Mr. ROUSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. FISHER, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. BAKER, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. CORMAN, and Mr. REES):

H.R. 11433. A bill to further the conduct of research, development, and commercial demonstrations in geothermal energy technologies, to direct the National Science Foundation to fund basic and applied research relating to geothermal energy, and to direct the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to carry out a program of demonstrations in technologies for commercial utilization of geothermal resources including hot dry rock and geopressured fields; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MCCORMACK (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. RHODES, and Mr. CASEY of Texas):

H.R. 11434. A bill to further the conduct of research, development, and commercial demonstrations in geothermal energy technologies, to direct the National Science Foundation to fund basic and applied research relating to geothermal energy, and to direct the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to carry out a program of demonstrations in technologies for commercial utilization of geothermal resources including hot dry rock and geopressured fields; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. McCORMACK (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. FULTON, Mr. PODELL, Mr. WARE, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. CONTE, Mr. HUBER, Mr. FRASER, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. YATRON, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. PREYER, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, and Mr. HAMILTON):

H.R. 11435. A bill to further the conduct of research, development, and commercial demonstrations in geothermal energy technologies, to direct the National Science Foundation to fund basic and applied research relating to geothermal energy, and to direct the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to carry out a program of demonstrations in technologies for commercial utilization of geothermal resources including hot dry rock and geopressed fields; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. McCORMACK (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. FISH, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. VAN DERLIN, Mr. POAGE, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. KEMP, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. HICKS, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. RODINO, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. BOLAND, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 11436. A bill to further the conduct of research, development, and commercial demonstrations in geothermal energy technologies, to direct the National Science Foundation to fund basic and applied research relating to geothermal energy, and to direct the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to carry out a program of demonstrations in technologies for commercial utilization of geothermal resources including hot dry rock and geopressed fields; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MARAZITI:

H.R. 11437. A bill to cease exports of oil and oil products from the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11438. A bill to cease all foreign aid to those Middle East nations that reduced the export of oil and oil products to the United States as a punitive reaction to U.S. support of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOAKLEY (for himself and Mr. HELSTOSKI):

H.R. 11439. A bill to amend title 3 of the United States Code to provide for the order of succession in the case of a vacancy both in the Office of President and Office of the Vice President, to provide for a special election procedure in the case of such vacancy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 11440. A bill to provide for Federal control over foreign banks and other foreign persons establishing, acquiring, operating, or controlling banking subsidiaries in the United States (including its possessions); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. QUIE, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. BRADEMAs, Mr. BELL, and Mr. MEEBS):

H.R. 11441. A bill to postpone the implementation of the Head Start fee schedule; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H.R. 11442. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex or marital status against individuals seeking credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 11443. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide veterans a 10-year delimiting period for completing educational programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RARICK (for himself, Mr. TREEN, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. STYMS, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, and Mr. LEHMAN):

H.R. 11444. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to repeal the recently added provision for the establishment of Professional Standards Review Organizations to review services covered under the Medicare and Medicaid programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 11445. A bill to provide emergency security assistance authorizations for Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 11446. A bill to assure opportunities for employment and training to unemployed and underemployed persons; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CARTER):

H.R. 11447. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide a mechanism to obtain information bearing on the adulteration or misbranding of food; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11448. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide increased assurance against adulterated or misbranded food; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 11449. A bill to abolish the U.S. Postal Service, to repeal the Postal Reorganization Act, to reenact the former provisions of title 39, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 11450. A bill to direct the President to take action to assure through energy conservation, rationing, and other means, that the essential energy needs of the United States are met, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. THONE):

H.R. 11451. A bill to improve the conduct and regulation of Federal election campaign activities and to provide public financing for such campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CAREY of New York:

H.R. 11452. A bill to correct an anomaly in the rate of duty applicable to crude feathers and downs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

H.R. 11453. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to provide full disclosure of contents of report to consumers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11454. A bill to amend the "Freedom of Information Act" to require consent of subject individuals before disclosure of personally identifiable information in certain circumstances; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 11455. A bill to protect the privacy of statistical reporting or research system subjects; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRITCHARD:

H.R. 11456. A bill to extend daylight saving time to the entire calendar year for a 3-year period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 11459. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.J. Res. 822. Joint resolution to amend title 5 of the United States Code to provide for the designation of the 11th day of November of each year as Veterans' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.J. Res. 823. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of February 20 of each year as "Postal Employees Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 824. Joint resolution designating November 11 of each year as "Armistice Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Res. 693. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H. Res. 698. Resolution to establish as part of the congressional internship program an internship program for senior citizens in honor of John McCormack, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FROELICH (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. BAUMAN, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HUBER, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. POWELL of Ohio, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROE, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. THONE, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. WON PAT):

H. Res. 697. Resolution creating a select committee to study the impact and ramifications of the Supreme Court decisions on abortion; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEMP:

H. Res. 698. Resolution creating a Standing Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'NEILL (for himself and Mr. BROWN of Michigan):

H. Res. 699. Resolution to seek peace in the Middle East and to continue to support Israel's deterrent strength through transfer of Phantom aircraft and other military supplies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

326. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to observance of daylight saving time year-round; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 11457. A bill for the relief of Il Kwon Yang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 11458. A bill for the relief of Arsenia Daitol Hingpit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

352. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Commissioners, Sarasota County, Fla., relative to its confidence in and support of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

353. Also, petition of Phillip B. Anderson, Pittsburgh, Pa., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 7446, ESTABLISHING AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DONOHUE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 7446) to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 93-639)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7446) to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 6.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 7. (a) (1) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to carry out the provisions of this Act, except for the program of grants-in-aid established by section 9(b) of this Act, not to exceed \$10,000,000, of which not to exceed \$1,375,000 shall be for grants-in-aid pursuant to section 9(a) of this Act.

"(2) For the purpose of carrying out the program of grants-in-aid established by section 9(b) of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed \$20,000,000, as may be necessary, and any funds appropriated pursuant to this paragraph shall remain available until expended, but no later than December 31, 1976."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 9. (a) The Administrator is authorized to carry out a program of grants-in-aid in accordance with and in furtherance of the purposes of this Act. The Administrator may, subject to such regulations as he may prescribe—

"(1) make equal grants of appropriated funds in each fiscal year of not to exceed \$85,000 to Bicentennial Commissions of each State, territory, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, upon application therefor;

"(2) make grants of nonappropriated funds to nonprofit entities, including States, territories, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (or subdivisions thereof), to assist in developing or supporting bicentennial programs or projects. Such grants may be up to 50 per centum of the total cost of the program or project to be assisted."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(b) For the purpose of further assisting each of the several States, the Territories, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in developing and supporting bicentennial programs and projects,

the Administrator is authorized, out of funds appropriated pursuant to section 7(a) (2) of this Act, to carry out a program of grants-in-aid in accordance with this subsection. Subject to such regulations as may be prescribed and approved by the Board, the Administrator may make grants to each of the several States, Territories, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to assist them in developing and supporting bicentennial programs and projects. Each such recipient shall be entitled to not less than \$200,000 under this subsection. In no event shall any such grant be made unless matched by the recipient."

And the Senate agree to the same.

HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
JAMES R. MANN,
M. CALDWELL BUTLER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
ROMAN HRUSKA,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7446) to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Conferees agreed to the language of Senate Amendment No. 1 amending Section 4 of H.R. 7446. This language is consistent with the basic principle of the legislation in encouraging State and local participation in the Bicentennial observance. The Senate language further implemented this purpose in providing that the Administrator is to coordinate his activities to the extent practicable with those being planned by State, local and private groups. He is further authorized to appoint special committees with members from among those groups to plan such activities as he deems appropriate.

The Senate amended Section 7(a) (1) of the House bill by placing a ceiling of \$10,000,000 annually for the expenses of the Administration. Included in that amount was an authorization of not more than \$2,475,000 for annual grants of \$45,000 to each State, Territory, the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The provision for the \$45,000 grants was contained in a parallel amendment to Section 9 of the bill which authorized the Administrator to make equal grants from appropriated funds of not more than \$45,000 to each of the recipients.

The Conferees agreed to reduce the \$45,000 figure to \$25,000 per entity and the annual authorization for this grant program to \$1,375,000.

Section 7(a) (2) as added by the Senate authorized an appropriation of not more than \$20,000,000 for grants-in-aid on a matching basis to the several states to assist them in developing and supporting Bicentennial programs and projects as provided in the new Section 9(b) as added by the Senate, the amount to remain available until expended but no later than June 30, 1976.

The Conferees changed this date to December 31, 1976, because of the continuing celebrations and commemorations anticipated throughout the calendar year of 1976.

The language of Section 9(b) as contained in the Conference Report is the revised language agreed to by the Conferees. The Senate language provided that the amounts received under Section 9(b) by any State could not exceed \$400,000 per state on a matching basis. In Conference, it was agreed to change this language so that each recipient would be entitled to not less than \$200,000 in grants

on a matching basis under the Subsection. In addition, the District of Columbia, the Territories and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico were included as eligible recipients. The Conferees recognized that each jurisdiction would, therefore, be assured of the right to participate in this grant program up to the amount of \$200,000. The language of the Subsection makes it clear that these grants are subject to regulations prescribed and approved by the Board. The \$200,000 amount is available for grants to each jurisdiction and considered obligated for that purpose, which, if not used, would lapse. It is not intended that the unused portion of the \$200,000 minimum earmarked for each jurisdiction will be available for distribution to any other jurisdiction or for any other purpose. The remaining funds under the \$20,000,000 authorization are automatically available for grants to any eligible jurisdiction that presents a program found acceptable to the Administration.

The Conferees retained Senate Amendment No. 4. It is merely a conforming amendment made necessary by the renumbering changes in Subsection (a) of Section 9.

The Senate Conferees receded from Senate Amendment No. 6 which would have provided that the Administrator would serve as Chairman of the American Revolution Bicentennial Board and the Vice Chairman shall be elected by members of the Board from members of the Board. The Conferees agreed to retain the original House language providing that the Chairman and Vice Chairman shall be elected by members of the Board from members of the Board other than the Administrator.

The Conferees intend that the regulations provide a reasonable period for applications for grants by eligible entities.

HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
JAMES R. MANN,
M. CALDWELL BUTLER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
ROMAN HRUSKA,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 11459, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION FOR 1974

Mr. McSPADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 701 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES 701

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move, clause 6 of rule XXI to the contrary notwithstanding, 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. 11459) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes and the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI are hereby waived with respect to any appropriation contained in such bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

Mr. McSPADEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 701 provides for a waiver of the provisions of clause 6 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives—the 3-day rule—in order that the House may consider the bill H.R. 11459, a bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

House Resolution 701 also provides for a waiver of the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI of the rules of the House—prohibiting unauthorized appropriations.

H.R. 11459 makes appropriations for military construction and family housing for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. The bill recommends new budget authority of \$2,609,090,000, an increase of \$285,869,000 above the amount provided in fiscal year 1973 and \$335,810,000 below the requests of fiscal year 1974.

H.R. 11459 includes appropriations for construction in support of the Trident submarine and underwater-launched ballistic-missile systems.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 701 in order that we may discuss and debate H.R. 11459.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Latta).

Mr. Latta. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the statements just made by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

House Resolution 701 provides for the consideration of H.R. 11459, the military construction appropriation bill, 1974. This resolution waives the 3-day rule in order that we may consider the bill this week, and also waives points of order with regard to clause 2, rule XXI.

The purpose of this legislation is to make appropriations for military construction and family housing for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1974.

The committee has recommended new budget authority of \$2,609,090,000, which is an increase of \$285,869,000 above the appropriations for fiscal year 1973, and a decrease of \$335,810,000 in the request for fiscal year 1974.

The increase is due to several large programs. Most important is the construction in support of the Trident submarine and underwater-launched ballistic missile systems. This construction, to be initiated in fiscal year 1974, is a net increase of \$112,320,000 over fiscal year 1973. Additionally, the cost of operating and maintaining military family housing has increased, therefore, there is an increase of \$94,131,000 to meet these costs. Also, the Army has increased its bachelor housing program.

The reduction of \$335,810,000 is due primarily to the announced and pending base closure actions on the military construction and family housing programs. Also, because of these announced closures, there have been a number of projects canceled at these bases.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this rule.

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

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

Mr. Latta. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. Gross. This is a most unusual procedure. Not 5 minutes ago the House

approved the conference report on the authorization bill and 5 minutes later we are called upon to take up a rule-making in order for a bill that provides funds for the authorization measure.

How the Committee on Appropriations could know what the House would do with the conference report is a mystery.

Mr. Latta. Let me say to my good friend from Iowa, this shows that this body can act with expedition if it really wants to.

Mr. Gross. Yes; if it does not show anything else, it does show that.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. Sikes. 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. 11459) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, one-half the time to be controlled by myself and one-half by the gentleman from California (Mr. Talcott).

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 11459, with Mr. ANNUNZIO 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. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Sikes).

Mr. Sikes. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

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

Mr. Sikes. Mr. Chairman, this bill comes to you under a rule which waives the 3-day requirement and waives the necessity for completion of the authorization process. We in the committee have no desire to circumvent the authorization process. The bill is brought to you in this manner because of the prospect for delays in the completion of the authorization process. There is no non-germane material in the bill.

It is the desire of the leadership that we expedite all essential legislation in every way that we can. This is one of the last remaining appropriations bills and it is deemed important to clear it in the House so that this part of our legislative program can be advanced as far as possible prior to the Thanksgiving recess and in that way help to avoid the logjam of uncompleted legislation which might build up early in December.

First let me express my very great appreciation to the members of the subcommittee and to the staff. I have highest commendation of this able group for the dedicated and conscientious manner in which they carried on the difficult work of the Subcommittee on Military Construction. It is an exacting task because hearings must be conducted day after day and week after week as line items are examined and witnesses are questioned on the requirements for funding proposals which are submitted by the various departments.

Understandably, there is not full agreement within the committee on some items, but the net result is a sound and workable package which I can strongly recommend to the House.

Again, let me say that I do so with appreciation for the outstanding contributions of my fellow Members and the staff of the subcommittee.

The committee recommends that you approve new budget authority in the amount of \$2,609,090,000 for military construction for fiscal year 1974. The original estimate submitted by the Department of Defense was for \$2,944,900,000. An additional \$35,400,000 was requested subsequently but was not approved by the authorizing committees and could not be considered by this subcommittee.

Conferee agreement on the authorizing bill was in the amount of \$2,723,711,000, a cut of \$221,189,000. Your committee has made further cuts of \$114,621,000 below the recommendations of the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate. This is a total cut of \$335,810,000.

Broken down by services, we have the following figures.

For the Department of the Army, the total request was \$740,800,000. The authorization is for \$684,394,000. Your committee recommended \$627,475,000.

For the Department of the Navy, the total request was \$705,700,000. The total of the authorization is \$661,049,000. Your committee recommended \$610,541,000.

For the Department of the Air Force the request was for \$321,900,000. The committee authorized \$294,096,000. We recommend funding of \$269,702,000.

For family housing, the request was for \$1,181,500,000 for 12,688 units. The committee is recommending \$1,094,372,000 which will permit construction of 10,691 units, and which is approximately the amount authorized.

For your information, the funding for family housing includes much more than the construction of housing units. Costs in addition to construction of new units include modernizing, relocating, operating, maintaining, and leasing military family housing, as well as debt principal and interest payments on military family housing indebtedness. Also covered are construction of trailer spaces, minor construction, acquisition of Wherry housing, planning, furniture procurement, payments under the rental guarantee and section 809 which is armed services housing for essential civilian employee housing programs, payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation for housing built with funds obtained from the surplus commodity

program, and servicemen's mortgage insurance premiums. Still other costs associated with housing military families are carried in the military personnel appropriations. Housing allowances and cost of transportation of personnel and of household goods are examples.

To some extent, savings resulting from cancellation of prior-year projects as the result of base closures or other changes in requirements can be applied to finance the fiscal year 1974 program. Sufficient funds have been provided to allow for the construction of adequate units for those projects which remain valid in the fiscal year 1972 and 1973 family housing programs.

For defense agencies the total request was \$19,100,000. The amount authorized is \$10,000,000. We find available revenues are sufficient to finance this program through fiscal year 1974 so no new appropriation is approved.

This year's reduction in authorization much higher than usual. However, your is much higher than usual. However, your committee has recommended additional cuts as indicated. I can assure you there is no justification for other cuts. The Nation is moving into a peacetime force status—the level-off period when there are no longer requirements for participation in the conflict in Southeast Asia and begin with what we hope will be a long period of relative stability for our forces at strength levels based on worldwide treaty commitments.

Most base closures and realignments have now been finalized and are in process of being carried out. That means we are dealing primarily with permanent bases. We also are seeking to achieve an all-volunteer force. To do these things successfully we must attract a high-level type of personnel. Modern, sophisticated equipment demands personnel who are capable of manning and maintaining it. This also requires training facilities which are modern and barracks and homes which are livable. Providing these is a slow process. Construction is now very costly. Inflation continues to exact a heavy toll and the military construction budget is never large in comparison with other defense costs or domestic budgets. So this can be accepted as a modest program for an essential requirement.

"TRIDENT" PROGRAM

You will note from the report that we are embarking in a sizable way on the Trident program. It is discussed in the report before you on page 5. The Trident is a new, improved ballistic missile submarine which is larger and more survivable than any other submarine in the world. It has new, long-range missiles. As antisubmarine weapons are improved and as land-based missiles become more fearsome, we must have a new trump card which has a better prospect for survival in the years ahead. The Trident promises to give us such a weapon, one which the Soviets will know they cannot expect to knock out with the first strike. The Trident will increase the possible worldwide patrol area of our submarine fleet six-fold over that of current submarines. That means they can wait and watch just about anywhere in the world. We hope to assure maximum time for the

submarines on station and minimum time undergoing repair and overhaul. Present plans call for the support facility for 10 Tridents at Bangor, Wash., with essential operational capability for the system in the late calendar year 1978, 5 years hence. The Navy originally requested \$125,000,000 for military construction for this program. The request was revised to \$112,000,000. We have cut it by \$6,000,000. We expect a total cost of more than a half billion dollars for Trident construction. This is a new program and a big one, but it is for America's survival.

BASE CLOSURES AND REALIGNMENTS

Your committee devoted much time to the question of base realignments. Substantial base closures and realignments were announced earlier this year. The announcement came late. It has resulted in significant delays in the preparation of this bill and it is unfortunate we did not have the announcement earlier. The Department of Defense has identified large savings associated with these realignments and closures, but it must be realized there will also be significant first costs. This is the shakedown period during which realignments are taking place and closure proceedings are being initiated—274 specific actions to consolidate, reduce, realign, or close military installations in the United States and Puerto Rico have been announced. This is expected to save \$3.5 billion over the next 10 years and to result in the elimination of 42,800 military and civilian positions.

There is the possibility of a few additional closures or realignments, particularly it appears in the Army. However, the committee has taken into consideration all of the announcements to date in the preparation of this bill and we have carefully sought to identify possible weak bases which are likely to be found in any remaining closure or realignment actions. We seek to avoid funding new construction for bases which will not remain operational.

The committee also has consistently urged that a strong effort be made to utilize existing facilities during realignments rather than to undertake the construction of new facilities.

REDUCTIONS IN OVERSEAS BASES

There is a subject of particular concern to the committee. We did not feel that the Department of Defense is pursuing a cutback of unnecessary functions overseas and the reduction of closure of excess overseas facilities with the same determination that has been applied to functions and installations in the United States. The committee realizes that it would be a grave mistake to be too hasty in removing U.S. combat units overseas thereby undermining the military and political strength of the United States and the allies. We know there must be adequate facilities for the troops who are stationed overseas. In most areas land is scarce and once a base is given up, there is little likelihood of getting it back. However, taking all the factors into account, it appears there is room for reductions in our base structure overseas and wherever this could be accomplished, it would save money. We just do not feel

the Department of Defense is giving adequate consideration to base closures or realignments overseas.

NATO INFRASTRUCTURE

In the report the committee has gone quite fully into the NATO infrastructure program. It begins on page 13 of your report. I recommend that you give it careful thought. Infrastructure has provided a flexible and useable instrument. It has made possible \$3.4 billion worth of installations in support of the common defense of Europe. It represents a very fine example of cooperation and realistic cost sharing between the NATO allies.

We have from time to time noted disappointing delays by our own representatives and by our allies in taking full advantage of the opportunities provided by the NATO infrastructure toward saving money for the United States. Nevertheless, we are consistently gaining ground in that the NATO allies are providing year by year for an increasing share of the cost of the facilities which are a common requirement for the military defense of Europe. As a matter of fact, in 1951 we were paying 43 percent of the joint cost of the program. Now we are paying less than 20 percent.

This bill contains \$40 million for our contribution to the NATO infrastructure. The figure of \$95,650,000 which is carried on page 55 of your report may appear contradictory. That figure represents the total NATO infrastructure program—\$20 million of this amount is in reimbursements from NATO allies and the remainder is transferred from other accounts such as Safeguard.

The committee is mindful of the uneasiness expressed in some quarters about the stability of the NATO alliance. This results from incidents occurring during the war in the Middle East. It is not the business of this subcommittee to analyze the future of NATO. Our job is to fund the U.S. part of its construction requirements. However, it is my personal opinion that the NATO alliance is a strong and viable organization and that when danger threatens within Western Europe, it will function as planned and anticipated. The war in the Middle East brought questions about the supply of oil which is essential to Europe and about transfers of equipment which had been prepositioned in Europe for the defense of Europe. These questions would not arise if Europe were threatened militarily.

HOUSING FOR BACHELOR PERSONNEL AND MILITARY FAMILIES

The committee is continuing its support for improved housing for bachelor personnel and for military families. We have departed from the old idea of open bay barracks with their noise and lack of privacy which was the standard for so many years. It is the policy now to provide uniform rooms with bath for not more than three men per room for the lower grades of enlisted personnel, up to one man per room for the highest grades of enlisted personnel.

The family housing has improved accordingly. Quarters are now on a par with the average of those in private communities although it is not possible under present funding limitations to provide

some desirable amenities such as garages and additional recreational space. However, there has been a steady effort on the part of the committee to insure the availability of more of the things which housewives very much want in their homes and on which until recent years they were not even consulted when military housing was designed. The bachelor housing program is proceeding in a very satisfactory manner. Family housing in this year's program has suffered a setback because of the limitations imposed by the authorizing committees.

By the use of the turnkey program, it has been possible to get more originality in the housing program and in most instances to save money by encouraging the contractor to develop his own designs and plans in competition with other bidders.

HOMEPORTING FOR THE NAVY

The committee is continuing to support homeporting for the Navy. The program is still somewhat small but it gives to a limited number of Navy families an opportunity to live where their men are stationed. The Army and the Air Force have long been able to accomplish this by allowing dependents to live overseas. Navy families could not enjoy the same privilege and this has meant additional family separations. One of the chief problems for retention of skilled and desirable personnel in the Navy is the simple fact that the family has been separated for such long periods from the man in uniform. In a partial effort to offset this, the Navy has transferred personnel so frequently the transfer costs have been excessively high.

COMMISSARY FUNDING

It should be noted that the committee has denied funding in a number of cases for commissaries. This action should not be construed as a policy decision. We realize the commissary facilities are a traditional part of military benefits. Our action is intended to stimulate the military toward devising other means of providing such facilities without coming to the Congress for public moneys. This could be done through a surcharge with which to establish a building fund for commissaries. The Government is subsidizing the commissary program at a level of nearly \$300 million a year. They do not pay taxes. Their overhead is low. They are important to the military program but less so than in the days when military pay scales were very low and adequate shopping facilities were limited near the average military base. Now there are food stores and shopping centers around nearly all bases.

SOUTHEAST ASIA FUNDS

The end of hostilities in Southeast Asia left some unused funds which have been appropriated in prior years. At the beginning of the fiscal year there still remained in Southeast Asia funds for military construction \$59.9 million. Of that amount \$29.2 million is programmed for use during fiscal years 1974 and 1975. This is for facilities for South Vietnam, Thailand, and other areas. Nothing is planned for Laos and Cambodia. In the main this is for roads and bridges and there is some vertical construction.

The means \$30.8 million of the remaining SEA funds is not programed for expenditure at this time. Accordingly the committee has recouped \$15 million of this amount and applied it to other projects. The remainder is available in case of unexpected emergencies.

AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

I am very glad to report to the House the continuing support and significant progress in both air and water pollution control programs. We are now well over the hump in these two essential programs. The committee recognizes their importance and has given solid support to them.

STATUS OF SAFEGUARD PROGRAM

There are no construction funds requested for the Safeguard program in fiscal year 1974. However, some \$35,650,000 has been reprogramed from the Safeguard reserve to meet requirements which were generated in the NATO infrastructure account as the result of dollar devaluation.

A summary of the present funding situation of the Safeguard program follows:

The total amount of appropriation available to the Safeguard program was \$646.8 million.

Against this, the current total estimated cost of the construction program including claims is \$597.1 million.

Prior to the reprogramming to NATO infrastructure, the Safeguard reserve was \$59.7 million.

Transfer to NATO, \$35.6 million.

Remaining Safeguard reserve is \$14.1 million.

Obligations as of September 30, 1973, \$568.8 million.

Expenditures as of September 30, 1973, \$485.3 million.

DECENTRALIZATION OF FACILITIES

For a number of years this subcommittee has pressed the military services to decentralize some of the military programs away from Washington. Progress has been slow and tedious and results are minimal. It should be obvious the concentration of additional military activities in and around our Nation's Capital makes it a more inviting military target. It also means that personnel are being moved to one of the highest cost areas in the land. It means further congestion in an already congested area. Yet everyone wants to be close to the throne. Everybody wants to be in a position to influence the powers that be and impress the admirals and generals. We have even withheld appropriation but rental space is available.

I have to confess that during the year immediately preceding we have made less progress than in prior years. Some of this has been due to the large turnover of individuals in the Secretariat. It has been hard in recent months to find someone to talk to in these positions who was still there 3 or 6 months later. Nevertheless this committee wants it understood that we are very displeased at the comparative indifference to efforts to decentralize military programs away from the Capital. This is one good way to achieve revenue sharing. Certainly there is no reason why more of the activities

and the funding which now come to Washington should not be in various States and cities throughout the country.

The committee has spent weeks and months in a dedicated effort to bring to the Congress a bill in which unnecessary projects are eliminated. In some cases, we may have been over zealous but I can assure you the committee is not prejudiced toward any project which may have been deferred. If a stronger case can be made in the Senate and the project is retained there, we shall give it a fresh look and an unbiased one when we go to conference. We feel that we have a good program. One that will help to meet the requirements for a strong defense program in the years ahead and one which will help to provide adequate living quarters, training facilities, research facilities and all the other things which are essential to a modern defense. We believe you can safely place your confidence in this bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The call will be taken by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 584]

Abdnor	Fascell	Pike
Anderson, Ill.	Fraser	Reid
Archer	Goodling	Roberts
Baker	Gubser	Rooney, N.Y.
Blackburn	Hays	Rooney, Pa.
Blatnik	Hébert	Rosenthal
Brasco	Holtfield	Rostenkowski
Brown, Ohio	Howard	St Germain
Buchanan	Jarman	Schroeder
Burke, Calif.	Karth	Seiberling
Chisholm	Kastenmeter	Sisk
Clancy	Keating	Spence
Clark	Kluczynski	Stuckey
Clawson, Del.	Lehman	Teague, Tex.
Collins, Ill.	Madden	Udall
Davis, Wis.	Martin, Nebr.	Waggoner
Dellums	Mills, Ark.	Wyatt
Devine	Minshall, Ohio	Young, S.C.
Diggs	Murphy, N.Y.	
Edwards, Calif.	O'Brien	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ANNUNZIO, 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. 11459, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the electronic device, whereupon 375 Members recorded their presence, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT).

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to reiterate what the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) has already told the House but there are a few comments I think would be pertinent.

First of all, our subcommittee was unanimously in favor of this bill. We have mixed feelings about the bill, of course. We have some definite differences of opinion about the bill, of course.

Nevertheless we were able to work out an agreement. The committee has had to work long and conscientiously over a very difficult and tedious subject. There are many installations involved.

There are hundreds of special interests involved, there are various priorities, and there are constant, continuing changes. The entire Defense Department is in a state of turbulence, with the changes we have undergone, the winding down of the war in Southeast Asia, as an example. There has been a dramatic reduction in forces; there is considerable development of new weaponry. There are the needs of the Volunteer Army, which have to be considered.

There have been many base closures and realignments. There is a shifting from wartime to peacetime activities, which has required many changes in many facilities.

Mr. Chairman, there is a new emphasis on responsible family men in the service rather than bachelor draftees and adventurers.

There is considerable construction which had to be delayed during the Vietnam war. There is a good deal of maintenance and repair that was neglected.

So we have tried to pare down to the low-dollar figure, without jeopardizing the morale or the readiness of our forces. We have tried to develop those projects which are essential to the modernization of our defense forces. We have tried to cut or defer those projects which have not been justified or which might not fit into the new programs of base relocations.

However, our cuts have been selective. Because of the turbulence and indecision of the Defense Department, our committee has spent more than 50 percent more time last year in hearings.

There are three increases that amount to \$336 million which I think are important. These are as follows: \$112 million for Trident; \$94 million for family housing, the maintenance operation of family housing; and \$130 million for bachelor housing. These figures amount to \$336 million of increases.

Even so, this budget is below the budget proposed by the President.

Mr. Chairman, we have made cuts in various other areas, mainly in those which affect the changes in base utilization plans.

There are three items which I would like to mention that have been neglected in our military construction program.

One pertains to language teaching. Language teaching has been neglected in our military forces. It may be more important than missiles in the future Army and in our defense and peacekeeping efforts. I believe we need to pay more attention to language teaching.

We have neglected our maintenance and repair of all our installations. Any private landlord or private operator would spend a good deal more on maintenance and repair than we have spent in protecting our military facilities.

Mr. Chairman, the hospital at West Point may be one of the most outdated, neglected, medical facilities in the forces. I think that we deferred this hospital

because of the exorbitant price and some concern over the plans that were presented by the Army.

I happen to believe that we need to look into this matter quickly, review it quickly, and present to the committee and the Congress next year the plans and the appropriation for the medical facility there.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has made a very persuasive presentation concerning this. He is one of the most knowledgeable Members of the Congress on this subject, and he urges us to do it. We deferred it, but I hope that we can get to it next year.

Mr. Chairman, I think the cut of \$335 million reflects a degree of fiscal restraint which is responsible and appropriate at the present time. It is a prudent and selective bill in terms of the increases which are approved and those which are denied.

I think we have approved those projects which are truly necessary for national security. An example is the \$112 million which is allowed for Trident construction to be initiated this year. We need the Trident system to assure our deterrence capability toward the end of this decade, and if we are to have these larger submarines and missiles, we must start acquiring the facilities to support them this year.

We have, hopefully, where it was possible, allowed additional amounts to cover increased costs. An example of this is in the family housing area where, of the total increase of approximately \$127 million allowed, \$94 million is merely to meet the increased cost of performing adequate operation and maintenance. Also, the allowed unit cost of new housing has increased by an average of \$3,500 each from that allowed 2 years ago, and this is not really sufficient to meet the increases in construction costs which have occurred and are projected. We had to provide additional funds to meet these costs.

A third and very important area in which a significant increase of \$130,084,000 has been provided is the Army barracks construction and modernization program. For years, testimony before our subcommittee has indicated that enlisted personnel were growing increasingly unhappy with open bay bachelor housing. We have worked with the military departments to encourage them to upgrade their standards for bachelor housing, and they have done so. The Army's fiscal year 1974 request, which has been very largely approved, reflects both the additional cost of building adequate bachelor housing and the size of the construction program which is needed to provide modern, permanent, adequate barracks at the Army's hardcore installations.

When one considers just these 3 increases for Trident, \$112 million; family housing operation and maintenance, \$94 million; and bachelor housing for the Army, \$130 million; their total, \$336 million exceeds the amount of the increase which is recommended over last year, which is approximately \$286 million.

Obviously, there have had to be compensating savings and reductions else-

where in the program. One factor which has brought about these reductions is the emphasis on base realignments which has been apparent in the past year. The administration has taken steps to reduce unnecessary costs of maintaining more military bases than are needed. As a result, many projects for which funds had been provided in prior years are no longer needed. Also, in an environment in which base utilization plans are changing, the requirements for construction projects do not, in many cases, become clear until force deployments have settled down. As a result, many projects are held in abeyance or deferred. In some cases, the original decisions reflect inadequate planning and require further study. The Army is currently engaged in such a study of its smaller bases now, and there will doubtless be further reductions in some of these bases in the future. In this situation, it seems unwise to proceed with construction projects at many of these bases.

One area in which I have become particularly concerned about the adequacy of the Army's planning is in language training. They seem to regard this very critical program as something which can be moved around the country whenever a barracks building or two is vacated at any location. Anyone familiar with education in general and with language training in particular should realize that this is not the case, that the heart of such training lies in its dedicated professionals and its academic traditions which cannot be duplicated at just any place where there happens to be space available.

To some extent the budget request this year is lower than it might have been because expensive programs such as the Safeguard antiballistic missile have been dropped. One cannot but regret the large amounts that have been spent and largely wasted upon this program. One can, however, be glad that, to some extent, our pushing ahead with this program, with the considerable cost and waste that that entailed, enabled the strategic arms limitation agreements to come about. As a result of that, enormous costs in this and in other strategic weapons programs can be kept within bounds, provided the letter and the spirit of this agreement is maintained. Funds appropriated for Safeguard in prior years which are not required to cover claims and necessary work have been reapplied to other programs to reduce new budget authority to the extent that the committee feels is prudent at this time.

In addition, many of the projects which were requested, which were nice to have, but not necessary, or which were badly planned, have been eliminated from the bill by both the authorizing action and committee's recommendation. There are so many examples of the former that I will not offend anyone by simply pointing out a few projects. But, most of the projects which can be deferred, which should be restudied, or which may be at weak installations have been deleted.

One project which I feel I should mention and which confronted the commit-

tec with a real dilemma was the request for \$25 million for a new hospital at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y. I have seen the existing facility. It is certainly a hospital that needs to be replaced sometime in the near future. It may be the most inadequate medical facility in the Services. On the other hand, the Army's plans for providing a new hospital were so expensive as to be shocking. The hospital, for instance, was to be a 100-bed hospital at a cost of \$25 million. We have built 400-bed hospitals for considerably less in recent military construction programs in other areas of the country, of course. Furthermore, 100 beds seem to be too many for the actual or projected workload for cadets at West Point. Finally, moving the hospital away from its present location, paradoxically, may make it harder to provide for cadet's medical needs without further large expenditures. All of this is spelled out in the committee's report and in our hearings. I feel that we had to defer this hospital at this time to force the Army to really restudy their plans for this facility. I hope our review can be completed promptly, because a new hospital is direly needed at West Point—and before the costs escalate even more.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has made a persuasive presentation—he is the most knowledgeable member concerning this hospital need.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. McEwen), a member of the committee.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT) concerning the hospital at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

Mr. Chairman, I had the opportunity of visiting this hospital just this past week, and I would confirm everything that the gentleman from California has said. This is an old, obsolete facility, with a great deal of maintenance that has been deferred, and deliberately deferred, in anticipation of the construction of a new facility.

I do not suggest, Mr. Chairman, that I know all of the answers on exactly the size and location that the proposed new facility should be, but from my own viewing of the existing facility I know it is obsolete and I know of the need for a new facility.

I would like to say that the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has been most industrious in bringing to the attention of all of us on the subcommittee the need for this hospital.

I was pleased at having the opportunity to see it. Everything Mr. GILMAN told us has been confirmed; namely, that the existing hospital is obsolete and the need for a replacement is great.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York (Mr. McEwen) for his thoughtful remarks concerning the long-needed West Point hospital proposal and appreciate the concern of the Subcommittee's distinguished chairman (Mr. SIKES).

I am hopeful that the decision of funds for this project from the committee bill will only be temporary, and I am confident the Army will respond in the days ahead to the objections raised by the

subcommittee. The Army has demonstrated its concern for the high costs of this and other construction projects at the Academy and has consistently and conscientiously tried to keep costs as low as possible.

Impressive documentation has been presented supporting the need for this new 100-bed hospital facility. The present hospital, already more than 50 years old, serves a large and growing community, both on the Academy grounds and in the surrounding region. Its archaic systems, extremely limited space and poor location have all been cited as major deficiencies. These obstacles have hindered the delivery of first-rate medical service to the thousands of patients who are served annually.

As these deficiencies become more acute with the passage of time, the costs of construction increase to even higher levels.

The Army Corps of Engineers has exhaustively examined alternative proposals in an effort to find a way of providing the needed improvements in medical service at the lowest possible cost.

All of the alternative proposals have been found wanting. The construction of a smaller facility or renovation of the existing hospital would result in only a nominal saving, if a saving at all, as compared with an entirely new 100-bed facility. But more important, the end result would still be a marginal facility that would not have the approval of the Army Surgeon General or the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health and Environment. Sacrificing efficiency and the complete utilization of the latest medical technology would be false economy.

Twice in recent years, Congress has authorized this project, including current approvals by both the House and Senate in connection with the military construction authorization bill. This clearly demonstrates a legislative recognition of the necessity for a new West Point hospital.

I know the Army will now approach the committee's concerns with the same thoroughness and diligence that it has previously displayed in documenting the need for this facility. I trust there will yet be an opportunity to resolve these concerns as the other body prepares to consider the military construction appropriation.

One of the finest military institutions in the world is deserving of a first-rate hospital.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished resident commissioner of Puerto Rico (Mr. BENITEZ).

Mr. BENITEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise once again, this time hopefully to help rectify a deplorable situation which affects the good name of the United States, the good name of those of us who in Puerto Rico defend the United States and identify ourselves with its basic values and perhaps more importantly to defend the right of the people of a very small island in Puerto Rico to live, work, and go about without the constant threat, danger and perturbation of bombardment.

I refer to the issue of Culebra. This is a very small Puerto Rican island on our eastern shore which for a number of

years has been the subject of special discussion and debate here and throughout the Hemisphere. A week ago, we thought in Puerto Rico that the matter had been adjudicated finally. We felt that the action of the conferees of the House and the Senate on the military construction authorization, fiscal year 1974, the report of which we approved just 30 minutes ago would forstall any additional delay. However, that report has been completely ignored in the appropriations bill now before us for our consideration.

Members of the Appropriations Committee have been surprised to discover that the military construction bill authorizes according to the recommendation of the conferees the necessary funds to settle the Culebra issue; but nonetheless no appropriation ensues in the bill now under consideration. Why?

In the conference report which we received half an hour ago it is stated specifically in section 204(a):

SEC. 204. (a) In order to facilitate the relocation of the ship-to-shore and other gun fire and bombing operations of the United States Navy from the island of Culebra, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$12,000,000 for the construction and equipage of substitute facilities in support of such relocation.

This section continues, establishing a number of conditions and requirements to insure that the Navy will have full occasion and opportunity to protect the vital national interests that might be involved, making as a prerequisite to the disbursement of any appropriations, a mutually satisfactory agreement.

Under the circumstances which, I may say, motivated and required the appearance here on three separate occasions of the Governor of Puerto Rico to give assurances at different moments before Members of the other body, before the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House, and afterward before the House conferees on the military construction authorization fiscal year 1974, full satisfaction was accorded to the conferees on both our willingness and even eagerness to meet all reasonable conditions required and presented. And then we, to our amazement, find that your committee's appropriation bill lacks any recommendation of funds for these purposes.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, to point out that three successive Secretaries of Defense, Secretary Laird, Secretary Richardson, and Secretary Schlesinger, reported publicly in answer to the request of Governors of the people of Puerto Rico, that the Navy operations at Culebra would be terminated no later than July 1, 1975.

I may say that this morning at breakfast, I had the opportunity to talk to Secretary Schlesinger and to express to the Secretary my amazement that the Navy, having requested this course of action necessitating more funds apparently had made no such funding request—at least in a timely way—to the Committee on Appropriations. Mr. Schlesinger was, I am sure, surprised at this, and indicated to me that he would study the matter and help to rectify what he thought had been an oversight.

I wish to add that this pledge was first made to the former Governor of Puerto Rico, Governor Ferré, several times, and was used as an electoral commitment. Governor Ferré's pledge was negated 6 weeks thereafter by Secretary Laird.

But former Secretary Richardson promised to review the policy in his confirmation hearings after consulting several voluminous studies prepared by the Defense Department at the direction of Congress. He conducted extensive discussions with Navy officials and obtained personal assurances from the Government that a transfer of the operations from this small inhabited island of Culebra would not be impeded in any way, should it be made anywhere in the uninhabited islands of Puerto Rico.

Mr. Richardson made the commitment that was afterward echoed by Mr. Schlesinger.

Here we stand after 3 years of commitments concerning Culebra, with the dignity and welfare of our people profoundly involved with a final approval obtained from this House on the conference committee recommendations on the authorization bill and now we are to return home to be expected to say all this was in jest.

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

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

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the distinguished Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico on the statement. As he indicates, we have been talking about this issue for years. This is not a case merely of failing to have an appropriation. If there is no appropriation to follow the authorization, we are failing to keep a promise not only to the people of Puerto Rico but a promise that affects the credibility of the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, I call upon the conferees to see to it when they go to the Senate that this matter is rectified and that appropriations are made for the relocation of the facilities.

Mr. BENITEZ. I thank the gentleman from New York.

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

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my friend, the gentleman from Puerto Rico, on the statement he has made. Certainly we visited together on the beach at Culebra and looked at the installations there and talked to the mayor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Puerto Rico.

Mr. BENITEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEGGETT. Certainly this has been a matter where the gentleman has been very, very aggressive to try to fulfill the commitments of the three Secretaries of Defense that he mentioned, but we do have a problem where these funds were not requested at the outset by the Navy.

We had inserted them in the Senate in the authorization bill. We later had, through the gentleman's aggressiveness, I guess, the conference committee approve the item, so we have the matter authorized. But still there is nothing before the Committee on Appropriations, I guess, to date. I would certainly hope that the Committee on Appropriations would consider the matter and that this has come about in an irregular way.

If the Senate chooses to act on this matter and be a little more aggressive than we have, I certainly hope that we can favor the Secretary's recommendations in a positive way in conference.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct the question to the chairman of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute. I had not intended to engage in this discussion at this time. The fact is that the committee has had no request for funds. The request for funding went to the Senate after we had completed our work, and it has not yet come to this committee.

There is another side to this case which I expect to discuss in detail if an amendment is offered. At the moment let me say that if the matter is taken up and considered favorably in the Senate, we will look at it carefully with an open mind. We are not prejudiced against the project.

Mr. LEGGETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Puerto Rico.

Mr. BENITEZ. I thank the gentleman.

I wish to say that I appreciate and understand the explanations given by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and wish to say that I trust the Members understand perfectly well that our interest is not only the interest of the people of Culebra, but this House's common interest in making clear to everyone in Puerto Rico and outside of Puerto Rico that these commitments pertaining to human beings will be observed. I trust that this will be the case, and I would continue to pledge my support to the processes that will make it possible.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, we have no further request for time.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee I support this bill.

The bill does represent a substantial cut below the authorization. The authorization, it is fair to say, cut quite substantially below the budget request, with the net result that we do have a very substantial cut here below the budget request. While this is a bigger bill than last year, it is a bigger bill roughly by the factor of inflation only.

I wish we could have cut more. I have been one of those who have been fighting for years to cut the military spending particularly after the war in Vietnam. But, let us face it, the cold war is heating up. I have not always been convinced by the warnings of the hawks and I am

still not entirely, but it is better to be safe than to be sorry.

The sums of money involved in what we are doing are relatively small in relation to the tremendous dangers this country faces in the perilous world in which we live today.

There are some problems of military construction I have felt some concern about. I do think the military is often asking us for new buildings or is often leasing when it could be using old buildings which are perfectly serviceable buildings. There is a vacant base in my district, Fort Holabird, on which the Army has appraised as good buildings until 1994. Although they are not beautiful they are serviceable. It is a great mistake to walk away and leave that money there.

In connection with some of the overseas bases I have had some concern but we have found ourselves in something of a dilemma. A great deal of our overseas housing is in very bad shape, yet we are not replacing it now because it is not clear how long we are going to be at those bases.

I think we should have taken more into account the lack of combat readiness of certain National Guard units. Some of them are in a C-4 category. They are just not ready and the buildings are not going to make them ready. Combat readiness depends on other factors than buildings.

I have some concern about the construction for Trident because we are putting all our eggs in one basket at one base in one place in Bangor, Wash. A single bomb could knock out a very large part of the Trident. Should we be putting so much investment in one spot.

I have some concern about emergency funds. But the sums are not great and this is a matter on which reasonable people can come to some sort of agreement.

On the matter of Culebra I would like to point out to the gentleman from Puerto Rico that no one can commit the Congress of the United States to move a base from anywhere. Congress is not at the beck and call of the Secretary of Defense or any other administrative agency that wants to tell some area that we plan to move out.

I hope Congress and these other people keep that in mind. There are other things that bother me, but nevertheless, I think this is a reasonably prudent bill.

I want to commend Congressman SIKES, who has been a very distinguished chairman. He is always tolerant and understanding and listens to the views of everybody on the committee.

I think this is a reasonably prudent bill, which is a reasonable compromise, and I ask my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman about one item in the military construction bill providing for funds for the construction of one facility in my particular district, a commissary at Bergstrom Air Force Base. We have been waiting for the authoriza-

tion of this project for over 30 years. Finally, after waiting this period of years, it was authorized. I am advised that the bill before us now does not provide the funds in this instance. Is that correct?

Mr. SIKES. Yes. I will be glad to respond to the distinguished gentleman. I commend him for his interest in his own district and the military installations there.

The facility which the gentleman refers to, the commissary, is an authorized item. It is one of several commissaries deleted by the Appropriations Committee. The committee went rather fully into this subject, and the majority of the members of the committee felt that the Department of Defense should take a new look at commissaries in general. It is costing the Government nearly \$300 million a year in personnel costs to operate the commissaries. They do not pay any taxes. Their overhead is low. They obtain land, and in many cases facilities, without charge. A surcharge is added to the commissary prices to pay for overhead expenses. In many cases this has been used to construct new commissaries or to rehabilitate existing ones.

The majority of the members of the committee felt that this procedure might be a rational way for the construction of this and other commissaries to be funded.

We are not prejudiced against commissaries. We accept the fact they are important to the military programs. The committee feels however, that the need may not be as great as it was in prior years when the military pay scale was very low and when there were very few good shopping facilities and food stores in the vicinity of most bases. That picture has changed. The committee felt that the Department of Defense should take a new look at the commissary structure. That does not mean that we are asking that the commissaries be eliminated, but that consideration be given to having commissaries carry more of the costs which are now borne by the taxpayers.

Mr. PICKLE. I believe the gentleman would understand that this action catches many Members by surprise, because we had assumed that once the authorization was in this year and without any notice of difficulty, that it would not be taken out. Will this matter now go to conference?

Mr. SIKES. This bill now goes to the Senate and, of course, if the Senate restores the commissaries, including that of the distinguished gentleman, I assure the gentleman that I as one member of the subcommittee will view the matter with an open mind. I am not prejudiced against any of the commissaries.

Mr. PICKLE. I appreciate that very much. It will be a harsh act to deprive that base the funds we have been waiting for during these 30 years.

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range and its activity on the property owned and developed by the U.S. Navy on the island of Culebra, the one criterion by which this activity should be judged—the one question that we should

put above all others: "Is this activity essential to the defense requirements of the United States?"

We cannot seek the answer to this question from unqualified critics, self-serving interests, inconsolable instigators, political opportunities, and kibitzers from afar.

But seeking an honest answer to the question: "Is this activity essential to the defense of my country?" ought to be the overriding consideration for every patriotic American, whether he is wearing the uniform of this country, whether he has the honor and responsibility of high public office, whether he is selling newspapers in San Juan or real estate from New York or beer to the white hats in the little town of Dewey—Culebra.

Every American is expected to make needful sacrifices for the security of his country, certainly when it is a matter of his convenience compared to the preparedness of the forces first committed to lay down their lives in a challenge to our national interests.

The good citizens of Puerto Rico would be deeply insulted—and rightly so—to have it suggested that they would be less willing than their fellow citizens of any other part of these United States to bear their share of the burden of eternal vigilance.

Communities across the country daily endure a much greater burden of annoyance and inconvenience for the sake of their military neighbors—without nearly the perfect record of safety which Culebra can claim.

So we go back to the basic question—disregarding for the moment even the arguments of the dollar cost to our taxpayers or the convenience of the naval services—"Is this activity essential to the defense requirements of these United States?"

And I refer you to the testimony of Rear Adm. A. R. Marschall, CEC, USN, Commander, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, on page 907 of the hearings on this bill—and let only those better qualified contradict him—"Is this range on Culebra essential?"

Admiral Marschall's answer:

Most Essential, Sir.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to express my thanks to Chairman ROBERT SIKES of the Subcommittee on Military Construction Appropriations and the other members of the subcommittee for recommending favorable action on the construction of a composite medical facility at F. E. Warren Air Force Base in Cheyenne, Wyo.

As noted in the hearing record on the legislation, Warren's medical facilities were built in 1887 and have outlived their usefulness as a base hospital. I heartily agree with the subcommittee that it is time for newer facilities to meet the new demands of modern medical science.

I might point out that as well as serving the more than 4,400 officers, enlisted men, and civilians at the base, this facility will provide medical treatment to the thousands of retired servicemen living in the State of Wyoming. I thank the subcommittee and its chairman for not only the men serving at Warren but for the people of Wyoming.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

Mr. SIKES (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARRETT

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

(The portion of the bill to which the amendment refers is as follows:)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, and facilities for the Navy as currently authorized in military public works or military construction Acts, and in sections 2673 and 2675 of title 10, United States Code, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$587,641,000, to remain available until expended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRETT: Page 2, line 12, strike the figure "\$587,641,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$582,437,000".

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to reduce the appropriations of funds for Navy construction by the sum of \$5.204 million, for the construction of a building at Albany, Ga., which is intended to house the administrative functions of the Marine Corps supply activity now located in Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. Chairman, many of us from Pennsylvania have had extensive discussions with the military—the DOD, Navy, and Marine Corps—concerning this proposal. We are firmly convinced that it is ill-conceived and totally unwarranted. Further, it is a needless expenditure of funds.

The Marine Corps supply activity serves as the single inventory control point for the corps in support of the operating forces and the supporting establishments. It is also the sole activity providing provisioning to support the introduction of all new or modified end items of equipment and systems, cataloging of all items of supply including the preparation of all Marine Corps stock lists and central computation and validation of prepositioned war reserve requirements, including the forced issue in support of contingency withdrawal plans.

This proposal was first presented in April of this year to the employees. It was explained at that time, that the proposed relocation would ultimately result in an annual savings to the Federal Government of \$2.6 million—primarily through the reduction of maintenance cost and to a lesser degree through the reduction of overall personnel cost. A critical scrutiny of this proposal, and the rationale which supports it, refutes the reliability of these anticipated economies.

The fact sheet prepared by the Marine Corps states that there are no facilities available at Albany, Ga., for this function and the initial estimate of construction is \$5.2 million. It was noted

that the age of the Philadelphia buildings had resulted in increasing annual maintenance costs and programmed requirements of \$4,924,000 were currently identified. Thus it was argued, the continued maintenance cost and out-year military requirements exceeded 50 percent of the cost to construct a new administrative building at Albany, Ga. In fact, the total funds expended in fiscal year 1972 for the maintenance and repair of the present facility in Philadelphia was only \$357,703.35. The programmed requirements of almost \$5 million are based almost exclusively on fiscal year 1968 estimate of the cost of complete central air conditioning of the Philadelphia complex. This plan was never implemented since 40 percent of the administrative areas of the command are effectively air conditioned by individual air conditioning units. Actual time lost in administrative shutdowns due to excessive heat has been negligible. Specifically a portion of the workforce has lost a total of 5 hours over the last 6 years ending June of this year.

Mr. Chairman, the initial cost estimate has been set at \$5.2 million by the military. We know what these initial estimates have been in the past. They have amounted to the camel getting his nose under the corner of the tent. These estimates are already several years old and we know that the costs of construction have increased greatly in the past several years. There is no doubt in my mind that once they get started on this building they will be back asking for additional funds.

The Marine Corps has expressed concern over the availability of family housing units for the marines in Philadelphia. It should be pointed out however, that less than 6 years ago over 800 marines and their families were adequately housed and there are currently less than 200 marines, eligible for housing, on-board. I doubt that serious problems of military housing now exist.

The Marine Corps fact sheet frequently refers to the proposed relocation as a "consolidation of functions." The fact is that the proposed move does not in any way involve a change to the current mission of the activity. There is no change or modification planned for any functions now performed in Philadelphia and thus there is no planned major modification to the number and type of occupational specialists who now accomplish the assigned mission. This in itself is significant. An inventory control point is responsible to perform a variety of duties in the management of equipment. Most of these responsibilities require a professional expertise greater than that of a purely clerical nature. The Marine Corps inventory control point is unique in that it manages all commodity areas; electronic, missile, automotive, engineer, ordnance, general property and clothing. Highly qualified technical people are required to analyze the design of a radar system or truck or refrigerator or missile to determine which repair parts should be acquired and the proper quantities for continued support. Technical people are required to analyze engineering drawings for these repair parts in order to properly catalog them. These are but a few of the

functions performed by the center. The opinion of those who have visited Albany, Ga., on other business for the Marine Corps, there is a warehouse located there, is generally that the area will not provide for a future labor market of the type required. In fact, inquiry has disclosed that there are currently considerable vacancies at Albany for technical positions which they have not been able to fill from the local labor market.

Mr. Chairman, technically capable people are vital to the function of this military facility. The Marine Corps itself states that out of the present 1034 civilian positions in Philadelphia only 184 are to be abolished by the proposed move to Georgia and these are fringe jobs not related to the basic function of the inventory control operation.

They propose to move 984 positions. The Corps itself estimates that of this number from 250 to 350 personnel are expected to relocate. The employee group indicates that this is an optimistically high figure. The large minority complement in Philadelphia will probably not relocate because of area and the higher housing costs compared to their present situation.

It has been admitted that the present Albany, Ga., labor market is unable to supply the needed personnel to fill technical positions presently vacant in the area. The Marine Corps is unable to respond to the question and problem which would result if this move takes place—namely, where would the technical personnel come from?

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I submit that this proposal by the Marine Corps is not a consolidation in any sense of the word and will not save the taxpayers any money. It is a relocation which may well jeopardize the efficient operation and functioning of this activity and will surely cost the taxpayers of this country additional dollars in taxes.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Marine Corps plan to move the supply activity now located in Philadelphia to Albany is an ill-conceived, poorly planned operation.

I believe the decision was made simply to show some activity on the part of the Marine Corps in response to public demands for a reduction in military spending. It is also my opinion that the cost-savings figures presented in support of this plan do not represent the true cost to the taxpayers of this project.

The Marine Corps states that it will have to construct a completely new facility in Albany, Ga., for \$5.2 million. It justifies this expense by stating that the annual maintenance and program requirements of the present facility in Philadelphia are \$4.9 million.

However, the fact is that in the last fiscal year the maintenance and repair costs to the Philadelphia plant were only \$375,703. The remaining \$4.55 million would be for the proposed air-conditioning of the entire facility which was first suggested in 1968. This plan was never implemented and 40 percent of the areas which should be air-conditioned are already serviced by individual air-conditioning units and estimates for taking care of the remaining areas are considerably lower than the original \$4.9 million.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, the Marine Corps has not figured into its cost projections the effect of this move on the economy of the city of Philadelphia and the surrounding suburbs.

The loss in much needed revenue to our public transportation system which serves the Marine facility will eventually have to be made up by other Federal agencies along with the reduction in payments to our school systems now made through impacted aid grants.

As I said before, this is an ill-conceived, poorly planned decision and I urge my colleagues to support Congressman BARRETT's amendment to strike funds for this project from the military appropriations bill.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

(Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard something here today about saving money, and I can tell the Members that one of the best ways by which we can save \$5.2 million plus is to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT).

The Marine Corps supply activity is located at Broad and Washington Streets in Philadelphia. It is in no part of my district. However, I visited there, and they have substantial buildings, with a very low maintenance cost. I do not understand why they want to air-condition parts of the building in which only uniforms and things of that nature will be stored. The fact of the matter is that the building is now 40 percent air-conditioned.

Now, as far as the Broad and Washington Street location is concerned, the railroads run right into the Marine Corps supply activity, the truck terminals are right there, and 14 blocks away there is the Delaware River, one of the biggest ports in the country. So if the Marine Corps wants to ship anything any place in the world, they can.

Mr. Chairman, the irony of this whole thing is that just about 12 blocks away from this spot there is the Tunn Tavern, where it is reported the Marine Corps was founded. And now, after spending substantial sums of money on modernizing these buildings in Philadelphia, they want to turn around and spend \$5.2 million some place else for new buildings.

I can tell the Members that this \$5.2 million figure was developed almost a year ago, and since that time building

expenses have increased by some 30 percent. So if we want to save some money, without taking anything away from anybody, and keeping an installation in a very strategic location where all forms of transportation are readily available to it, we should adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT) and keep the Marine Corps supply activity in Philadelphia.

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

Mr. Chairman, first let me state that I rise reluctantly to oppose the amendment of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Mr. BARRETT is a distinguished and able Member, a very kindly gentleman, and a warm personal friend. I know that this is a matter of great concern to him. I applaud him for the zeal with which he fights for the interests of his own district.

Now I must give to the House the justification submitted by the Department of the Navy in support of the proposed transfer of supply activities from Philadelphia to Albany, Ga. The subcommittee went carefully and fully into the proposal. It is the Navy's position that by this move the Marine Corps will be able to effect significant personnel strength reductions and cost savings.

By this move the Marine Corps will reduce 184 civilian and 50 military personnel commencing in fiscal year 1976, when the move will take place, the Government will experience \$1.2 million in savings because of these personnel cuts. Thereafter the annual personnel savings will amount to \$2.6 million each year.

Mr. Chairman, the old Marine Corps facility in Philadelphia consists of buildings which date back to 1908, which were not designed for their present use and needs. By this transfer we shall avoid \$4.9 million in improvement costs which are absolutely necessary to the Philadelphia installation.

The committee supports the move for these reasons:

Colocation of the inventory control and data processing installations and the materiel which is at Albany.

The naval air station at Albany is closing at the end of this year. We can use facilities and quarters there for the incoming people. The individual marine can live on post, not subsist out on the Philadelphia community as he must now.

There is very large and relatively new facility now in existence in Albany. This is a proposal to consolidate a small facility with a larger one. Consolidation of the two facilities is realistic. Albany can accommodate the move. The Navy asks for one administration building to be constructed at Albany which costs \$5.2 million.

I urge the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania be defeated.

Mr. BARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT. I would like to point out to the gentleman that we have given long study to this relocation with the De-

partment of Defense, the Navy, and the Marine Corps and have searched out every possible facet as to its maintenance and durability. The gentleman spoke very kindly about the need of substantial maintenance in another 2 years. I would like to inform the gentleman that there will be no need of substantial maintenance to the Marine Corps building in Philadelphia for the next 15 or 20 years. It is a very fine structure; the exterior and interior architecture are comparable to that of any building. I just cannot see why the Government wants to spend \$5.2 million at this time when we are clamoring for economy.

Mr. SIKES. If I may respond, this building was constructed in 1908 and Navy witnesses said that substantial renovation will be required if it will continue to be used. I am giving you the information that was given to my committee in support of the move. They estimate these costs would be more than \$4 million, which is very close to the cost of the new facility at Albany. I am sure their analysis of the cost was made carefully and that they are considered accurate.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it also gives me a great deal of pain to rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend from Philadelphia, who is an eloquent spokesman for his district and State, but the facts outlined by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee speak for themselves.

There will be substantial savings effected by this move from Philadelphia to Albany, Ga. The chairman touched on those very briefly and effectively, I think.

The chairman mentions and I think I should emphasize that there are at the present time 630 Capehart housing units that are among the best available anywhere which will be available immediately for the military people being transferred to Albany, Ga.

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

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I would state to the gentleman from Georgia that we have made a very, very thorough check on this, and our findings indicate to us that they do not have the personnel involved who would be capable of performing the services comparable to what they have been doing here in Philadelphia for the last close to 150 years.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, with all due respect, that I think if the gentleman would check that he would certainly find personnel in Georgia who are just as capable as personnel in Philadelphia, Pa.

I do not want to boil this down to a fight between districts, because I have too much respect for my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Let me also say to my friend that I am losing a military installation in my district in Albany, Ga., which is being implemented, and I may say that this gives me a great deal of pain to lose that facility because there are a number of mili-

tary personnel involved in it. But I must say that the bulk of the activities are being transferred to Key West, and I do not feel that it is my responsibility to raise an issue, or to try to block the move of the Navy from Albany, Ga., to Key West.

So, as I say, I do not want to break this down as to an issue concerning the capabilities of the workers in Georgia versus the workers in Pennsylvania.

I simply think that the committee has done its homework, the Marine Corps has done its homework, and I would urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, I am sure the gentleman from Georgia would certainly defend the relocation of an installation where there was going to be a savings to the taxpayers of \$5.2 million. I believe that the gentleman from Georgia is a good Congressman, and I have great respect for the gentleman, but where the gentleman could save \$5 million the gentleman would do it. And I am quite sure we can save the taxpayers \$5.2 million.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Philadelphia that we have been told that we are going to effect a savings of \$2.6 million annually based solely on the personnel, and it would not take very long at annual savings of \$2.6 million to make up the \$5.2 million of new construction authorization.

Again I urge defeat of the amendment. Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee that the gentleman has been furnished erroneous information by the Navy. In a similar move we were told it would cost \$28 million, and when we informed them they left out \$6 million, they promptly reduced the cost to \$20.1 million. Anyone knows that one cannot build a building for \$5.2 million and at the same time save \$2.6 million on personnel.

It is quite true that this building was built in 1908, but the Members should see the construction of that building, the all masonry construction. It was built to last for at least 100 years, and substantial sums have already been spent in the renovation of this building in Philadelphia.

As far as savings are concerned, they are entirely fictitious, because they are not going to save \$2.6 million in salaries over this period of time. In fact, with the enlisted personnel that we have there it would not permit anywhere near a savings of \$2.6 million.

The gentleman has given us the Navy case. I must say to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) that we questioned the Navy, and they have not been able to substantiate their figures. And in the other similar move which I previously mentioned, they came down \$8 million when they should have been going up \$8 million.

So, all that I can say is that if we want to save money and use what we have al-

ready now in the facility, that is being used very, very efficiently, then do not waste the money on building new buildings some place else, even if you want to build them in my own district in Pennsylvania, which is not Philadelphia.

Let us use what we have now and let us stop throwing our money away on military programs where it can be used more helpfully in other ways by the military or by other agencies.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I share the respect that the chairman of the committee indicated for the gentleman from Philadelphia and those who are interested in the Philadelphia installation. I should just like to say that the reason our subcommittee and our full committee made this proposal was to save money, to consolidate facilities, to improve working and living conditions, and to permit better management of the Marine Supply Services. We were trying to consolidate facilities wherever we could and to do it in the most efficient manner. We were told that the renovation and modernization at Philadelphia was simply not economical or practical. At least, that was the information given to us. We were told that this inventory control function would be more effective and less costly at Albany. There are existing data processing and other supporting functions there that are necessary to the materiel and supply functions and which will allow considerable reductions in overhead costs.

We were only trying to save money and improve the services.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. As a compromise, why not move the installation out to Iowa? We do not have any military installations and we will not feed them grits and fat pork.

Mr. TALCOTT. I think the gentleman from Iowa may have a good idea.

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

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In answer to the question that was asked about the necessary personnel, when the new Clinton Industries Shipyards were being built in Mississippi or Louisiana—whichever they were—where do the Members think they were recruiting their personnel? At the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, at the Sun Shipbuilding Co., and in the areas around Philadelphia. We have those highly skilled personnel there right now. Let us keep them there, and let us save at least \$8 million by adopting this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BARRETT) there were—ayes 21, noes 54.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request for a recorded vote and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

One hundred eight Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, surely I can make a request for a recorded vote again.

Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused. So the amendment was rejected.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question or two concerning this bill. On the face of it, it appears to call for \$2,609,000,000 which is an increase of approximately \$286 million over expenditures for military construction in 1973, the last fiscal year. What precisely causes this increase over last year, this increase of \$286 million?

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

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, a great deal of the additional cost of this bill is the result of increased family housing operating and maintenance costs and additional costs of construction. Inflation has entered very strongly into all the construction programs. Then there are several new programs such as Trident for which the just construction funds are provided. The amount of \$112 million and an increase of \$130 million for Army bachelor quarters which amount for the rest of the increase. We feel that the increase over last year is a modest one.

I think what is of the greatest significance is that this bill as a result of the action of the authorizing committees and the House Appropriation Committees is cut \$335 million below the total request of \$2,944 million. That is a very significant reduction and I believe it is all that can be cut.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give us a figure as to the added cost of this bill in terms of the devaluation of the dollar?

Mr. SIKES. I think the gentleman can figure that as well as I can but it has had its effect and of course it means everything is costing more.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that but I just wondered how much more was added to this bill by virtue of devaluation.

Mr. SIKES. No funds were added to the bill by the committee as a result of devaluation.

Mr. GROSS. It is mentioned in the report on the bill that devaluation has added to the cost.

Mr. SIKES. Devaluation has.

Mr. GROSS. But there is no figure given.

Mr. SIKES. Devaluation has added to the cost but no money was added because of that.

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

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I might point out to the gentleman from Iowa he should ask where are the savings that were made as a result of all those closings in Massachusetts and Rhode Island? They were cited as saving hundreds of millions of dollars in their claims, but in looking over the budget for the next year I see they are coming in and asking for millions of dollars more for housing down in Norfolk that they have to build to provide housing for personnel. Every time they close an installation the cost goes up.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has raised an excellent question. I fail to see anywhere any result by way of savings from the closings of bases and other installations.

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman will yield further, I will again call to his attention figures which were used in my discussion earlier, in which I did discuss the base closure picture and the amount of savings which the Government anticipates will result. It is anticipated that the savings will be \$3.5 billion over the next 10 years. These actions would result in the elimination of 42,800 military and civilian positions.

Obviously, there is not going to be a great deal of savings in the first year. This is the first year. It may even cost more in the first year because of the relocation of personnel and the cost of closing bases. But, in the next 10 years the Department will save \$3.5 billion.

Mr. GROSS. Apparently inflation is feeding on itself, as evidenced by this bill. If inflation continues I would hesitate to predict whether there would be any savings on the closing of these bases in the next 10 years.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ANNUNZIO, 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. 11459) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

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.

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

Mr. SCHERLE. 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 366, nays 29, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 585]
YEAS—366

- Abdnor
- Adams
- Addabbo
- Alexander
- Anderson, Calif.
- Andrews, N.C.
- Andrews, N. Dak.
- Annunzio
- Archer
- Arends
- Armstrong
- Ashbrook
- Ashley
- Aspin
- Bafalis
- Baker
- Bauman
- Beard
- Bell
- Bennett
- Bergland
- Berl
- Biaggi
- Blester
- Boggs
- Boland
- Bolling
- Bowen
- Brademas
- Bray
- Breaux
- Breckinridge
- Brinkley
- Brooks
- Broomfield
- Brotzman
- Brown, Calif.
- Brown, Mich.
- Broyhill, N.C.
- Broyhill, Va.
- Burgener
- Burke, Fla.
- Burke, Mass.
- Burleson, Tex.
- Burleson, Mo.
- Burton
- Butler
- Byron
- Camp
- Carey, N.Y.
- Carney, Ohio
- Carter
- Casey, Tex.
- Cederberg
- Chappell
- Clark
- Clausen, Don H.
- Clawson, Del
- Cleveland
- Cochran
- Cohen
- Collier
- Collins, Tex.
- Conable
- Conlan
- Conte
- Corman
- Cotter
- Coughlin
- Crane
- Cronin
- Culver
- Daniel, Dan
- Daniel, Robert
- Daniels, W. Jr.
- Daniels, Dominick V.
- Danielson
- Davis, Ga.
- Davis, S.C.
- de la Garza
- Delaney
- Denliska
- Dellenback
- Dellums
- Dennis
- Dent
- Derwinski
- Devine
- Dickinson
- Diggs
- Donohue
- Dorn
- Downing
- Dulski
- Duncan
- du Pont
- Eckhardt
- Edwards, Ala.
- Erlenborn
- Esch
- Ehleman
- Evans, Colo.
- Evins, Tenn.
- Fascell
- Findley
- Fish
- Fisher
- Flood
- Flowers
- Flynt
- Foley
- Ford, Gerald R.
- Ford, William D.
- Forsythe
- Fountain
- Frelinghuysen
- Frenzel
- Frey
- Fröhlich
- Fulton
- Fuqua
- Gaydos
- Gattys
- Glaimo
- Gibbons
- Gilman
- Ginn
- Goldwater
- Gonzalez
- Goodling
- Grasso
- Gray
- Green, Oreg.
- Griffiths
- Grover
- Gubser
- Gude
- Gunter
- Guyer
- Haley
- Hamilton
- Hammer-schmidt
- Hanley
- Hanna
- Hanrahan
- Hansen, Idaho
- Hansen, Wash.
- Harsha
- Hastings
- Hawkins
- Hays
- Hébert
- Heinz
- Helstoski
- Henderson
- Hicks
- Hillis
- Hinshaw
- Hogan
- Hollifield
- Holt
- Horton
- Hosmer
- Howard
- Huber
- Hudnut
- Hungate
- Hutchinson
- Ichord
- Jarman
- Johnson, Calif.
- Johnson, Colo.
- Johnson, Pa.
- Jones, Ala.
- Jones, N.C.
- Jones, Okla.
- Jones, Tenn.
- Jordan
- Karth
- Kazen
- Kamp
- Ketchum
- King
- Koch
- Kuykendall
- Kyros
- Landgrebe
- Landrum
- Leggett
- Lehman
- Lent
- Litton
- Long, La.
- Long, Md.
- Lott
- Lujan
- McClary
- McCloskey
- McCullister
- McCormack
- McDade
- McEwen
- McFall
- McKay
- McKinney
- McSpadden
- Macdonald
- Madden
- Madigan
- Mahon
- Mailliard
- Mallary
- Mann
- Maraziti
- Martin, Nebr.
- Martin, N.C.
- Mathias, Calif.
- Mathis, Ga.
- Matsunaga
- Mayne
- Mazzoli
- Meeds
- Melcher
- Metcalfe
- Mezvinsky
- Michel
- Milford
- Miller
- Minish
- Mink
- Minshall, Ohio
- Mitchell, N.Y.
- Mizell
- Mollohan
- Montgomery

- Moorhead, Calif.
- Moorhead, Pa.
- Morgan
- Mosher
- Moss
- Murphy, Ill.
- Myers
- Natcher
- Nedzi
- Nelsen
- Nichols
- Obey
- O'Hara
- O'Neill
- Owens
- Parris
- Passman
- Patten
- Pepper
- Perkins
- Pettis
- Peysler
- Pickle
- Pike
- Poage
- Podell
- Powell, Ohio
- Preyer
- Price, Ill.
- Pritchard
- Quie
- Quillen
- Railsback
- Randall
- Rarick
- Rees
- Regula
- Reuss
- Rhodes
- Riegler
- Rinaldo
- Robinson, Va.
- Robison, N.Y.
- Rodino
- Roe

- Rogers
- Roncaglio, Wyo.
- Roncaglio, N.Y.
- Rooney, Pa.
- Rose
- Roush
- Rousselot
- Roy
- Roybal
- Runnels
- Ruppe
- Ruth
- Ryan
- Sandman
- Sarasin
- Sarbanes
- Satterfield
- Scherle
- Schneebell
- Seiberling
- Shibley
- Shoup
- Shriver
- Shuster
- Sikes
- Sisk
- Slack
- Smith, Iowa
- Smith, N.Y.
- Snyder
- Staggers
- Stanton, J. William
- Stanton, James V.
- Steed
- Steele
- Steelman
- Steiger, Ariz.
- Steiger, Wis.
- Stephens
- Stokes
- Stratton
- Stubblefield
- Sullivan
- Symington
- Talcott

- Taylor, Mo.
- Taylor, N.C.
- Teague, Calif.
- Thomson, Wis.
- Thone
- Thornton
- Towell, Nev.
- Treen
- Ullman
- Van Deerin
- Vander Jagt
- Vanik
- Veysey
- Vigorito
- Walsh
- Wampler
- Ware
- Whalen
- White
- Whitehurst
- Whitten
- Widnall
- Wiggins
- Williams
- Wilson, Bob
- Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
- Wilson, Charles, Tex.
- Winn
- Wolf
- Wright
- Wyatt
- Wydler
- Wyllie
- Wyman
- Yates
- Yatron
- Young, Alaska
- Young, Fla.
- Young, Ill.
- Young, Tex.
- Zablocki
- Zion

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

NUTRITION FOR THE ELDERLY

(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, on September 26, together with the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) introduced H.R. 10551, a bill to extend the nutrition program for the Elderly Act for 3 years.

Evidence of the overwhelming bipartisan support enjoyed by this program, Mr. Speaker, is that since that date 137 Members of the House, on both sides of the aisle, have joined the gentleman from Florida and me in cosponsoring this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the nutrition program for the elderly began as a demonstration program under the Older Americans Act of 1965, and last year it evolved into an ongoing service when Congress overwhelmingly approved the nutrition program for the Elderly Act as a separate title of the Older Americans Act.

Because of several presidential vetoes of Labor-HEW appropriations bill, which included funds for the nutrition program, the act is only now beginning to be implemented.

But the program, Mr. Speaker, is not a partisan issue. For Congress has demonstrated its support for the nutrition program by appropriating funds for it, and the President, as well, has evidenced his backing by requesting \$100 million to implement nutrition programs across the land.

Mr. Speaker, when this program is fully implemented, nutrition centers will be able to provide one hot, nutritious meal a day, 5 days a week, for thousands of Americans aged 60 and over in every State.

And the meals can be served not only in community centers, such as schools and churches, but also directly in the homes of elderly shut-ins.

Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 10551, which Mr. PEPPER and I have introduced, would authorize \$150 million for 1975, and \$175 million and \$200 million, respectively, for 1976 and 1977.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, we can afford these modest increases in this program which is, even now, assisting the elderly poor, who, living on fixed incomes, are now the victims of the worst inflation in a generation.

Mr. Speaker, just 2 days after the gentleman from Florida and I introduced

NAYS—29

- Badillo
- Barrett
- Bingham
- Chisholm
- Clay
- Conyers
- Drinan
- Edwards, Calif.
- Eilberg
- Green, Pa.

- Gross
- Harrington
- Hechler, W. Va.
- Heckler, Mass.
- Holtzman
- Kastenmeier
- Mitchell, Md.
- Moakley
- Nix
- Rangel

- Sebelius
- Skubitz
- Stark
- Studds
- Symms
- Thompson, N.J.
- Waldie
- Young, Ga.
- Zwach

NOT VOTING—38

- Abzug
- Anderson, Ill.
- Blackburn
- Blatnik
- Brasco
- Brown, Ohio
- Buchanan
- Burke, Calif.
- Chamberlain
- Clancy
- Collins, Ill.
- Davis, Wis.
- Dellums

- Dingell
- Fraser
- Harvey
- Hunt
- Keating
- Kluczynski
- Latta
- Mills, Ark.
- Murphy, N.Y.
- O'Brien
- Patman
- Reid
- Roberts

- Rooney, N.Y.
- Rosenthal
- Rostenkowski
- St Germain
- Schroeder
- Spence
- Stuckey
- Teague, Tex.
- Tiernan
- Udall
- Waggoner
- Young, S.C.

So the bill was passed.
The Clerk announced the following

- pairs:
- Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Stuckey.
 - Mr. Brasco with Mr. Young of South Carolina.
 - Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
 - Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
 - Mr. St Germain with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
 - Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Blackburn.
 - Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. O'Brien.
 - Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Reid.
 - Mr. Dellums with Ms. Abzug.
 - Mrs. Collins of Illinois with Mr. Rosenthal.
 - Mr. Dingell with Mr. Patman.
 - Mrs. Schroeder with Mr. Fraser.
 - Mr. Hunt with Mr. Chamberlain.
 - Mr. Spence with Ms. Clancy.
 - Mr. Waggoner with Mr. Buchanan.
 - Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Harvey.
 - Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Keating.
 - Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Latta.
 - Mr. Roberts with Mr. Udall.

(b) No funds made available under any Act may be used for the purchase, hire, or operation and maintenance of any passenger motor vehicle for the transportation of any Government officer or employee between his dwelling and his place of employment, except in cases of medical officers on outpatient medical service and except in cases of officers and employees engaged in fieldwork in remote areas, the character of whose duties make such transportation necessary and only when such exceptions are approved by the head of the department concerned.

(c) Subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply with respect to the purchase, hire, operation, and maintenance of (1) passenger motor vehicles for use by the President; and one each by the Chief Justice, members of the President's Cabinet, and the elected leaders of the Congress; or (2) of passenger motor vehicles operated to provide regularly scheduled service on fixed routes.

SEC. 604. REPORTS OF THE PRESIDENT TO CONGRESS.—The President shall report to the Congress every sixty days, beginning December 1, 1973, on the administration of this Act and the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973, and each report shall include specific information, nationally and by region and State, concerning staffing and other administrative arrangements taken to carry out programs under these Acts, together with specific budget estimates for such programs.

SEC. 605. USE OF CARPOOLS.—(a) The Secretary of Transportation shall encourage the creation and expansion of the use of carpools as a viable component of our nationwide transportation system. It is the intent of this subsection to maximize the level of carpool participation in America.

(b) The Secretary of the United States Department of Transportation is directed to establish within the Department of Transportation an "Office of Car Pool Promotion" whose purpose and responsibilities will include—

(1) responding to any and all requests for information and technical assistance on carpooling and carpooling systems from units of State and local governments and private groups and employees;

(2) promoting greater participation in carpooling through public information and the preparation of such materials for use by State and local governments;

(3) encouraging and promoting private organizations to organize and operate carpool systems for employees;

(4) promoting the cooperation and sharing of responsibilities between separate, yet proximately close, units of government in coordinating the operations of carpool systems; and

(5) other such measures that the Secretary determines appropriate to achieve the goal of this subsection.

(c) The Secretary of Transportation shall encourage and promote the use of incentives such as special parking privileges, special roadway lanes, toll reductions and other incentives as may be found beneficial to the furtherance of carpool ridership.

(d) The Secretary of Transportation is directed to allocate the funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection according to the following distribution between the Federal and State or local units of government:

(1) The initial planning process—up to 100 percent Federal.

(2) The systems design process—up to 100 percent Federal.

(3) The initial start-up and operation of a given system—60 percent Federal and 40 percent State or local with the Federal portion not to exceed one year.

(e) Within twelve months of enactment of this legislation the Secretary shall make a report to Congress of all its activities and expenditures pursuant to this subsection.

This shall include any recommendation as to future legislation concerning carpooling.

(f) The sum of \$25,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the conduct of programs designed to achieve the goals of this subsection, such authorization to remain available for two years.

SEC. 606. PETROLEUM ALLOCATION FOR MINERAL PRODUCTION.—The President is authorized to allocate residual fuel oil and refined petroleum products in such amounts and in such manner as may be necessary for the maintenance of exploration for, and production or extraction and processing of, minerals, and for required transportation related thereto.

SEC. 607. PROTECTION OF FRANCHISED DEALERS.—(a) As used in this section—

(1) "Distributor" means an oil company engaged in the sale, consignment, or distribution of petroleum products to wholesale or retail outlets whether or not it owns, leases, or in any way controls such outlets.

(2) "Franchise" means any agreement or contract between a refiner or a distributor and a retailer or between a refiner and a distributor, under which such retailer or distributor is granted authority to use a trademark, trade name, service mark, or other identifying symbol or name owned by such refiner or distributor, or any agreement or contract between such parties under which such retailer or distributor is granted authority to occupy premises owned, leased, or in any way controlled by a party to such agreement or contract, for the purpose of engaging in the distribution or sale of petroleum products for purposes other than resale.

(3) "Notice of intent" means a written statement of the alleged facts which, if true, constitute a violation of subsection (b) of this section.

(4) "Petroleum product" means any liquid refined from oil and useable as a fuel.

(5) "Refiner" means an oil company engaged in the refining or importing of petroleum products.

(6) "Retailer" means an oil company engaged in the sale of any petroleum product for purposes other than resale within any State, either under a franchise or independent of any franchise, or who was so engaged at any time after the start of the base period.

(b) (1) A refiner or distributor shall not cancel, fail to renew, or otherwise terminate a franchise unless he furnishes prior notification pursuant to this paragraph to each distributor or retailer affected thereby. Such notification shall be in writing and sent to such distributor or retailer by certified mail not less than ninety days prior to the date on which such franchise will be canceled, not renewed, or otherwise terminated. Such notification shall contain a statement of intention to cancel, not renew, or to terminate together with the reasons therefor, the date on which such action shall take effect, and a statement of the remedy or remedies available to such distributor or retailer under this section together with a summary of the applicable provisions of this section.

(2) A refiner or distributor shall not cancel, fail to renew, or otherwise terminate a franchise unless the retailer or distributor whose franchise is terminated failed to comply substantially with any essential and reasonable requirement of such franchise or failed to act in good faith in carrying out the terms of such franchise, or unless such refiner or distributor withdraws entirely from the sale of petroleum products in commerce for sale other than resale in the United States.

(c) (1) If a refiner or distributor engages in conduct prohibited under subsection (b) of this section, a retailer or a distributor may maintain a suit against such refiner or distributor. A retailer may maintain such

suit against a distributor or a refiner whose actions affect commerce and whose products with respect to conduct prohibited under paragraphs (1) or (2) of subsection (b) of this section, he sells or has sold, directly or indirectly, under a franchise. A distributor may maintain such suit against a refiner whose actions affect commerce and whose products he purchases or has purchased or whose products he distributes or has distributed to retailers.

(2) The court shall grant such equitable relief as is necessary to remedy the effects of conduct prohibited under subsection (b) of this section which it finds to exist, including declaratory judgment and mandatory or prohibitive injunctive relief. The court may grant interim equitable relief, and punitive damages where indicated, in suits under this section, and may, unless such suit is frivolous, direct that costs, including reasonable attorney and expert witness fees, be paid by the defendant. The court may also grant an award for actual damages resulting from the cancellation, failure to renew, or termination of a franchise.

(3) A suit under this section may be brought in the district court of the United States for any judicial district in which the distributor or the refiner against whom such suit is maintained resides, is found, or is doing business, without regard to the amount in controversy. No such suit shall be maintained unless commenced within three years after the cancellation, failure to renew, or termination of such franchise or the modification thereof.

The title was amended so as to read:

"A bill to declare by congressional action a nationwide energy emergency; to authorize the President to immediately undertake specific actions to conserve scarce fuels and increase supply; to invite the development of local, State, National, and international contingency plans; to assure the continuation of vital public services; and for other purposes."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized, in the engrossment of the bill, to make certain technical and clerical corrections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I simply wish to take this opportunity to extend my gratitude and the gratitude of the entire Senate to the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON). His able handling of this emergency energy proposal reflects well upon each and every Member of this body. With the passage of this proposal goes the clear message that the Senate of the United States has initiated action to meet the Nation's energy crisis while the executive branch and its so-called experts have failed to provide any measures to offset our current difficulties. I congratulate Senator JACKSON. I congratulate the Senate.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, let me take this opportunity to compliment my many colleagues who worked so diligently on this bill, S. 2589. Particularly let me commend the chairman of the Interior Committee, Senator JACKSON, for his fair and impartial handling of

this most important legislation. Also, I want to recognize the hard work of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN) for his untiring efforts to fashion a bill that will accomplish the many essentials necessary to meet this energy crisis.

Mr. President, I thank also Mr. Harrison Loesch, Interior Committee minority counsel; Mr. David Stang, deputy counsel for the minority on energy and fuels; and Mr. Fred Craft, deputy minority counsel for the Interior Committee, for their long hours and expertise on this bill, which saw 17 rollcall votes today. Let me thank also Mr. Bill Van Ness, majority counsel, and Mr. Mike Harvey, special counsel, for their many contributions.

Mr. President, with further regard to our distinguished chairman, I commend him again on his leadership as floor manager of this bill. The President called for early action on his emergency energy legislation, and Senator JACKSON indeed responded with early hearings and prompt committee action on this bill. Although the general spirit of cooperation on this bill was basically nonpartisan throughout, I was somewhat disappointed that each of the amendments the administration requested on this bill—specifically my amendments Nos. 690, 691, 692, 693, and 671, and Senator HANSEN's amendment No. 682—were opposed by the manager of the bill and, as a result of his opposition, defeated.

Mr. President, this bill entailed a tremendous amount of work. I am very pleased that we have had the full cooperation of the people I have mentioned.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to keep the regular procedure in its correct stance, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the conduct of morning business with a time limit of 3 minutes attached thereto for each speaker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presiding Officer (Mr. HELMS) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Raymond C. Anderson, of Michigan, to be Federal Cochairman of the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the state of the finances of the United States Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1972 (with an accompanying report). Referred to the Committee on Finance.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS OTHER THAN TREATIES

A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs of the Department of State transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of international agreements other than treaties entered into within the past 60 days (with accompanying papers). Referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION BY THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

A letter from the Director of the Judicial Conference of the United States transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enlarge the trial jurisdiction of United States magistrates to encompass additional misdemeanors (with accompanying papers). Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ENERGY CONSUMPTION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs transmitting, for the information of the Senate, material showing the energy consumption of the Department of Defense (with accompanying papers). Ordered to lie on the table.

NOTE

In the RECORD of November 15, 1973, in the third column, page S20408 under "Communications From Executive Departments," the following appears:

REPORT ON PROPERTY, SUPPLIES AND COMMODITIES PROVIDED BY THE BERLIN MAGISTRATE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, the value of property, supplies, and commodities provided by the Berlin Magistrate, and under the German Offset Agreement for the quarter July 1, 1973 through September 30, 1973. Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

The reference to the Committee on Armed Services is in error. The correct reference is to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Ordered to lie on the table:

RESOLUTIONS

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation permitting year-round daylight saving time

"Whereas, Daylight saving time, in effect for only half of the year in many states of the United States, including Massachusetts, is greeted with enthusiasm as a means of lengthening daylight hours; and

"Whereas, In these critical days of fuel shortages and energy crises, especially in New England, longer daylight hours would help alleviate the necessity for increased fuel consumption; and

"Whereas, Oil, heat and fuel have become an open instrument of Arab and Soviet Military and foreign policy; the conservation of United States oil resources through the extension of daylight saving time will help

relieve international pressures of the oil blackmail cartel; and

"Whereas, Additional daylight hours would provide several other advantages to the citizens of the Commonwealth, such as fewer traffic accidents, less incidence of crime and the opportunity for increased outdoor leisure activities; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending the present daylight saving time statute to enable the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and other states to adopt year-round daylight saving time; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Senate Clerk and Parliamentarian to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States and to each member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted, November 6, 1973."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 11459. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-548).

~~By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:~~

S. Res. 204. An original resolution to pay a gratuity to Emiko Kuraoka.

REPORT ENTITLED "EMERGENCY POWERS STATUTES: PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW NOW IN EFFECT DELEGATING TO THE EXECUTIVE EXTRAORDINARY AUTHORITY IN TIME OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—(S. REPT. NO. 93-549)

Mr. MATHIAS, from the Special Committee on the Termination of the National Emergency, submitted, pursuant to Senate Resolution 9, 93d Congress, 1st session, a report entitled "Emergency Powers Statutes: Provisions of Federal Law Now in Effect, Delegating to the Executive Extraordinary Authority in Time of National Emergency," which was ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, the following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert J. Roth, of Kansas, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Kansas.

The above nomination was reported with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed, subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time

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

CONSUMER PROTECTION

From testimony before a House Government Operations subcommittee by Patrick J. Head, vice president of Marcor, Inc., on Oct. 10:

There is far more self-policing in business today than there was 30 years ago. By improving the quality of its products, by better training of its personnel, by management policies insisting that the customer be satisfied, business is becoming increasingly responsive to consumer demands.

Yet there is no doubt that consumer skepticism toward business persists. One reason, as I have suggested, is the sometimes impersonal nature of selling, credit arrangements, and customer service, which is a by-product of computerization and of modern urban life itself. Another is the all-pervasive presence of advertising, some of it exaggerated, or inadequately informative.

A third reason, more relevant here, is the great number of government decisions in which business and consumers each have a stake, but in which consumers feel they have an inadequate voice. In truth, as members of this committee know, each of the federal regulatory agencies has as a prime responsibility the protection of the general public's interests, and most have counsel whose principal job is to speak for that public. Yet the problem, is not simply one of what is, but what appears to be. And it often appears to consumers that no one is looking after their particular interest in decisions wherein other interests are well represented.

It seemed to Marcor that the presence of a consumer advocate in government decision-making processes might reduce this cause of consumer skepticism. We recognized that many businesses felt sufficiently challenged and investigated today to require no further intervention by government-sponsored parties in their affairs. We knew that a Consumer Protection Administration, if created by loosely drafted legislation could become, not just an advocate, but a possible source of harassment to legitimate business which outweighed its service to consumers.

Yet we supported the creation of the CPA and re-affirm that position today, because we believe that consumers who don't feel so suspicious of business and government—who don't feel shut out and unrepresented in government proceedings which affect the pocketbooks, their well-being and the quality of their lives—will be better customers of ours and of other businesses which are in fact trying to serve them well.

RETAILING AND GOVERNMENT IN THE 1970'S

(By Edward S. Donnell)

As we entered the late sixties, we suddenly found people's expectations were exceeding our performance capability. The consumer bill of rights—to be informed—to be safe—to choose and to be heard—became a reality.

Most of us became fully aware that our business can only be as good as the environment in which we operate, and I mean total environment—economic, social, and political as well as physical and ecological.

With regard to consumerism and the expansion of government legislation, regulation, investigation and litigation that has hit us to date, if past is prologue, we're in trouble for the rest of the 70's.

And past is prologue and we are in trouble for the rest of the 70's. However, the quantity and quality of that trouble, and the degree to which we can convert trouble into opportunity will be largely up to us.

The April issue of Fortune indicates the depth of the problem in an article entitled "The Legal Explosion Has Left Business

Shell-Shocked." This article covers the geometrically exploding, often conflicting, state, county and municipal regulations we all must comply with. It also covers the resulting rapid rise in litigation that has driven legal expenses and exposures right through the ceiling.

In the Securities regulation field, lawsuits filed in the past 6 years in Federal district courts have increased 400%, reaching 2,000 in 1972 alone. During the 70's we may expect that security regulation standards will be more demanding and that legal expenses for compliance, and damages and other penalties for non-compliance will be more costly.

Lawsuits on environmental issues have doubled in the recent past to 268 cases in 1972. In our industry the International Council of Shopping Centers recently called a special session to discuss possible effects of pollution controls on future expansions.

Lawsuits on Fair Employment practices have begun to mushroom—over 1,000 in 1972 alone. Settlements with the Equal Opportunity Commission in cases charging discrimination against women and minorities has important implications for retailing in the 70's. It is a fact that labor intensive retailing has historically been one of the better providers of job opportunities, training and advancement for minorities and other disadvantaged persons. Despite this I can offer no more useful advice to anyone tonight than to make certain that our own houses are completely in order. Equal employment opportunity for all Americans is so vitally important to our achieving a cohesive society that we must give this matter the highest priority.

Truth in Lending legislation and regulations put us all on one fair and reasonable standard in keeping our customers accurately informed as to the terms of consumer credit.

I can only hope that those few states which have imposed credit rate ceilings below the roughly break-even monthly service charge rate of 1½% will soon realize that to drive credit rates to an uneconomic level makes it very difficult to extend credit to those who need it most. In addition, it often forces retailers to raise the cash price of some merchandise to help absorb credit costs, an increase which hurts all citizens on those states. We expect consumer credit issues will continue with us on the Federal and State level the remainder of the 70's.

Product safety is now covered in a new Federal law and the new commission and staff are a reality. Thus, greater effective emphasis will be put on product safety for the rest of the 70's.

Advertising substantiation has become a major focus of, consumerism in the recent past and will be receiving even greater attention during the rest of the decade. Growing emphasis on warranties-guarantees indicates this activity also is likely to be the subject of required, fuller, more uniform disclosure in the near future.

If we can take a leaf from Europe's recent experience, perhaps the most important change we will see during the next 8 years will be the extent to which government tries to impose rising standards of clear information disclosure on product performance, product life and even product content.

How, the nature, extent and fairness to all concerned of these rising standards of consumer service is in significant part up to us. Past is prologue in this realm, too. We have learned that where we simply oppose in toto a new consumer bill or regulation our impact on its final content, its degree of reasonableness for all concerned, its degree of practicality, is usually very limited.

For business to always oppose whatever consumers or their representatives propose, strains the credibility of our public statements that for us the consumer always comes

first. Selective, well reasoned support for certain consumer legislation proposals, even if not ideal, will do much to enhance our prospects for fair and reasonable government regulations during the rest of the 70's, as well as the prospects for eliminating altogether the need for further regulations in certain areas.

All of us here tonight have been and can increasingly become consumer advocates. For 32 years in retailing I've regarded the customer as my real "boss," and I know you feel you have the same boss. Or, here in Washington, we might say the same constituency.

We are a highly competitive industry. All of us have been observing and evaluating the same trends, the same forces, in the same marketplace. Consequently, I know we agree that in this fast-moving industry, the retailer who is not a sincere practitioner of consumerism simply is not going to survive. We are the most knowledgeable and demanding customers in history. In fact all of us here tonight have had a great deal to do with educating them and raising their expectations over the years.

If you will forgive one note of American History close to home, it was, I believe, the need for consumer protection that prompted Aaron Montgomery Ward, a century ago, to break the back of "Caveat Emptor"—"Buyer Beware"—with his new promise to America's consumers—"Satisfaction Guaranteed or Your Money Back." Today, you can see consumer advocacy in action as American retailers and our suppliers expend billions of dollars in market research, product development, quality control, product safety, protective packaging, informative labeling and computerized merchandising distribution systems. We are providing the American Public with the most efficient, responsible and protective marketing system in the world.

Yet, we believe it can be further improved.

Because of this belief we have supported such consumer legislation, as the Consumer Protection Agency Bill, truth-in-lending, Warranty/Guarantee, and, of course, The Uniform Consumer Credit Code which we all support.

But far more important than this is retailing's overall commitment to the protection of the rights of the consumer to be informed, to be safe, to choose and to be heard through our industry's support of the President's National Business Council for Consumer Affairs.

The Council, chaired and co-chaired by Robert E. Brooker, Chairman of Montgomery Ward's Executive Committee and Don Perkins of Jewel Companies has been the work of over 100 Chief Executive officers of the nation's leading companies. Their unstinting dedication has produced council guidelines covering these key areas—Packaging and Labeling, Product Safety, Advertising and Promotion, Guarantees and Warranties, Tire Inflation and the Consumer, Credit and Related Terms of Sale, and Consumer Complaints and Remedies.

The guidelines are tough, but we all can and should live by them because they encompass the specific consumer protection principles to which we all subscribe.

However, because voluntary guidelines can be, and sometimes are, ignored by a few companies to the detriment of all the others, there is a move afoot to recommend that the Federal Trade Commission hold public hearings on those parts of the guidelines which are suitable as substantive rules. This would be a prelude to their adoption—after all the responsible inputs have been received—as official FTC standards. Such standards will be more comprehensive, effective, and fair and reasonable to all concerned, than many government regulations currently in effect or under consideration.

Moreover, they will give the force of law to the voluntary product of thoughtful and

committed business, government and consumer leaders at a time when our nation badly needs to develop a positive consensus for the benefit of all our people. We therefore support this move.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1974

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, Calendar No. 522, H.R. 11459, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 11459) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, reported with amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I present today for the consideration of the Senate—and, incidentally, there will be a rollcall vote on final passage—H.R. 11459, together with the report from the Appropriations Committee, No. 93-548, making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

The Military Construction Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee held joint hearings again this year with the Military Construction Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, chaired by the able Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON). These joint hearings were most productive in saving time for Senators and the witnesses from the Department of Defense. Additional hearings by the Appropriations Subcommittee were held to hear testimony on items in the bill which were from previous years' authorizations and other important matters.

It is not my intention in presenting the bill to give detailed figures concerning each line item. The line item breakdown and explanation are contained in the report which has been placed on each Senator's desk.

Before going into the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee, I would briefly like to summarize the pertinent facts pertaining to the bill.

The fiscal year 1974 budget estimates as submitted to the Congress for military construction last January were \$2,944,090,000 broken down as follows: Army, \$664,900,000; Navy, \$685,400,000; Air Force, \$291,900,000; Defense agencies, \$19,100,000; Army National Guard, \$35,200,000; Naval Reserve, \$20,300,000; Air National Guard, \$20,000,000; Air Reserve,

\$10,000,000; Army Reserve, \$40,700,000; family housing, \$1,150,400,000; and homeowners' assistance fund, \$7,000,000.

The total of the military construction appropriations bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations is \$2,670,972,000. This is an increase of \$61,882,000 over the \$2,609,090,000 provided by the House. The total bill as reported to the Senate is \$273,928,000 under the budget estimate or \$2,944,900,000, or somewhere between 9 or 10 percent below the request of the administration.

ARMY

The major thrust of the Army portion of this bill is in support of soldier-oriented facilities. Bachelor housing, primary medical facilities, and community support facilities total about \$456.2 million. This continues the emphasis begun in last year's bill and the committee supports this effort.

The bill includes construction of 23,425 new barracks spaces and 185 new bachelor officer spaces, mostly at permanent installations in the United States. Of the total, 380 enlisted spaces are for isolated locations overseas. Additionally, the committee allowed funds to modernize 45,188 enlisted spaces and 528 officer spaces to bring these existing facilities up to present-day standards. The Army continues their program to eliminate the old World War II woodframe mobilization structures built in the early forties and now long beyond their economical life. Concurrently, maximum effort is being made to modernize and extend the useful life of existing permanent housing facilities.

The committee allowed \$39.6 million for medical facilities. The major facilities are a 100-bed hospital at the U.S. Military Academy and an addition to the hospital at Fort Lee, Va. A significant item, although not actually for a medical facility, is the approval of \$10.8 million for the underground parking facility at Walter Reed Army Medical Center in the District of Columbia. This parking structure is an integral part of the 1,280-bed hospital and was authorized in Public Law 92-145, fiscal year 1972. As part of the sequential development of the new hospital center, construction of the parking structure is scheduled to begin this summer.

The particular medical facilities plus additional planning and design funds in this bill mark the beginning of a multi-year defense program to improve service medical facilities.

The committee has approved all pollution abatement projects requested by the Army and authorized by Congress. This includes \$7.3 million for air pollution abatement projects and \$7.1 million for water pollution abatement control. The Army program is smaller than in recent years but significant increases are anticipated in future requests to meet the requirements of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972.

The committee continues to be a strong supporter of the U.S. Military Academy expansion plan and is pleased that the Army is following a viable and realistic program. Three projects totaling approximately \$25.1 million were approved, the major item being the new hospital

previously mentioned. The committee recognizes the need for and strongly endorses early construction of this new medical facility. Despite commendable Army efforts to reduce costs, the committee feels there is potential room for further reduction. Therefore, the Army request of \$25 million for the hospital was reduced by \$5 million. The committee will expect the Army to construct the hospital within the \$20 million approved.

The committee approved \$20 million in new obligational authority for NATO infrastructure support. This is a reduction of \$20 million from the service request and the amount approved by the House. The committee concurred with the House in approving the transfer of \$35.65 million in unobligated prior year Safeguard funds to NATO Infrastructure toward meeting unbudgeted costs stemming from recent dollar devaluations.

Approval has been given to the Army for \$56 million for general authorization which includes: \$39 million for planning and design; \$15 million for urgent minor construction; and, \$2 million for access roads.

Included in this bill are \$40.7 million for the Army Reserve facilities and \$35.2 million for the Army National Guard. This is consistent with the Army's continuing recognition of the need to provide adequate facilities for the effective training and improved readiness of its Reserve components. The committee agrees with this approach.

NAVY

The portion of the military construction budget proposed for the active forces of the Department of the Navy was \$685,400,000. The committee approved for the Navy \$608,467,000, which is \$20,826,000 greater than the amount allowed by the House and a decrease of \$76,533,000 from the budget estimate of \$685,400,000.

I will discuss in the following broad categories since that is how the Navy presented its program this year. These are: strategic forces, all-volunteer forces, major weapons systems, pollution abatement, new technology—research, development test and evaluation—and training facilities.

Under "Strategic forces," the committee approved \$112 million for the initiation of construction of a Trident submarine refit complex and facilities for flight testing the Trident missile. The facilities approved are essential this year for meeting the initial operational capability date of late calendar year 1978 for this weapons system.

Projects that will assist the Navy in achieving and maintaining the all-volunteer force are for bachelor housing, community support, medical, and cold iron facilities. Cold iron facilities are shore utilities which enable a ship in port to shut down its boiler plant and electrical generation equipment. Projects approved for the all-volunteer force are approximately one-fourth of the total.

This year \$66 million was approved for bachelor housing and messing facilities. This is a reduction from last year's appropriations for bachelor housing, but

still a substantial program with bachelor housing constituting about 11 percent of this year's appropriations.

The committee approved \$13 million for community support facilities which have received a minimum of funding the last several years.

The medical program approved in the amount of \$38 million is a slight reduction from the program for which funds were appropriated last year.

The cold iron program is directed toward reducing watch standing requirements when a ship is in port in order to increase the amount of time ships' personnel may spend with their families. The availability of utilities from the shore also provides benefits in shipboard equipment maintenance and fleet readiness and conserves scarce petroleum resources. This year \$26 million was appropriated for cold iron facilities.

Ten million dollars has been provided for major weapons systems, excluding Trident. This year's appropriation for major weapons systems is slightly less than the \$11 million appropriated last year.

The Navy is concerned with the prevention of environmental pollution and actively seeks to: First, control and abate emissions of pollutants from Navy sources; second, design and construct facilities to meet recent environmental quality standards; and third, cooperate with local, State, and Federal agencies.

The present energy crisis, which may result in the temporary lowering of pollution standards, does not reduce the need for the Navy air pollution abatement facilities.

The total pollution abatement program approved for the Navy is \$82.7 million.

Four percent of the appropriation is for projects in support of research, development, and test and evaluation associated with underwater acoustic surveillance, communications, manned underwater systems and coastal region warfare.

The Navy is taking several concurrent actions to strengthen, modernize and vitalize its training programs. One action was the recent establishment of the Chief of Naval Training Office with the responsibility of overseeing and managing all Navy academic, applied, shipboard, aircraft, and submarine training. The committee supports this endeavor and has provided \$62 million for training facilities. Appropriations of \$12 million were added for this category to match the amount authorized for the relocation of the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range from Culebra.

Funding in the amount of \$51 million was approved for the Marine Corps facilities. As in last year's program, major emphasis was placed on personnel support facilities, which comprise 54 percent of the Marine Corps program. The provision of adequate bachelor housing is a high priority requirement. The committee fully supported the bachelor housing program of the Marine Corps.

The committee allowed \$20,300,000 for Naval Reserve facilities, the amount of the Navy request.

The committee placed the Navy re-

quest under especially careful scrutiny. The major new considerations posed by the base realignments announced by the Secretary of Defense in April of this year, the effects of inflation on construction costs, the beginning of shore support facilities for the new Trident submarine system, and the first year of implementation of the All-Volunteer Force—all these impacted heavily on committee discussion and decisions.

AIR FORCE

The Air Force portion of the bill provides \$291,198,000 which includes \$249,452,000 for projects in fiscal year 1974 and \$41,746,000 for planning and design, minor construction, and projects authorized but unfunded in fiscal year 1973. There has also been a reduction of \$1,800,000 to compensate for the fact that this amount is available in Air Force prior year appropriations for Southeast Asia that can be applied against fiscal year 1974 requirements elsewhere. The committee's total reduction from the original request of \$321,900,000 is \$30,702,000.

The bill covers essential facility projects for the Air Force and a few others where national policy, such as in the case of pollution abatement, other strong cases of economy, and projects with a potential for energy conservation.

A case of the latter point is the aircraft engine component research facility at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. The prime purpose of this item is to test and provide data and knowledge to prevent compressor "instability" in aircraft gas turbine engines especially under transient conditions. Presently, this test capability does not exist in the military or civilian aircraft community. This facility will process data 3,000 to 6,000 times faster than existing facilities by utilizing computer control of the test article, the test facility and the data acquisition system. By locating the facility at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, it is possible to utilize a complete precision controlled 30,000 horsepower drive unit already in place and thereby save from \$12 to \$15 million that would be required to locate the facility elsewhere. Finally, by determining transient effects to be avoided during engine operation as much as a 15- to 20-percent improvement in fuel economy can be realized and the knowledge gained can be made available to the entire aircraft industry. The avoidance of just one engine compressor development problem would result in savings that would amortize the cost of this facility investment.

The largest portion of Air Force funds is for urgent operational facilities. They consist of airfield pavements, aircraft fueling and support facilities, flight operations buildings, communications facilities and navigational aids. They total \$52.4 million or 18 percent of the recommended amount. Important items approved by the committee are: \$11 million for a second increment of the technical intelligence operations facility at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, \$13.5 million for special aircraft support facilities at Andrews Air Force Base, and

\$4.5 million for a station composite support facility at Cape Newenham Air Force Station, Alaska.

The second largest portion of the bill provides for bachelor housing. This category totals \$40 million and is viewed as a priority objective by the Air Force. This is 13.7 percent of the amount recommended by the committee and will provide for the construction of 3,524 new dormitory spaces at a cost of \$25.7 million, and 60 new officers' quarters at a cost of \$1.2 million. The Air Force will also modernize 4,757 existing dormitory spaces for \$11.3 million. Included in the program are a student housing composite building at Keesler Air Force Base, Miss., and a composite recruit training and housing facility at Lackland Air Force Base, Tex. Buildings of these types provided in earlier programs have proven to be very effective.

The third largest portion of the bill, \$31 million, is for maintenance facilities, predominantly for aircraft maintenance. Included are 10 projects comprising another increment for modernization of the Air Force Logistics Command's depot overhaul facilities. This category also provides various maintenance and storage facilities for short-range attack missiles at two locations for \$1 million.

Another large portion of the recommended amount is directed toward expansion, alteration and replacement of medical facilities to provide proper clinical and dental care within a regionalized framework. Projects of this type have been supported by the committee in recent fiscal year programs and as far back as fiscal year 1965. In the current bill, the committee is supporting 12 health care facility projects. Two of the projects involve total replacement of the aged, professionally obsolete, composite medical facilities at F. E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyo., and Laughlin Air Force Base, Tex. These facilities have been in use for 86 years and 18 years, respectively. For the other items approved by the committee, work involves additions and alterations principally addressing the problem of inadequate space for outpatients in the clinics, pharmacies, laboratories, X-ray departments, and other areas servicing these patients.

The construction proposed by the Air Force to support the Air Force R. & D. program is \$10 million, of which \$4.9 million failed to survive the authorization reviews. However, that which remains is essential to a vigorous R. & D. effort as an investment in our future security. Earlier the committee discussed at some length an aircraft engine component research facility at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. Other R. & D. projects are: expansion of a human impact laboratory, a weapons guidance test facility, and alteration of a rocket propulsion research laboratory.

Other significant amounts are recommended for facilities in support of training, supply, administration, community and support facilities. In this latter category, the committee is providing \$35 million, of which \$18 million is for the design of facilities in this and future programs, \$15 million to fund minor construction

projects that are to be individually determined to be urgent by the Secretary of Defense or the service Secretaries, and \$2 million is provided for access roads.

Approval is also recommended for \$20 million for the Air National Guard and \$10 million for the Air Force Reserve by the committee.

DEFENSE AGENCIES

For the Department of Defense agencies, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$12,000,000. This is \$7,100,000 below the budget estimate of \$19,100,000 and is \$12,000,000 above the House allowance. It is \$24,704,000 below the appropriation for fiscal year 1973.

The program breakdown is as follows: Defense Nuclear Agency, \$574,000; Defense Supply Agency, \$8,370,000; National Security Agency, \$8,156,000; general support programs, \$2,000,000.

A wide range of project is encompassed in the approved program. The Defense Nuclear Agency has received approval for two projects at Kirtland Air Force Base, N. Mex., and at the Atomic Energy Commission Nevada Test Site. The Defense Supply Agency has received approval for 15 projects at 9 installations. The National Security Agency has received approval for four projects at Fort Meade, Md.

The Department of Defense indicated a program, or anticipated requirement, in the amount of \$30,000,000 for projects which would qualify for funding under DOD emergency construction authority. The Department further indicated that no additional funds were required for this purpose on the basis that unobligated prior year funds were considered adequate to finance fiscal year 1974 requirements. The unobligated balance in the Secretary's emergency fund totaled \$54,429,500 as of June 30, 1973.

The program approved by the committee, as tabulated above, provides for essential facilities of the agencies listed. The committee's allowance of \$12,000,000 is the maximum possible in view of action by the House and Senate Armed Services Committees which gave their approval for the full program requested for the agencies, but made a general reduction of \$7,100,000 in the authorization for appropriation. This action has the effect of applying additional prior year unobligated emergency construction funds to partially finance the fiscal year 1974 program.

The House has recommended a further reduction of \$12,000,000, which deletes funding in the amount of \$3,529,000 for a logistic support facility at Fort George G. Meade, Md., and provides that the balance of the program be financed entirely from unobligated prior year funds. The committee does not agree with the House action, and recommends approval of the Defense agencies program as submitted, subject only to funding constraints resulting from the Armed Services Committee's actions.

FAMILY HOUSING

The committee has approved \$1,188,539,000 in new appropriated funds for

the fiscal year 1974 military family housing program. This amount comprises approximately 44 percent of the entire funds appropriated in this bill and is \$93,128,000 lower than the revised defense budget request for family housing.

To provide maintenance and operation funds for defense housing, approval has been given in the authorized amount of \$622,913,000 to maintain and operate an estimated 380,006 housing units during fiscal year 1974. In addition, the committee has approved \$44,703,000 for leasing of 10,000 domestic and 7,262 foreign family housing units for assignment as public quarters.

The committee has recommended a \$381,603,000 family housing construction program. The approved program will provide for the construction of 10,541 new permanent units, which is 1,147 units less than requested. New construction approved includes 5,369 units at 12 Army installations, 3,460 units at 11 Navy and Marine Corps bases, 1,700 units at 8 Air Force bases and 12 units for the Defense Intelligence Agency. The committee did not approve the 150-unit Navy project authorized for construction at Iceland because of questions remaining in the need for the project. A total of \$309,733,000 is required for the approved new construction program. Other construction approved by the committee includes \$5,700,000 for mobile home facilities; \$240,000 for acquisition and connection of a utility system serving Wherry housing, \$62,510,000 for improvements to family quarters, \$2,720,000 for minor construction and \$700,000 for planning. The committee recommends that \$361,746,000 in new appropriations be provided for this construction program and that the balance of the program amounting to \$19,857,000 be financed from savings. Savings are available in funds appropriated in prior years but not needed because of project cancellations due to base closures, realignments or other changes in requirements. Sufficient funds remain to provide adequate construction for the valid fiscal year 1972 and 1973 housing projects.

The funding allowed by the committee for debt payment is the budget estimate of \$159,177,000. This includes \$100,167,000 for the payment of debt principal amount owed on Capehart, Wherry, and Commodity Credit-financed housing. In addition, \$53,024,000 is approved for the payment of interest on mortgage indebtedness on Capehart and Wherry housing and for other expenses relating to the construction and acquisition of these houses in prior years. The committee approved \$5,986,000 for payment to the Federal Housing Administration, for premiums on Capehart and Wherry housing mortgage insurance and for the payment of premiums on insurance provided by the FHA for mortgages assumed by active military personnel for houses purchased by them.

With respect to the inadequate quarters legislations, section 508 of Public Law 92-545, which authorized the desig-

nation as inadequate of not more than 20,000 family housing units, in addition to inadequate units already in the inventory, Defense reported that the services and the Defense Supply Agency had designated 19,282 units as inadequate as of July 1, 1973, and had placed them on a rental basis at fair rental values, not to exceed 75 percent of the occupant's basic allowance for quarters.

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE FUND, DEFENSE

The base realignments announced April 17, 1973, are of such magnitude that resources in the homeowners assistance fund will be insufficient to take care of the requirements of the homeowners assistance program in fiscal year 1974. Accordingly, Defense requested an additional \$7 million in appropriations for the program. This amount will also provide a modest expansion of the program to cover certain personnel not now covered by the program because of statutory technicalities, but who suffer the same losses in disposing of their homes as the personnel covered by the program at the same installation.

The committee has approved the revised request for funds in the amount of \$7 million. Spending of agency debt receipts, authorized in permanent legislation, will provide an additional \$17,443,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the pending bill be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purpose of amendment as original text, provided that no point or order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to the order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendments, agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, at the beginning of line 4, strike out "\$551,575,000" and insert "\$567,735,000".

On page 2, line 14, after the word "appropriation", strike out "\$587,641,000" and insert "\$608,467,000".

On page 2, at the beginning of line 22, strike out "\$239,702,000" and insert "\$261,198,000".

On page 3, at the beginning of line 6, insert "\$12,000,000"; and, in the same line, after the word "expended", insert "and in addition".

On page 4, at the beginning of line 17, strike out "\$22,900,000" and insert "\$20,300,000".

On page 5, line 8, after the word "law", strike out "\$1,194,539,000" and insert "\$1,188,539,000".

On page 5, line 15, after the word "Construction", strike out "\$103,947,000" and insert "\$97,947,000".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a comparative statement of the appropriations for fiscal year 1973 and the estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal 1974.

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

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1973 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1974

[In dollars]

Item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974	New budget (obligational) authority, recommended in the House bill	Senate committee bill compared with—			
				Amount recommended by Senate committee	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Military construction, Army	413,955,000	664,900,000	551,575,000	567,735,000	+153,780,000	-97,165,000	+16,160,000
Military construction, Navy	517,830,000	685,400,000	587,641,000	608,467,000	+90,637,000	-76,933,000	+20,826,000
Military construction, Air Force	265,552,000	291,900,000	239,702,000	261,198,000	-4,354,000	-30,702,000	+21,496,000
Military construction, Defense agencies	36,704,000	19,100,000	0	12,000,000	-24,704,000	-7,100,000	+12,000,000
Transfer, net to exceed	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)			
Military construction, Army National Guard	40,000,000	35,200,000	35,200,000	35,200,000	-4,800,000		
Military construction, Air National Guard	16,100,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	+3,900,000		
Military construction, Army Reserve	38,200,000	40,700,000	40,700,000	40,700,000	+2,500,000		
Military construction, Naval Reserve	20,500,000	20,300,000	22,900,000	20,300,000	-2,200,000		-2,600,000
Military construction, Air Force Reserve	7,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+3,000,000		
Total military construction	1,355,841,000	1,787,500,000	1,507,718,000	1,575,600,000	+219,759,000	-211,900,000	+67,882,000
Family housing defense	1,064,046,000	1,250,567,000	1,194,539,000	1,188,539,000	+124,493,000	-62,028,000	-6,000,000
Portion applied to debt reduction	-96,666,000	-100,167,000	-100,167,000	-100,167,000		-3,501,000	
Subtotal, family housing	967,380,000	1,150,400,000	1,094,372,000	1,088,372,000	+120,992,000	-62,028,000	-6,000,000
Homeowners assistance fund, Defense		7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	+7,000,000		
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority	2,323,221,000	2,944,900,000	2,609,090,000	2,670,972,000	+347,751,000	-273,928,000	+61,882,000

¹ Due to lack of authorization does not include additional \$4,300,000 requested in H. Doc. 93-155.

² Includes \$7,000,000 requested in H. Doc. 93-155.

³ Due to lack of authorization, does not include additional \$31,100,000 requested in H. Doc. 93-155.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I want to say that I am indebted to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER) for his cooperation, for his understanding, for his dedication to duty, and for the tremendous assistance he has rendered the subcommittee and the whole committee in the hearings under this legislation, and in being responsible in large part for such a tremendous reduction.

I have an idea that the bill may well signify the deepest cut of any, so far as appropriation measures are concerned, as related to any of the other appropriation measures which have come before Congress to this date.

Mr. President, again I want to say how much I am indebted to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER) for his cooperation and understanding.

Mr. President, now I yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I should like to add my remarks to the statement of the distinguished majority leader concerning the Military Construction bill for fiscal year 1974.

Although this bill is \$61.8 million greater than the House bill, it is significantly below the budget estimate of \$273,928,000.

In this day of budgetary and monetary crisis, it is important, as the majority leader just underscored, that the committee was able to stick well below the budget estimate. I commend the majority leader for his work and leadership in this area.

Mr. President, the bill provides more funds for the respective Services than was provided in the fiscal year 1973 program. In some cases, this increase reflects the fact of inflation. In other cases, it reflects new facilities provided to support justified requirements. A portion of the additional requirements and recommended appropriations support the re-

spective Services attempt to attract sufficient volunteers to satisfy manpower goals without the draft. These requirements involve new barracks for men and women, family housing, and work facilities.

I commend the Defense Department in its efforts to implement all-volunteer Armed Force.

Mr. President, contained in this appropriations for military construction is \$5.2 million for the construction of administrative facilities to accommodate the transfer of the Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia, Pa. to Albany, Ga. I oppose this specific appropriation on the basis that adequate justification for the transfer of this facility was not provided to the committee.

Although the record of the two hearings on this item, both of which I chaired, contain some questions regarding the correctness of an appropriation of \$5.2 million to meet the cost of construction for a facility at Albany, Ga., the basis of the computation using the standard Department of Defense space and construction criteria seem to provide a realistic cost estimate.

However, whether the cost estimates regarding the savings to be realized as a result of this transfer are accurate or realistic is for me the central issue. It was suggested to the committee during the hearing's that it's concern with the relocation of the supply activity should relate primarily to the question of whether or not the relocation will result in a savings of Federal dollars, and whether or not such a move will improve the efficiency of the Marine Corps supply system.

Mr. President, the primary savings to be realized from the transfer according to the Department of Defense is the cost avoidance of approximately \$4.6 million programed for installation of air conditioning at the Philadelphia facility over the next 4 fiscal years.

In my judgment that is not a credible justification. It seems questionable that

\$4.6 million for air conditioning could be legitimately claimed as a cost avoidance since this item has never been incorporated into the military construction budget for the Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia.

In fact, the Commandant of the Marine Corps in a letter dated August 3, 1972, published his "Guidance for Facility Planning and Programing," in which he stated he was providing a 6-year dollar control for each facility and command with a single year limitation. His letter stated:

It should be noted that, for purposes of flexibility, the total of these controls is in excess of the amount that can be anticipated for the next 6 years. Therefore, to assure that limited construction dollars are expended on the most urgent requirements, the controls should not be exceeded.

For the Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia, the 6-year dollar control—fiscal year 1974 through 1979—was \$2 million. No funds were projected for fiscal year 1974.

Nevertheless, the Department of Defense cites a cost avoidance of \$4.9 million as a justification for this transfer. I seriously question how bona fide is this claimed cost avoidance.

Mr. President, the Defense Department has indicated that the transfer will permit a functional consolidation in the personnel administration procurement, comptrollership, civilian and military personnel administration procurement and personnel services. The annual savings claimed by Defense Department in operating costs is projected at \$2.6 million. However, in order to do this, DOD plans to reduce its civilian manpower in Philadelphia by 184 positions and its military personnel by 50. This is in addition to a total reduction of 205 military and 2,894 civilian positions in Philadelphia.

The Philadelphia area impact from these base closings is approximately a loss of 8,000 jobs. Most of these are civil-

ian jobs and most are being transferred to other areas. The immediate impact will be on those whose jobs are abolished and on those who cannot or choose not to transfer.

The indirect impact from those who are transferred, is the loss of payroll. This, of course, impacts on the entire Philadelphia area economy, and if one estimates an average annual salary per position of \$8,000 or \$10,000, the annual payroll loss may come to \$60 or \$80 million.

In outlining this personnel cost having the Department of Defense failed to adequately take into account the costs to the Government of the retirement expenditures to these affected employees. In fact, the \$2.6 million savings does not include the increased costs of early retirements. Thus the \$2.6 million should be reduced by the retirement costs of the people no longer on the payroll. In addition, \$708,000 in the cost of severance pay should also be deducted. The Defense Department stated that by 1978 the saving would be \$2.6 million since by then "these other factors of changeover have been taken up or assumed in this period, have been amortized." Mr. President, that strikes me as awfully vague.

In October, 1970, a study was prepared by the Marine Corps as an internal study within the Supply Department, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, to analyze a conceptual plan for the relocation of the Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia, to Albany, Ga. Although the Marine Corps claims the study was never approved by the Quartermaster General, it concluded, in part, "within the parameters addressed by the study panel, the benefits to be potentially derived do not warrant incurring the risks involved." Also, the study stated:

Some benefits will accrue from the increased computer utilization and a more efficient working environment, but no beneficial factors concerning operational performance will be realized which will overcome the retardation of progress towards attainment of a fully operationally effective Material Management System.

The panel report was dated November 10, 1970, and recommended "that the relocation of the Inventory Control Point from Philadelphia to Albany not be initiated at this time."

Mr. President, if the Marine Corps disavows this study it seems to me it was incumbent on the Marine Corps to make available to the committee the study used as the basis for its decision to move the supply activity from Philadelphia to Albany, Ga.

Mr. President, I do not feel the Department of Defense has adequately made its case and I am opposed to this transfer. Overlooked in the planned transfer is the affect it will have on the people involved, the employees of the facility. Spokesmen for the employees testified at the hearing conducted by the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction and I ask that the statements submitted by Royal L. Sims, national vice president, and Forrest Sellers, president, Local 89, American

Federation of Government Employees, be inserted at this point in the RECORD. Also, Mr. President, I ask that a letter from my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, HUGH SCOTT, be inserted in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF ROYAL L. SIMS, NATIONAL VICE PRESIDENT AND FORREST SELLERS, PRESIDENT, LOCAL 89 AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, OCTOBER 9, 1973

I am Royal L. Sims, National Vice President, Third District, American Federation of Government Employees; I am accompanied this morning by Mr. Forrest Sellers, the President of American Federation of Government Employees Local 89, which directly speaks for the civilian Federal employees directly affected by the issue you are deliberating today.

We are most grateful to the Subcommittee for the opportunity to appear before you in opposition to the proposed transfer of the Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia, to the Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia. In presenting our opposition, we are speaking, in the first instance, on behalf of the civilian employees of the Philadelphia Marine Corps Supply Activity, whom we represent both through our American Federation of Government Employees Local 89 and through our AFGE Third National District. Additionally, we are speaking as taxpayers who are concerned about the expenditure of Federal tax revenues for a transfer which is both unwarranted and unjustifiable. Finally, we speak for those residents of Philadelphia and its suburbs, who will suffer serious economic and social consequences as a result of this unnecessary and imprudent action by the Marine Corps.

The principal argument proffered by the Marine Corps for this questionable undertaking is budgetary. Among the arguments which have been developed in support of this action, it is alleged that by 1978, that is, five years from now, the cumulative savings resulting from this action will overtake the additional costs of transferring this facility. In other words, the Marine Corps concedes that for the next five budgetary years, the U.S. government will have to spend more for these services by the transfer to Albany, Georgia, than maintaining the facility at Philadelphia.

What are the other risks of undertaking this transfer? In a letter to Mr. Forrest W. Sellers, July 19, 1973, Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics) Jack L. Bowers conceded that there are serious risks to the national security involved. He stated:

"It has always been recognized that in accomplishing this consolidation a risk of temporary degradation of supply support to the Fleet Marine Forces could be encountered. During the Southeast Asia conflict, this risk was unacceptable. Now, with the culmination of the conflict and the drastic realignment of operating forces, it is mandatory that the costs to maintain the Marine Corps support establishment be reduced."

I believe anyone reading the papers today must realize that the world situation is potentially just as explosive now as it has been in the past several years during the Southeast Asia conflict. Our nation is already concerned about the oil fuels shortage we are already threatened with rationing of heating oils and gasoline. The conflict in the Middle East has already resulted in major naval forces realignment and alerts. It is an imprudent and irresponsible act, there-

fore, to experiment with transferring such an essential and efficient facility as the Marine Corps Supply Activity on the hypothesis that five years later there may be, perhaps, some savings in budgetary costs.

Assistant Secretary Bowers concedes further difficulties which have not been properly reflected in the planning estimates—costs of recruiting employees. He wrote as follows to Mr. Sellers:

"The Marine Corps realizes that it may not be an easy task to recruit and train people to replace those current employees who choose not to exercise their right to transfer with their functions to the consolidated activity at Albany. However, it is believed that this difficulty will be minimized by the long lead time allowed for recruiting and training; i.e., from the present to January 1976 and the availability of required skills through the Department of Defense Priority Placement Program. In this regard, the Marine Corps is currently developing a time-phased plan for the consolidation of the Marine Corps Supply Activity at Albany. Requirements for recruiting and training will be an integral part of this plan."

But Assistant Secretary Bowers makes no provision for such contingencies as the current conflict in the Middle East. The availability of civilian employees is much, much greater in such a large community as Philadelphia, a major international seaport and airport as well as a major industrial and commercial center, than in Albany, Georgia. But what would happen if the Marine Corps Supply Activity would have to expand rapidly, as it was required to do so during the height of the Southeast Asia conflict. In brief, we believe that Philadelphia can afford a much better employee environment both during periods of rapid expansion and during periods of de-employment than a small community such as Albany, Georgia.

The foregoing considerations apply to the basic problem, seen from the standpoint of the national interest. As taxpayers and citizens we are concerned with that issue. We are also concerned with the issue of the impact of this action on the human beings directly affected—residents and citizens of Philadelphia and its environs.

According to the Marine Corps, on December 4, 1972, there were 1,132 employees of the installation. It is claimed that, after transfer to Albany, Georgia, and consolidation, there will be a need for only 948 of these employees, with 184 positions being reduced. Let us take these figures at face value, even though there are many reasons to believe they are inaccurate and overstate the reductions in force that will take place solely because of the geographical transfer of the activity.

Taken at face value, 948 employees are confronted today with serious problems of livelihood, uprooting, and expenses incidental to transfer. To what end? Supposedly, because five years from now the transfer allegedly will begin to save the United States money.

Moreover, the greater part of these savings comes from the alleged reduction in personnel costs arising from the firing of 184 employees. These are hypothetical savings, reflecting only alleged presumptive payroll costs. They leave out of account the costs of recruiting of new personnel; their training; travel and per diem for training and orientation; problems arising if the facility suddenly has to expand to meet a national emergency; and the host of other contingent costs, both in dollars and in human welfare, following such a transfer.

The transfer of this facility can be defended only if one takes a short-sighted and narrow view of costs. Even then, it can be scarcely justified, except by taking the further risk of assuming that the Supply Activity will be faced only with a diminishing

program, based on demobilizing the American military forces. It can be defended only if one takes a naive attitude that we have the end of all crises in the world and from now on the future is only one of coasting along.

Who is to pay the price for this attitude. First, the American people and taxpayer. Secondly, immediately and personally, the 184 employees who will be reduced in force and the 948 other employees who will be faced with problems just as great, perhaps greater, than those who were fired. These 948 employees must face the fact of being uprooted, dislocated, removed from the community where they now live and integrated into a community much smaller and less able to provide them with housing, schools, and other facilities available in Philadelphia.

In short, it is not 184 employees who are being reduced in force. There are 948 other employees who will have the order and rhythm of their homes and families disrupted, solely to carry out the alleged, unproven saving of money five years from today. The social costs are alienation, poor education, family disruption, reduced efficiency of the work force. In short, the costs are much greater to the United States than any potential savings, five years hence, which the Marine Corps can allege.

For these reasons, we earnestly ask your Committee to deny the Marine Corps the funds, which were generated out of the taxes of the American people, including the taxes of these employees, to carry out this imprudent and unwise experiment in budgetary planning. The American people can use those \$5.2 million to better advantage. Put them into schools; put them into social security benefits for the aged; put them into urban renewal; put them in cleaning up our air and water. Do not waste them on an unnecessary transfer of any activity which may not save any money in the future despite allegations of economy and will divert funds today from an efficient, proven facility.

Our nation must preserve its human, natural and fiscal resources. We cannot afford to squander any of these as we have done in the past. For this reason, we urge that the Marine Corps Supply Activity remain in Philadelphia, both in the national interest and in the interest of the community which has supplied its personnel for many years and which has built up a viable resource around it for our nation.

STATEMENT OF FORREST W. SELLERS

I am Forrest W. Sellers, President, Local 89, American Federation of Government Employees, which represents the civilian employees of the Marine Corps Supply Activity under the provisions of E.O. 11491. On behalf of these employees I should like to submit to you testimony which analyzes the alleged savings the Marine Corps claims will arise from this transfer. As you will recognize from this analysis, these savings are illusory and are predicated on assumptions which are invalid.

Mr. Sims has already indicated to you some of the considerations, including national security, why this transfer should not be authorized. Besides challenging the costs figures, I shall concentrate my summary on the impact this transfer will have on human beings.

4.6 MILLION "COST AVOIDANCE" FIGURE: IS THIS AN ACCURATE PROJECTION?

The 4.9 million dollar "cost avoidance" figure includes the following:

1. \$191,000 for a standby generator for processing equipment.

\$27,000 for a sprinkler system.

\$66 million dollars for air conditioning buildings.

It appears questionable that 4.9 million dollars could be legitimately claimed as a cost

avoidance when 4.6 million for air conditioning has never been incorporated into the military construction budget. Only funds for a sprinkler system and a standby generator are incorporated into the budget. One wonders if the air conditioning would ever have been assigned high enough priority to be incorporated in the military construction budget if the cost avoidance factor would not have been conducive to the proposed relocation. The Department of the Navy stated MCSA is old and in need of a modernization program. In 1965 MCSA said the Philadelphia building is structurally sound and sufficient. The aforementioned statement was made in a letter written by General Butcher, Commanding General of the MCA and is contained in the Congressional Record, in 1965. Secondly, extensive modernization has been made to MCSA since that time. The modernization included but is not limited to: installation of new elevators, new lighting, tile flooring, new roofing, and new windows; painting and pointing of various buildings, relocation and renovation of bathrooms, and other modernization. Thirdly, Inspectors of the Northern Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, and Headquarters, Marine Corps make periodic inspection of the buildings at MCSA. I am advised that the 1972 report of NFEIC listed only two principal items: the installation of the standby generator for data processing equipment and installation of a sprinkler system. As stated in the above paragraph, the projected cost to install these two items is only 258,000 dollars.

It is noted that Marine Corps Headquarters used as a justification for not effecting the program request for air conditioning the fact that there were higher Marine Corps priorities stemming from operational requirements and personnel facility requirements associated with Zero Draft/Project Volunteer. It should be noted of course that to attempt to justify the expenditure of more than 5.2 million dollars for construction in Albany, Georgia, the Department of the Navy uses this as cost avoidance.

The Acting Assistant Secretary of the Navy has stated that activities are curtailed or completely closed down during the summer months because of the lack of air conditioning in most areas. It should be noted that the times it has been necessary for employees to go home because of humidity/heat were relatively few, and at no time is the activity completely closed down due to lack of air conditioning in the building. However, I am advised that the conditions in Albany, Ga., in the nontemperature controlled warehouses and in the non-office space in the repair division, make it necessary that the employees be allowed to go home at various times because the temperature/humidity reaches a high proportion. It has also been stated by the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Navy that the efficiency of the employees drops during periods of high heat and humidity because of the lack of air conditioning. It is noteworthy that MCSA was given an award for efficient operation by Headquarters Unit from the Secretary of the Navy for exceptional meritorious achievement; this in itself shows the efficiency of the employees has remained high.

5.2 MILLION COSTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW BUILDING: IS THIS ACCURATE?

Based on our research, the figure of 5.2 million dollars to construct a building in Albany, Georgia is exceedingly low. If the building is constructed in 1974 or 1975, we project that figure could go as high as 8 million dollars.

OPERATIONAL COSTS: ARE THESE ACCURATE?

In reference to overall costs of operations in Philadelphia, there has already been a sizeable drop in cost as a result of the reduc-

tion in workload because of the cessation of hostilities in the Southeast Asia area. Twenty-six civilian billets have already been eliminated at a cost of 10.5 thousand dollars each and this will amount to more than 260,000 dollars. We anticipate there will be additional billets in the Philadelphia employment as a result of new program changes that will be eliminated and this will increase this figure to over 1/2 million dollars.

EMPLOYEES: WHAT HAPPENS TO THEM?

Mr. Chairman, we would be remiss if we did not bring up the most important project in running this operation and that is the people. Here we have some 1100 employees well trained, well equipped to meet all of the operational needs. Some have worked in this one building for more than 30 years. The tremendous impact which will occur on the lives of these people by relocating this activity unnecessarily to Albany, Georgia should not be expected by those who have contributed dedicated, unselfish service to the United States Government in carrying out its mission. Sufficient employees will not be able to be secured in Albany to carry on this function and even if they could secure employees, it will take a considerable number of months to train them to work efficiently.

HOUSING: WILL IT BE AVAILABLE?

The average grade of the civilian employee at MCSA is 7.94 and as such they could not afford a three bedroom house in Albany as such house in the spring of 1973 was selling between \$29,000 and \$35,000. It is noted that 70% of MCSA employees are GS-9 and below and couldn't afford to purchase such a house. In fact, Mr. Chairman, there is insufficient low income housing to meet the needs. Although the average earnings are \$10,000, I would like to bring to your attention some statistics in terms of lower grade employees:

Grade, Number of people:	Salary
GS-2, 25	\$5,432
GS-3, 68	6,128
GS-4, 97	6,882
GS-5, 107	7,694
GS-6, 38	8,572
GS-7, 112	9,520
GS-8, 3	10,528
GS-9, 242	11,046

It appears as a result of conditions that will exist there so far as living some 800 of the 1118 employees on the rolls will not be able to transfer. Therefore it will cost the U.S. Government multiple hundreds of thousands of dollars in severance pay; when we add to that early retirement, the cost will run in the millions. None of this shows up in the budget project submitted by the Marine Corp, even though these are real cost which the American taxpayer will have to bear.

STATEMENT OF FORREST SELLERS, PRESIDENT, LOCAL 89 AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

I am Forrest Sellers, President, Local 89, American Federation of Government Employees, which represents the civilian employees of the Marine Corps Supply Activity, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, under the provisions of Executive Order 11491.

I am most grateful to the Subcommittee for the opportunity of appearing before you on October 9, 1973 to express my opposition to the proposed transfer of the Marine Corps Supply Activity to the Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia. I submit the following statement to you primarily to provide (1) written responses to questions regarding my statement of October 9th, (2) additions to comment upon data made available to me at and after the hearing of October 9th and (3) amplification of several of my re-

marks. Secondly, for purposes of simplicity and convenience, I have incorporated into this statement the substance of my previous statement. My sentiments, therefore, can be scored solely by reviewing this statement. I respectfully request that this statement be inserted into the record of these hearings.

On behalf of the employees at the Marine Corps Supply Activity I should like to submit to you testimony which analyzes the alleged cost and the alleged savings the Department of the Defense (DoD) claims will arise from the proposed relocation. As you will recognize from this analysis (1) the alleged savings have decreased significantly, (2) the alleged costs have increased significantly and (3) several assertions of DoD are in error.

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST, UP, UPI

The Fact Sheet which DoD distributed to interested Congressmen/individuals lists under "Funding Impact" cost of 5.2 million dollars in military construction (MILCON) funds required to relocate the Marine Corps Supply Activity. The Hon. Jack L. Bowers, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installation and Logistics, in an enclosure to a letter written on 29 June 1973 to Mr. Royal L. Sims, National Vice-President of the American Federation of Government Employees, listed costs of 9,748,000 dollars to relocate the Marine Corps Supply Activity. The total estimated cost consisted of 5,204,000 dollars in MILCON funds and 4,544,000 dollars in Operations and Maintenance, Marine Corps (O&M, MC) funds. A preliminary report of a Marine Corps Task Group dated 22 June 1973 listed under Section IV total O&M, MC costs of 5,719,000 dollars—\$1,175,000 more than listed in Assistant Secretary Bowers' letter of June 29th. The Hon. John W. Warner, Secretary of the Navy, in his letter of October 2, 1973 to Senator Richard S. Schweiker listed total estimated cost to relocate the Marine Corps Supply Activity as 11.0 million dollars. The cost consisted of 5.2 million dollars in MILCON funds and 5.8 million dollars in O&M, MC funds. The report of the Marine Corps Task Group and Secretary Warner's letter show, therefore, that (1) cost as listed by DoD officials in the Fact Sheet has increased 5,719,000 dollars and (2) cost as listed by DoD officials in Assistant Secretary Bowers' letter of 29 June has increased 1,175,000 dollars.

ARE DO D ESTIMATES OF TOTAL COST COMPLETE?

Notwithstanding the fact that DoD estimates of total cost have increased a minimum of 1,175,000 dollars, it appears that several indirect costs to the Federal government and to the taxpayers have been excluded from the cost estimates. Where in the estimates are the costs to the Federal government resulting from the early retirement of employees who would not transfer if the relocation is consummated? Where in the estimates are the costs to the Federal government for economic adjustment assistance rendered to the adversely affected community by the President's Inter-Agency Economic Adjustment Committee? Where in the estimates are the costs to the Federal government for displaced employees who would be eligible for unemployment benefits? Where in the estimates are costs to the Federal government to retrain employees who will be placed in new occupations in other agencies in the government?

5.2 MILLION DOLLARS COST FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW BUILDING: IS THIS ACCURATE?

The Marine Corps estimates that the cost to construct the proposed building at Albany will be 5,204,000 dollars. Several knowledgeable persons have advised me that the estimate is exceedingly low. First of all, I have been advised that labor and material in the construction industry are increasing a minimum of eight to ten percent per year. Assuming that the Marine Corps' estimate of 5,204,000 dollars is accurate, the cost to

construct the proposed building in 1974 considering labor and material increases would be between \$5,620,320 and \$5,724,400. If the proposed building was constructed in 1975, the cost would be between \$6,036,640 and \$6,244,800.

Secondly, I have been advised that it appears the cost estimate does not contain any allowances for probable cost over-runs, modifications and other contingencies. I was advised, further, that considering cost over-runs, modifications and contingencies, the cost of the building might go as high as 8,000,000 dollars.

WHAT IS THE TRUE COST OF THE PROPOSED RELOCATION?

Why was not the total estimated cost of 11.0 million dollars contained in Secretary Warner's letter not contained in the Fact Sheet which was initially distributed to interested congressmen and individuals? Why have several indirect costs to the Federal government been excluded from the cost estimates? DoD has increased the cost estimates by a minimum of 1,175,000 dollars. Will DoD increase the cost estimates again? What is the true cost of the proposed relocation?

ESTIMATED SAVINGS DOWN

DoD officials have stated in a number of letters and documents that the proposed relocation would result in estimated annual savings of 2,610,000 dollars.

The Installation Facility Data, attached as an enclosure to Assistant Secretary Bowers' letter of June 29th, shows that 804,000 dollars of the alleged savings would result from a reduction in military pay, and the remaining 1,806,000 dollars of the alleged savings would result from a reduction in *civilian pay/other O&M, MC areas*. Secretary Warner shows in the aforementioned letter that the alleged savings would result solely from reductions in personnel. Sources of the alleged savings as depicted in the two preceding references are not in agreement. One wonders, therefore, how reliable are the estimates of alleged savings. Secondly, the civilian and military billets alleged to be eliminated have not been identified by DoD officials. I have been advised, moreover, that the Table of Organization (T/O), which would reflect reductions resulting from the proposed relocation has not been completed to date.

Thirdly, the Fact Sheet cites that the alleged personnel savings are predicated upon the following reductions in the T/O in effect on December 4, 1972: civilian billets being reduced from 1132 to 948 and military billets being reduced from 431 to 381. Fourteen civilian and six military billets have been eliminated already. This reduction—resulting in estimated savings of 210,000 dollars—is documented in the Civilian-Military Complement Record of the Marine Corps Supply Activity. An additional twenty military billets are scheduled to be eliminated in the Data Processing Division of the Marine Corps Supply Activity during the next two years. These reductions of 40 billets would result in total estimated savings of 420,000 dollars. It is to be emphasized that this savings of 420,000 dollars would occur before the time of the proposed relocation and is not related in any way to the proposed relocation. These savings would reduce the alleged savings resulting from the proposed relocation.

Fourthly, a preliminary report of an on-site manpower survey team from Headquarters, Marine Corps recommended several months ago that thirty-one civilian and military billets in addition to the forty civilian and military billets cited in the above paragraph be eliminated. If the latter mentioned thirty-one billets are eliminated, DoD alleged savings of 2,610,000 dollars resulting from the proposed relocation would be reduced by 745,500 dollars.

Finally, it is anticipated that there will be additional personnel reductions at the

Marine Corps Supply Activity not related to the proposed relocation because of reductions in workload due to the cessation of hostilities in the Southeast Asia area.

\$4.9 MILLION "COST AVOIDANCE" FIGURE: IS THIS A LEGITIMATE CLAIM?

DoD Officials stated in a number of letters and documents that military construction at the Marine Corps Supply Activity totaling 4,924,000 dollars could be avoided if the proposed relocation is accomplished. The 4.9 million dollar "cost avoidance" figure includes the following items:

a. 191,000 dollars for a standby generator for data processing equipment.

b. 176,000 dollars for a sprinkler system. The original estimated cost of this project was 67,000 dollars.

c. 4.6 million dollars for air conditioning various buildings.

Mr. Witt stated in his letter of June 12, 1973 to Senator Schweiker that air conditioning of the Marine Corps Supply Activity "has not been effected up to now because of higher Marine Corps priorities stemming from operational requirements and personnel facility requirements associated with Zero Draft/Project Volunteer".

It is questionable that 4.9 million dollars could be legitimately claimed as a cost avoidance when 4.6 million dollars for air conditioning has never been incorporated into the military construction budget. Only funds for a sprinkler system and a standby generator have ever been incorporated into the budget. One wonders if the air conditioning would ever have been assigned high enough priority to be incorporated in the military construction budget if the cost avoidance factor would not have been conducive to the proposed relocation.

Secondly, enclosure (2) to the Commandant of the Marine Corps letter of August 3, 1972 (Subj: Guidance for Facility Planning and Programming) stated that the six-year dollar limitation for military construction at the Marine Corps Supply Activity for Fiscal Years 1974 through 1979 would be \$2.0 million. The aforementioned limitation renders it impossible to install air conditioning at the Marine Corps Supply Activity during the six-year period. The Director of MCSA Office of Supporting Services letter of 13 September 1972 to MCSA Chief of Staff collaborated the situation.

The Hon. Edward J. Sheridan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, stated in his letter of 14 June 1973 to Senator Richard S. Schweiker that the Marine Corps Supply Activity is old and desperately in need of a major modernization program.

Marine Corps Major General J. O. Butcher, Commanding General of the Marine Corps Supply Activity in 1965, stated in a letter that "the present permanent buildings at 1100 South Broad Street (Marine Corps Supply Activity) are structurally sound and are sufficient for orderly satisfaction of all anticipated requirements with remaining space still available for possible additional expansion."

The opinion expressed by General Butcher was subsequently incorporated into the Congressional Record.

Secondly, extensive modernization has been made to MCSA since that time. The modernization included but is not limited to: installation of new elevators, new lighting, tile flooring, new roofing, and new windows; painting and pointing of various buildings, relocation and renovation of bathrooms, and other modernization.

Thirdly, Inspectors of the Northern Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, and Headquarters, Marine Corps make periodic inspection of the buildings at MCSA. I am advised that the 1972 report of NFEC listed only two principal items: the installation of the standby generator for data proc-

cooling equipment and installation of a sprinkler system. As stated in the above paragraph, the projected cost to install these two items is only 367,000 dollars.

Fourthly, if General Butcher's statements were accurate, it must be concluded that the buildings at MCSA are structurally sound and sufficient today because the buildings are in better condition today than they were in 1968.

HEAT/HUMIDITY DOES NOT COMPLETELY CLOSE DOWN MCSA

Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Sheridan in his aforementioned letter stated also that many of the supply operations at the Marine Corps Supply Activity are curtailed or completely closed down during the summer months because of the lack of air conditioning in most of the Office spaces.

It should be noted that the times it has been necessary for employees to be released early because of the heat/humidity have been relatively few and at no time has the Activity been completely closed down due to lack of air conditioning in the buildings. Approximately 40 percent of the office/conference room spaces at the Marine Corps Supply Activity are air conditioned. Air conditioned spaces include the following offices: The Commanding General, the Chief of Staff, the Deputy Chief of Staff, all division directors, and various other offices in each division. Persons in air conditioned spaces are not released early due to heat/humidity—only persons in non-air conditioned space are released. Thus, at no time is the entire Activity completely closed down due to heat/humidity.

Secondly, when management deems it prudent to release employees in non-air conditioned spaces, divisions normally retain one or more key employees in each branch—including persons in non-air conditioned space—to process emergency/priority work.

EMPLOYEES AT MCSA ARE EFFICIENT

Former Acting Assistant Secretary of the Navy Hugh Witt stated in his letter of 12 June 1973 to Senator Schweiker that the efficiency of the employees drops during periods of high heat and humidity because of the lack of air conditioning. It is noteworthy that the Marine Corps Supply Activity was awarded a unit citation from the Secretary of the Navy on June 15, 1968 for "Exceptionally meritorious achievement in the performance of outstanding service in carrying out assigned duties . . .". The award substantiates that the efficiency of the employees at the Marine Corps Supply Activity is high.

ARE SUFFICIENTLY TRAINED PERSONNEL AVAILABLE IN ALBANY?

Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Edward J. Sheridan in his letter of 14 June to Senator Richard S. Schweiker stated the possible loss of specific talents possessed by employees who cannot relocate was recognized as a major problem in the relocation.

Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bowers stated in his letter of 19 July 1973 to me:

The Marine Corps realizes that it may not be an easy task to recruit and train people to replace those current employees who choose not to exercise their right to transfer with their function . . .

A Marine Corps Task Group in a preliminary report of June 22, 1972.

"Certain critical functions most seriously affected by the non-relocation of key civilian personnel require augmentation by military personnel in order to ensure a reasonable degree of continuity."

Why is the military augmentation required if there are sufficiently trained personnel in Albany?

In the event that the proposed relocation is consummated, who will staff the positions

if it becomes necessary to pull out the military personnel in an emergency?

Is it not true also that a number of previous Marine Corps studies—including the Dillard Study of 1970-71—recommended against the proposed relocation because of the lack of sufficiently trained personnel?

IS THERE ENOUGH LOW INCOME HOUSING IN ALBANY?

Former Acting Assistant Secretary of the Navy Witt stated also in his letter of June 12th, that the cost of three bedroom homes in Albany in the Spring of 1973 ranged between \$29,000 and \$35,000. As shown below, more than 70 percent of the employees at the Marine Corps Supply Activity are GS-9 (or equivalent) and below:

Grade, number of people, and salary		
GS-2	25	\$5,682
GS-3	68	6,408
GS-4	97	7,198
GS-5	107	8,055
GS-6	38	8,977
GS-7	112	9,969
GS-8	3	11,029
GS-9	242	12,167
Wage grade	69	

¹ Employees on board as of 30 May 1973.

These 771 employees normally would not secure or support a \$29,000 to \$35,000 mortgage based upon their income. Mr. Witt stated also that the cost of four bedroom homes in Albany in the Spring of 1973 ranged between \$35,000 and \$42,000. Four bedroom homes would, therefore, be limited to the select group of employees equivalent to GS-12 and above. Most of MCSA employees who lack sufficient income to purchase a \$29,000 to \$42,000 home in Albany now live in decent adequate row/semi-detached homes in Philadelphia and vicinity ranging between \$12,000 and \$22,000.

EMPLOYEES—WHAT HAPPENS TO THEM?

Mr. Chairman, we would be remiss if we did not bring up the most important project in running this operation, and that is the people. Here we have some 1100 employees well trained, well equipped to meet all of the operational needs. Some have worked in this one building for more than 30 years. The tremendous impact which will occur on the lives of these people by relocating this activity unnecessarily to Albany, Georgia should not be expected by those who have contributed dedicated, unselfish service to the United States Government in carrying out its mission.

In closing, I wish to reiterate that it is apparent that the rationale advanced by DoD officials to support the proposed relocation contains a number of defects. The major defect is that alleged savings of 2,610,000 dollars have decreased significantly, while total estimated cost has increased significantly. Another major defect is that several costs have been excluded from the estimates. A third major defect is that there are official documents to prove that the alleged cost avoidance of 4,924,000 dollars is invalid because Headquarters, Marine Corps was not going to allocate MCSA sufficient funds during Fiscal Years 1974 thru 1979 to air condition the buildings. A fourth major defect is that it is questionable that adequately trained civilian personnel are available to staff the proposed transferred positions.

I wish to emphasize that the above-mentioned statements are not made to be critical of any individual or agency, and identification of individuals and/or various agencies was for purpose of required documentation. I served as a Budget Analyst and a Budget/Accounting Analyst for the Federal government for eight years, and I know the difficulty in compiling meaningful estimates three years in advance. In my opinion, however, it would not be prudent or in the best interest of the Federal government, the taxpayers or MCSA employees to

recommend appropriation of the 5.2 million dollars based upon data presented by DoD to date. I respectfully request, therefore, that you, the members of the Military Construction Subcommittee, recommend disapproval of the proposed appropriation.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., November 1, 1973.

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
Ranking Member, Senate Appropriations Committee on Military Construction, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DICK: I am writing to let you know of my concern for the proposed appropriation of \$5.2 million to relocate the Marine Corps supply activity from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania to Albany, Georgia.

As you know, the \$5.2 million is needed to construct administrative facilities to adequately house Marine Corps supply activity personnel to be moved to Albany, Georgia. Reliable witnesses have appeared before your Committee to refute the overall estimates of cost and savings attributed to the move as presented to your Committee by the Department of Navy. This testimony shows the overall cost to the government, maintenance, construction, relocation, etc., will be less if the facility remains in Philadelphia.

Specifically, the \$5.2 million cost of the needed renovation at Albany, Georgia, could go as high as \$8 million when the construction is completed in 1974-75. Also, the Department of the Navy does estimate it will save \$4.9 million in "cost avoidance" by moving the supply operation. \$4.6 million of this estimate is for air conditioning—a cost never incorporated into the military construction budget.

Therefore, in view of the above, and other questions raised in the testimony, I respectfully request that the \$5.2 million not be appropriated until it is clearly shown to be in the best interest of the Government.

With kind regard,

Sincerely,

HUGH SCOTT,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I am not satisfied that the Department of Defense has properly evaluated this proposal and I regret that funds are provided in this bill which will begin the transfer. As the ranking Republican on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction I conducted hearings on this important subject. Also, I was able to have this specific appropriation item deferred to the full Appropriation Committee for consideration. I felt that the full committee should have the opportunity to evaluate and consider the necessity for the transfer and thus the need for \$5.2 million to begin construction of a facility in Albany, Ga. During the Appropriations Committee deliberations on this bill, I presented the various issues involved including the points of view of the employees, the content of the Dillard study I mentioned earlier, and the testimony presented at the hearings which I chaired. I requested a vote on this specific item and was disappointed that the committee by a vote of 10 to 6 failed to adopt my recommendation that the funds be deleted from the bill.

Mr. President, I repeat, this appropriation item is unnecessary, unjustified and will result in severe hardships for the city of Philadelphia and particularly for the many employees whose loyal service to the Federal Government is being overlooked for no good reason.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it has been my pleasure and privilege to serve on the Board of Visitors of the Military Academy, which we call West Point. I want to express my appreciation to the committee for having included \$20 million to commence the building of a new hospital. This is very badly needed. The present hospital has been there since 1923. It has been enlarged sort of piecemeal from time to time, and I know that this is not a satisfactory way to produce the proper kind of hospital.

I speak with some experience in this matter, because I have been a member of the board of three hospitals in this country. I know the per-square-foot cost to be very high in their construction. I know that at West Point the per-square-foot cost to build anything is ridiculously high, because we have never been able to acquire the proper construction facilities, unions, and so forth, in the close proximity of the academy.

Mr. President, while \$20 million will not exactly finish this hospital, it will get it started. I am very gratified, and I know that I speak the gratification of the entire Board of Visitors and the staff of West Point when I express thanks to the committee for this fine job.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to express the thanks of the committee, to the distinguished Senator from Arizona, who has been leading the fight for this item for more months than, frankly, I care to remember. I think he and the Academy have achieved success. We have been assured by the Army that this will be sufficient to take care of its needs. They are very much pleased with the proposal, and we hope that the House will agree in conference.

May I say that the Senate figure, despite its almost 10 percent cut from the administration's request, is \$61 million above that of the House. But of that \$61 million, more than half is the result of new items—the \$20 million for the hospital at the Military Academy at West Point and \$12 million for Culebra, off Puerto Rico, by means of which a pledge given by three Secretaries of Defense is being honored. This matter, we hope, now is on the way to a final solution.

Other islands, uninhabited, have been found to carry out the gunnery practice and the like which the Navy considers desirable. It is our hope that the House will agree with what the Senate will do in the case of Culebra, that a commitment will be honored, and that this difficult situation finally will be brought to a head.

It was interesting to note that the chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee, Representative ROBERT L. F. SIKES, of Florida, stated that he would give the matter all consideration and keep an open mind if it was put into the Senate bill. He explained that he could not do anything because he had received no communication from the Navy. We did. This committee did receive a communication from the Navy. This request now has been honored and is in the bill. There, again, I want to say

that a great deal of credit goes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), who, along with me, is managing the bill at this time on the floor.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. I certainly agree with the distinguished majority leader's point on Culebra. I had the opportunity during World War II to serve on an aircraft carrier operating off Culebra, and we were using the island for bombing practice.

I also had the misfortune to see a very serious accident occur during World War II, when pilots from our carrier, by mistake, in bad weather conditions, bombed the observation tower, killing a number of men on the island of Culebra. This event did not receive wide publicity at the time because of war conditions. It did receive a Navy board of inquiry.

It seems to me that this is good, graphic proof of what can happen when somebody makes a mistake and you are near a population area. Fortunately, this did not affect civilians; but the fact that we bombed our own observation post, killing a number of officers and enlisted men at the time, shows how a bombing incident near civilians endangers civilian population.

I can well understand that the people who live there are concerned about it. So I am glad that we have bitten the bullet, and that we have, in fact, set a target date for phasing out the bombing operation there.

I hope, as the distinguished majority leader has said, that the House will listen to our point and will agree that this is a better way to proceed. I think it is only fair to the people of Culebra; and it is also a very good index of what we ought to be doing.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, because there will be a yea-and-nay vote. The bill is of sizable proportions. I think we ought to help some of our Members to be recorded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, because of the fact that certain committees are holding important hearings this

morning, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the military construction appropriation bill occur at 12:15 p.m. today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the majority leader ask that the provisions of rule XII be waived?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the appropriate section of rule XII will be waived.

Without objection, the vote will occur at 12:15 p.m. today.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the pending bill, which would provide \$2,670,972,000 in appropriations for the fiscal year 1974 military construction program, deserves favorable consideration by the Senate.

This bill represents an increase of approximately \$61 million over that approved by the House Appropriations Committee earlier this month but is nearly \$300 million under the budget request.

It was pleasing to me that the Senate Committee approved a \$1.3 million project at the Naval Station in Charleston, S.C., for a communication facility badly needed by naval forces there.

This facility would provide fleet broadcast communications and improve harbor control. The present transmitter buildings are overcrowded and in poor condition.

Mr. President, unfortunately the Senate committee did not approve about \$6 million for enlisted and bachelor officer housing in Iceland. This request was taken out because the United States is presently negotiating for an agreement to insure retention of our forces there. While this money could be used only if suitable agreements are reached, it nevertheless would appear wise to provide the funds in the event a suitable agreement is reached.

Iceland is a very isolated area and our personnel there remain indoors most of the time. The present facilities are totally inadequate and if this funding is not restored and an agreement is reached, our servicemen will have to wait an extra year to receive suitable housing.

Mr. President, overall the committee has done an outstanding job on this bill. However, I hope the conferees will give serious consideration to the House position of leaving the Iceland projects in the bill, on the proviso that a suitable agreement might be reached.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I wish to commend the chairmen and members of the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees for providing \$12 million in the military construction appropriations bill, presently pending before the Senate, to effect the transfer of the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range from the inhabited island of Culebra to the two uninhabited islands of Desecheo and Monito.

This transfer was ordered by the Secretary of Defense on May 24, 1973, and it represents the fruition of efforts by many to end the Navy's use of this tiny island east of Puerto Rico as a target for naval weapons. For years, the Navy claimed that Culebra was essential to the national security as a target for ship-to-

shore and aerial bombardment until 1972, when two studies conducted by DOD concluded that there were other islands in the general vicinity that were uninhabited and that would serve the same purpose. Thus, Senator HUMPHREY and I introduced legislation, cosponsored by 38 Members of this body, to force the Navy to move elsewhere for their target practice; and I was very pleased to see Elliot Richardson, in his last action as Secretary of Defense, order the Navy to complete such a transfer by July 1, 1975.

The questions of how to effect the transfer and how to protect Culebra's unique environment from uncontrolled development remain to be answered. However, I am confident that the Department of the Interior, the Navy, and the Government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico can work out these details in the near future and that the transfer can be brought about as quickly and smoothly as possible.

The funds in the military constructions appropriation bill are essential to this purpose and I wish to thank once again the Senate Appropriations Committee for following through on this important matter.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF POSITION ON HELMS AMENDMENT RELATING TO BUSING

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, yesterday, November 19, 1973, it was necessary in the performance of my duties as U.S. Senator from Alabama to be absent from the session of the Senate. On that date, Hon. Howard H. Callaway, Secretary of the Army made an official inspection tour of Fort McClellan, one of the Nation's great military bases, near Aniston, Ala., as part of a survey that is being made by the Defense Department to determine the future mission of Fort McClellan and other military bases throughout the country. Along with Congressman BILL NICHOLS of the Third Congressional District of Alabama, I accompanied Secretary Callaway on his inspection trip to Fort McClellan to be of such assistance as I could in assisting the Secretary in arriving at a decision that would make the best possible use of Fort McClellan and its facilities and would best serve the national interest.

I regret that my necessary absence from the Senate yesterday caused me to miss the further deliberations of the Senate on the energy bill as well as the votes that were taken on amendments and on final passage.

I might state specifically as to the Helms amendment, which would have prevented the forced busing of schoolchildren and the use of gasoline for that purpose, I am a cosponsor of the amendment and had I been present in the Senate when the amendment was called up and the motion to table was made I would have voted against the motion to table in order that we might have then moved on to voting in favor of the Helms amendment.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR PRINTING OF S. 2589, AS PASSED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 2589 be printed as it passed the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 12:10 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon, at the hour of 11:50 a.m., the Senate took a recess until 12:10 p.m., whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO FILE A REPORT NOT LATER THAN MIDNIGHT, NOVEMBER 28, 1973

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to file its report on S. 1541 no later than midnight, November 28, 1973.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1974

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11459) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to vote on H.R. 11459.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is the appropriation bill for military construction?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HASKELL), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS) is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. McCURE) is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 510 Leg.]

YEAS—88

Abourezk	Fulbright	Moss
Alken	Goldwater	Muskie
Allen	Gravel	Nunn
Baker	Griffin	Packwood
Bartlett	Gurney	Pastore
Bayh	Hansen	Pearson
Beall	Hart	Pell
Bellmon	Hartke	Percy
Bentsen	Hatfield	Proxmire
Bible	Hathaway	Randolph
Biden	Helms	Ribicoff
Brooke	Hollings	Roth
Buckley	Hruska	Saxbe
Burdick	Huddleston	Schweiker
Byrd	Hughes	Scott, Hugh
Harry F., Jr.	Inouye	Scott,
Byrd, Robert C.	Jackson	William L.
Cannon	Idaoua	Sparkman
Case	Javits	Stafford
Chiles	Johnston	Stevens
Clark	Kennedy	Stevenson
Cook	Long	Symington
Cranston	Magnuson	Taft
Dole	Mansfield	Talmadge
Domenici	Mathias	Thurmond
Dominick	McClellan	Tower
Eagleton	McGee	Tunney
Eastland	McGovern	Welcker
Ervin	McIntyre	Williams
Fannin	Metcalfe	Young

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—12

Bennett	Curtis	Mondale
Brock	Fong	Montoya
Church	Haskell	Nelson
Cotton	McCure	Stennis

So the bill (H.R. 11459) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill (H.R. 11459) was passed.

Mr. CANNON and Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD moved to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and requests a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. BELLMON, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. TOWER conferees on the part of the Senate.

DELETION OF NAME OF SENATOR ROTH AS COSPONSOR OF S. 1541

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing my name be deleted as a cosponsor of S. 1541, the Federal Act to Control Expenditures and Establish Priorities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROHIBITION ON THE IMPORTATION OF RHODESIAN CHROME

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of calendar No. 388, S. 1868.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1868) to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome and to restore the United States to its position as a law-abiding member of the international community.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, whether or not there will be any more votes this afternoon, I cannot say at this time. It is possible that there may be, so I would urge Senators to stay very close to the Chamber. There will be some matters taken up relative to the executive calendar, on which we are awaiting further information.

As the Senate knows, the two treaties which were reported by the Foreign Re-

lations Committee unanimously will be voted on Monday. Again, we are awaiting word as to what time that vote will occur.

On the basis of the report made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration today concerning the nomination of GERALD FORD to be Vice President of the United States—and that nomination was reported unanimously, and debate on that nomination will begin immediately after the disposition of the two treaties on Monday next—the vote on the confirmation will not occur on Monday. Hopefully it will occur some time on Tuesday. The debate will not be too lengthy.

It is the present intention of the leadership, following the disposal of the nomination of GERALD FORD to be Vice President of the United States, to call up S. 2673, the so-called Saxbe pay bill.

That is the situation, as I see it, at the present time. As of now it does not look as if there will be any votes tomorrow. There will be a session, though.

I would hope that we could clean the calendar a little more today. I would hope it would be possible to dispose of the executive calendar. However, as I have indicated, that is a matter of waiting on events, and if an agreement is reached, announcement will be made as expeditiously thereafter as possible.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO TEMPORARILY LAY ASIDE PENDING BUSINESS AT ANY TIME

Mr. MANSFIELD. In view of the circumstances I ask unanimous consent that as the need arises—and the agreement will not be treated cavalierly—it be possible to lay aside temporarily the pending business at any time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We understand that. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROHIBITION ON THE IMPORTATION OF RHODESIAN CHROME

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (S. 1868) to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome and to restore the United States to its position as a law-abiding member of the international community.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Don Henderson, of the Foreign Relations staff, Mr. Spiegel and Miss Albertson of my staff be allowed the privilege of the floor during the consideration of S. 1868.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the pending business relating to the restoration of the United States sanctions against Rhodesia as one of the important items of international policy, particularly at this critical time when we need to look towards the Continents of Asia and Africa for not only their cooperation but also, may I say, in terms of many of their resources.

Mr. President, U.S. violation of international sanctions against Rhodesia has

seriously undermined some of our most fundamental foreign policy goals:

The United States is committed to the rule of law throughout the world and to upholding international treaty obligations. At a time when we are seeking binding international agreements in many areas—from international monetary reform to strategic arms limitations—we must do everything possible to make our own commitment to treaty obligations credible and to strengthen the international legal system.

Yet in violating sanctions we are breaking a treaty obligation to the United Nations and refusing to comply with international law. Article 25 of the U.N. Charter states that all member states are legally bound to comply with sanctions. The United States is a member state, and in fact we were the leading force in bringing about the United Nations and in securing the adoption of the charter. Section 5(a) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 gave the President express authority to implement sanctions when imposed by the United Nations.

The United States strongly supported the imposition of sanctions against Rhodesia in the Security Council—both in 1966 when the Security Council voted unanimously to impose partial mandatory sanctions and in 1968 when it voted unanimously to impose full mandatory sanctions.

So there it is, Mr. President, the law of the land. And a treaty is regarded as the supreme law of the land, just as is our Constitution. We are the only nation in the world to first support sanctions then pass a law requiring that we violate them.

This action can only weaken the international legal framework.

It should be clearly understood that the United States has more at stake in complying with international law than almost any other country in the world. For us to violate the law and abrogate international law in defiance of our treaty obligations is to invite international disorder and catastrophe.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would like to make my statement first. Afterward, I shall yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota would yield very briefly, my only inquiry is whether the Senator from Minnesota intends to ask for a vote on this bill today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I do not. Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Virginia.

We have the power to veto any United Nations resolution. When we refuse to comply with U.N. policy we are setting a bad example for nations which do not even have a vote in the Security Council.

Our violation of international law has not gone unnoticed in the United Nations. The General Assembly has passed four resolutions calling on the United States not to implement the legislation

craft to five Latin American countries, including Chile, although section 4 of the Foreign Military Sales Act, as amended, places restrictions on the sale of "sophisticated weapons systems, such as jet aircraft" to these countries. So as to make such a sale, section 4 requires that the President to make a determination that the financing of such a sale is "important to the national security of the United States," and the President is required to report such a determination to the Congress within 30 days. The President has made such a determination, and has also requested a waiver of section 33 of the Foreign Military Sales Act, so as to increase the regional ceiling on aggregate military sales to Latin America from \$100 million to \$150 million. In addition, it is my understanding that Chile has been the recipient of a \$1 million program of military training assistance.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there are sound reasons—some concerning principle and morality, others concerned with pragmatism and self-interest—that military assistance to the current Government of Chile should be discontinued.

I believe that the United States has contributed, slowly and methodically, to eroding the strength and durability of what had been the oldest democracy in Latin America. Through our leverage with the Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank, private sources of credit and financing, and our own Import-Export Bank, the United States made it impossible for President Allende to maintain a workable economy. Consequently, it is my opinion that the present military junta's ban on political parties, forceable "recess" of the Chilean Congress, take-over of communications media, invasion of universities, and suppression of dissent, are, in some measure, the responsibilities of the United States.

Congress can not turn back the clock, but we can decline aid to the forces directly involved in the crippling of democracy in Chile.

Practically speaking, I believe the day will soon come when our country will pay heavily for subordinating the long-term interests of our foreign policy to the short-term interests of American corporations abroad.

Nearly 50 percent of the people of Latin America are 15 years of age or younger. As this generation grows to maturity, they will surely recognize that most of the regimes supported by the United States are not dedicated to fulfilling their aspirations and needs. When this generation eventually comes to power—by democratic elections, if possible, by force if otherwise—the United States may well find itself tied to military and private interests and allied against broader national interests, thus dooming itself to repeat the lessons of Vietnam, closer to home.

Now is the time for the Congress of the United States to move the foreign policy of our Government in the direction of cultivating good relations with the people of Latin America. Congressional defiance to the corporate orientation of the present administration could be a tragic example of lack of foresight. We must instead begin to investigate and

review our policy toward Latin America in general and Chile in particular, with a view toward building a positive reputation in the eyes of the people of Latin America.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I urge this House to register in a concrete way its dissatisfaction with the current undemocratic regime in Chile, by acting to suspend military assistance to this regime until basic human rights are reestablished. I believe that we owe this much to both the people of Chile and to our own future interests.

Mr. Speaker, I intend on Friday, when the House considers the foreign aid appropriations bill, to offer an amendment that could have the effect of terminating all forms of military assistance to the present government of Chile. I hope at that time that my colleagues will join me in taking this positive step toward human rights, democracy, and an enlightened American foreign policy.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I am distressed by the inclusion in this bill of section 114 which provides that—

None of the funds made available to carry out this part shall be used to pay for the performance of abortions as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortions.

This provision is unnecessary because title X, section 291 of the present law says:

(a) It is the sense of the Congress that, while every nation is and should be free to determine its own policies and procedures with respect to problems of population growth and family planning within its own boundaries, nevertheless, voluntary family planning programs to provide individual couples with the knowledge and medical facilities to plan their family size in accordance with their own moral convictions and the latest medical information, can make a substantial contribution to improve health, family stability, greater individual opportunity, economic development, a sufficiency of food, and a higher standard of living.

This, it seems to me, states very well the intent of our aid, and does not trespass upon the right of nations to decide their own policies.

Abortion is one legitimate form of family planning and in some countries, the only available form. It is in fact legal for 58 percent of the world's population. It has always been our policy in providing aid to other countries to avoid dictating the precise form of its use; why do we now seek to place our own imprimatur upon this bill—and carrying, at that, the views of only a vocal minority?

The emotional prohibition of abortion is a misuse of the legislative process and of the aid program. It is providing a channel for the frustrations of those who object to the Supreme Court's decision, but it is not the purpose of legislation to provide such a channel. I fear that this constant outcry is really a manifestation of patriarchal chauvinism.

Inherent also in this provision is a blatant form of discrimination against women. It appears that we are attempting to deny the women abroad the freedom of choice in family planning that our own Supreme Court has recently granted to women in this country. No other class or group, so far as I

can recall, has been so singled out; we do not attempt to deny freedom of choice to construction workers, children under 12, people over 60—only to women.

I regret that the section does seem to place us in the questionable position of imposing on women abroad a restriction recently overturned by our Supreme Court and constitutes serious interference with the internal affairs of other countries.

Title X, section 291, subsection (c), states:

In carrying out programs authorized in this title, the President shall establish reasonable procedures to insure, whenever family-planning assistance from the United States is involved, that no individual will be coerced to practice methods of family planning inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs.

It seems to me that this is quite sufficient.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote "present" on the conference report because I favor it in principle, but do not agree with the actions of the conferees with respect to congressional policy on expropriations of American companies and properties.

When the bill was before the House earlier this year, I offered an amendment that would cut off aid to countries that had expropriated American firms or properties, if the recipient country had failed to compensate the firm or investor, or entered into negotiations leading toward compensation or submitted the matter to arbitration before the International Center for the Settlement of Investment Disputes. This amendment was adopted overwhelmingly by the House, but the conference report carries a substitute that is totally different and wholly inadequate.

My amendment would have extended to bilateral assistance the same policy, adopted overwhelmingly by the Congress, that now applies to multilateral lending institutions. It would have provided a uniform U.S. policy on expropriation. It is a policy that works, and a policy that has been effective in encouraging the systematic settlement of disputes arising from expropriations. Such a policy is imperative, and ought to be uniformly applied to all forms of foreign assistance. The action of the conferees in no way reflects the will of the House on this, expressed in four separate votes, nor does it support the clear policy of Congress, carried in three laws.

If the conferees had reported an adequate provision on expropriation, I would have voted "aye" on the report. I regret that the conferees failed to uphold the clear position of the House and the Congress on this issue, and hope that when we next consider foreign assistance we will see a sound expropriation policy enacted. I intend to work toward that end.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

THE SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken, and the

Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. 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 210, nays 193, answered "present" 1, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 620] YEAS—210

- Abzug
- Addabbo
- Alexander
- Anderson
- Anderson, Calif.
- Anderson, Ill.
- Annunzio
- Arends
- Armstrong
- Ashley
- Aspin
- Badillo
- Barrett
- Bell
- Blaggi
- Biestler
- Bingham
- Blatnik
- Boggs
- Boland
- Bolling
- Brademas
- Brasco
- Breckinridge
- Brooks
- Broomfield
- Brotzman
- Brown, Calif.
- Brown, Mich.
- Buchanan
- Burke, Mass.
- Burton
- Carney, N.Y.
- Carney, Ohio
- Cederberg
- Chamberlain
- Clark
- Clay
- Cohen
- Collins, Ill.
- Conable
- Conte
- Corman
- Cotter
- Coughlin
- Cronin
- Culver
- Daniels
- Dominick V.
- Danielson
- Davis, S.C.
- Delaney
- Dellenback
- Derwinski
- Dingell
- Donohue
- Drinan
- du Pont
- Eckhardt
- Ellberg
- Erlenborn
- Esch
- Fascell
- Findley
- Fish
- Flood
- Foley
- Ford
- William D. Forsythe
- Fraser
- Frelinghuysen
- Frenzel

- Gialmo
- Gilman
- Grasso
- Gray
- Green, Pa.
- Griffiths
- Gude
- Guy
- Hamilton
- Hanley
- Hansen, Idaho
- Harrington
- Harvey
- Heckler, Mass.
- Helms
- Helstoski
- Hillis
- Hogan
- Hoffield
- Holtzman
- Horton
- Hosmer
- Howard
- Johnson, Calif.
- Johnson, Pa.
- Jones, Ala.
- Karsh
- Keating
- Kemp
- Kluczynski
- Koch
- Kyros
- Leggett
- Lehman
- Lent
- Long, Md.
- McClary
- McCloskey
- McDade
- McEwen
- McFall
- McKay
- McKinney
- Madigan
- Mahon
- Mailliard
- Mallory
- Mann
- Mathias, Calif.
- Matsunaga
- Mayne
- Meeds
- Metcalf
- Mezvinsky
- Minish
- Mink
- Mitchell, Md.
- Mitchell, N.Y.
- Moakley
- Mollohan
- Moorhead, Pa.
- Morgan
- Mosher
- Moss
- Murphy, Ill.
- Murphy, N.Y.
- Natcher
- Nedzi
- Nix
- O'Brien
- O'Hara
- O'Neill
- Patman

NAYS—193

- Abdnor
- Adams
- Andrews, N.C.
- Andrews, N. Dak.
- Archer
- Ashbrook
- Bafalis
- Baker

- Bauman
- Beard
- Bennett
- Bevill
- Bowen
- Bray
- Breaux
- Brinkley
- Brown, Ohio
- Broyhill, N.C.
- Broyhill, Va.
- Burgener
- Burke, Fla.
- Burleson, Tex.
- Burlison, Mo.
- Butler
- Byron
- Camp

- Carter
- Casey, Tex.
- Chappell
- Chisholm
- Clancy
- Clausen, Don H.
- Cleveland
- Cochran
- Collier
- Collins, Tex.
- Conlan
- Conyers
- Crane
- Daniel, Dan
- Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
- Davis, Ga.
- Davis, Wis.
- de la Garza
- Dellums
- Denholm
- Dennis
- Dent
- Devine
- Dickinson
- Dorn
- Dulski
- Duncan
- Edwards, Ala.
- Eshleman
- Evans, Colo.
- Evins, Tenn.
- Fisher
- Flowers
- Flynt
- Fountain
- Frey
- Froehlich
- Fulton
- Fuqua
- Gaydos
- Gettys
- Gibbons
- Ginn
- Goldwater
- Goodling
- Green, Oreg.
- Gross
- Grover
- Haley
- Hammer
- Schmidt
- Hanrahan
- Harsha
- Hastings
- Hays
- Hechler, W. Va.
- Henderson
- Hicks
- Hinshaw
- Holt
- Huber
- Hudnut
- Hungate
- Hunt
- Hutchinson
- Ichord
- Jarman
- Johnson, Colo.
- Jones, N.C.
- Jones, Okla.
- Jones, Tenn.
- Kastenmeier
- King
- Ketchum
- King
- Landgrebe
- Landrum
- Latta
- Litton
- Long, La.
- Lott
- Lujan
- McCollister
- McCormack
- Maraziti
- Martin, Nbr.
- Martin, N.C.
- Mathis, Ga.
- Mazouzi
- Melcher
- Milford
- Miller
- Minshall, Ohio
- Mizell
- Montgomery
- Moorhead, Calif.
- Myers
- Neisen
- Nichols
- Obey
- Owens
- Parris
- Passman
- Ferkins
- Pettis
- Pickie
- Pike
- Poage
- Powell, Ohio
- Price, Tex.
- Quillen
- Randall
- Rarick

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gonzalez

NOT VOTING—29

- Bergland
- Blackburn
- Burke, Calif.
- Clawson, Del
- Diggs
- Downing
- Edwards, Calif.
- Ford, Gerald R.
- Gubser
- Gunter
- Hanna
- Hansen, Wash.
- Hawkins
- Hébert
- Jordan
- Kuykendall
- McSpadden
- Macdonald
- Madden
- Michel

- Mills, Ark.
- Reid
- Rooney, N.Y.
- Spence
- Stokes
- Van Deerlin
- Waldie
- Walsh
- Young, Ga.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

- On this vote:
 - Mr. Gubser for, with Mr. Michel against.
 - Mr. Walsh for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.
 - Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Spence against.

- Until further notice:
 - Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Madden.
 - Mr. Reid with Mr. Gunter.
 - Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Young of Georgia.
 - Mr. Downing with Mr. Waldie.
 - Mr. Hébert with Mr. Hawkins.
 - Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Blackburn.
 - Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Stokes.
 - Mr. Edwards of California with Miss Jordan.
 - Mr. Diggs with Mr. Hanna.
 - Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Bergland.
 - Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Macdonald.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 11459, APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 11459, making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 93-693)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11459) "making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 5, and 6.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7 and 8, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$247,277,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1 and 2.

- ROBERT SIKES,
- EDWARD J. PATTEN,
- DAVID OBEY,
- GUNN MCKAY,
- GEORGE MAHON,
- BURT L. TALCOTT,
- ROBERT C. MCEWEN,
- ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,
- Managers on the Part of the House.
- MIKE MANSFIELD,
- JOHN MCCLELLAN,
- WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
- JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
- ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
- STUART SYMINGTON,
- HOWARD W. CANNON,
- RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
- MILTON R. YOUNG,
- CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS,
- HENRY BELLMON,
- JOHN TOWER,
- Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11459) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1, military construction, Army: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment to appropriate \$578,120,000 instead of \$551,575,000 as proposed by the House and \$567,735,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

This would provide the following changes to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

Fort Polk, La.: Commissary	+ \$1,977,000
Tobytanna Army Depot, Pa.: Medical equipment maintenance facility	+411,000
U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.: Hospital	+20,000,000
U.S. Army Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory, New Hampshire: Logistics and storage facility	+597,000
Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, N.J.: Administrative facilities	+1,800,000
Electric substation	+400,000
Pueblo Army Depot, Colo.: Stack emission controls	+395,000
Access roads	+2,000,000
Fort McClellan, Ala.: Housing and training facility/WAC Band	-1,035,000

After prolonged discussion, the House conferees agreed to appropriate \$20,000,000 for medical facilities at the Military Academy, West Point, New York. The Senate conferees insisted on providing this appropriation in the fiscal year 1974. They felt that having the funds available would allow the Army to proceed as quickly as possible with hospital construction so as to avoid increased costs due to inflation in the construction industry in this area.

The conferees are in agreement that the Army's original plan to build a 100-bed regional hospital at West Point at a cost of \$25,000,000 was unrealistic, is in excess of the medical workload experienced and projected for West Point, and is overly expensive. The conferees of both Houses are in agreement that hospital facilities at West Point in no event shall exceed the \$20,000,000 appropriated and that the hospital shall be a 65-bed hospital. It is strongly suggested that the Army provide a sufficient contingency factor in its estimates in order to avoid contract cancellation should the cost exceed \$20,000,000. The conferees are in agreement that the function to which the hospital should be specifically designed is to provide excellent medical care to cadets and to active duty military personnel stationed at the Military Academy. They further agree that the Army should restudy the location, configuration, scope, utilization, and cost of the proposed hospital facility so as to provide for the above-cited functions in the optimum and least costly manner. The conferees direct the Army to report back to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives when it has completed its studies and plans for medical fa-

cilities at West Point. No funds will be obligated for construction and no construction contract advertised or awarded for medical facilities at the Military Academy until approval of the Army's plans and specific authority to proceed with construction have been provided in writing from the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The House conferees were not satisfied that the Army's plans for the construction of the hospital at the proposed location near Washington Gate, approximately 1.6 miles from the cadet area, would provide adequately for cadet medical care without some further provision for dispensary "sick call" or light bed care facilities for the cadets. The House conferees would be extremely concerned with any plan which would make cadet care more inconvenient or less adequate than that provided by the present hospital. The House conferees expect the Army to thoroughly examine this problem as a part of its studies and planning for the provision of medical facilities. The House conferees will not approve a hospital plan which does not take adequate account of these needs. Furthermore, the Army should program any required cadet dispensary facilities or other facilities required to provide medical care to cadets within the \$20,000,000 allowance provided in this bill.

For the NATO infrastructure program the conferees restored \$20,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees feel that, commencing with the next five-year (1975-1979) NATO common infrastructure program (Slices XXVI-XXX), the effective United States contribution to the NATO common infrastructure should be at a maximum 20%. This goal could be obtained by either a 20% share of a normal NATO infrastructure program or by a combination of a normal NATO infrastructure program and a new European defense improvement program financed entirely by European nations. The conferees further give notice that in the future they will look unfavorably upon requests which would fund a United States payment to the program at an effective rate above 20% for Slice XXVI and subsequent slices.

Amendment No. 2, military construction, Navy: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment to appropriate \$609,292,000 instead of \$587,641,000 as proposed by the House and \$608,467,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

This would provide the following changes to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

Naval Underwater Systems Center, New London Laboratory, New London, Conn.: Engineering building	+ \$3,600,000
Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, N.J.: Military Sealift Command, Atlantic relocation	+1,806,000
Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.: Maury Hall rehabilitation	+300,000
Naval Supply Corps School, Athens, Ga.: Restoration of commissary store	+120,000
Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii: Enlisted men's dining facility	+1,345,000
Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range, Puerto Rico (Sec. 204)	+12,000,000
Naval Complex, Guam: Naval Station theater	+1,480,000
Access roads	+1,000,000

The conferees have not allowed additional appropriations for \$3,400,000 authorized to

cover the cost of acquisition of leasehold interests situated on land acquired by the Navy under authority provided in fiscal year 1972 at Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia. Under the provisions of the fiscal 1972 legislation, authority exists and monies are available to take seven leaseholds which the Navy claims are required in the near future for Navy military construction projects at this installation. Additionally, nonappropriated funds can be made available to take a leasehold required to allow the construction of an Exchange warehouse at this location. The conferees feel that the acquisition of these leaseholds in this manner represents a prudent approach and that additional funding is not required at this time.

The conferees deferred without prejudice a communications facility at the Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, pending a restudy by the Navy of the manner in which this improvement in communications should be accomplished.

An agreement has been reached by the joint committee of conference that \$12,000,000 will be added to finance the movement of the ship-to-shore and other gun fire and bombing operations of the United States Navy from the island of Culebra.

The relocation of such operations from the northwest peninsula of the island of Culebra is expressly conditioned upon the conclusion of a satisfactory agreement to be negotiated by the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, with the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Subsequent to the conclusion of such agreement, the Secretary of Defense shall report the terms of the agreement to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Prior to the obligation of any of the funds appropriated in this Act for the construction and equipage of substitute facilities in support of the relocations of the above-mentioned activities from Culebra, the Secretary of Defense shall request, in writing, the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The conferees are in agreement that within 30 days of the receipt of both the information and the request referred to in the two preceding sentences of this report their respective Committees will approve or disapprove the Secretary's request. The agreement shall provide, among other things, that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall insure that (1) Commonwealth lands suitable for carrying out operations of the type referred to above will be made available for the continued use of the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range and Fleet Marine Forces training areas by the Navy, including, but not limited to, present areas and facilities on the island of Vieques, and (2) any proposed facility of activity which would interfere with the Navy training mission will not be undertaken, including the proposed deep water super-port on the island of Mona, in the event that such agreement includes the use by the Navy of such island or the area adjacent to such island.

The present bombardment area on the island of Culebra shall not be utilized for any purpose that would require decontamination at the expense of the United States. Any lands sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of by the United States as a result of the relocation of the operations referred to above may be sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of only for public park or public recreational purposes.

At the Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, two projects; namely, the bachelor officers quarters, \$3,258,000, and the bachelor enlisted quarters, \$2,834,000, have been restored to the Navy program. The joint conference agrees, however, that these funds may not be obligated until an agreement has been signed by the United States Government and the Ice-

Icelandic Government setting forth the conditions under which the Navy may continue to use Iceland as an operating base.

The conferees have granted authority to proceed with the projects requested for Naval Detachment, Souda Bay, Crete, Greece and for Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily, Italy. The funding for the following projects, however, is reduced by the amounts shown below to encourage greater use of direct programming through NATO infrastructure slices as explained in the House report:

Naval Detachment, Souda Bay, Crete, Greece:	
Aircraft parking apron-----	\$2,666,000
Air passenger/cargo terminal--	277,000
General warehouse-----	265,000
Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily, Italy:	
Photographic building-----	164,000

The conferees have provided \$4,000,000 over the amount budgeted for the Navy's planning and design account. This will not increase new budget authority, however, as these funds are provided by reprogramming from savings or cancellation of other projects which are not needed.

Amendment No. 3, military construction, Air Force: Appropriates \$247,277,000 instead of \$239,702,000 as proposed by the House and \$261,198,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have agreed to the following additions and deletions to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio: Alter aircraft engine component research facility-----	+ \$1,887,000
Satellite Control Facility, Kodiak, Alaska: Automotive maintenance facility-----	+462,000
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont.: Dormitory facilities--	+213,000
Bergstrom Air Force Base, Tex.: Commissary-----	+2,273,000
Nellis Air Force Base, Nev.: Base personnel office-----	+1,933,000
United States Air Forces in Europe, Germany: Deficiency authorization funding-----	+307,000
Access roads-----	+2,000,000
Grisson Air Force Base, Ind.: Alter airmen dormitories----	-1,500,000

The conferees have deferred the request for \$13,500,000 for special aircraft support facilities at Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland. Further development of the concept for the use of these Boeing 747 National Emergency Airborne Command Post aircraft is required, as is satisfactory development of the command-control communications package for these aircraft and electromagnetic pulse testing of the aircraft and communications systems.

Approval has been given for the funding of three Air Force projects at the Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland; namely, an aircraft maintenance shop, \$222,000; a weapons release systems shop, \$594,000; and a parachute and dinghy shop, \$539,000. The committee of conference states that these projects may not be placed under contract until a Status of Forces Agreement has been reached between the United States and the Icelandic Government.

The conferees have restored a portion of the House cut which was applied to the funding of a deficiency authorization for projects in Germany for United States Air Forces in Europe. The conferees agree to restore \$307,000 for additional costs of constructing an aircraft maintenance complex at Ramstein Air Base, while approving authority but not additional funding for an air freight terminal at the same location. This is consistent with action on the fiscal year 1973 appropriation which allowed authority but no funding for this project to encourage the programming of such projects through NATO infrastructure slices.

Amendments No. 4 and 5, military construction, Defense Agencies: Provide no appropriation as proposed by the House instead of appropriating \$12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agreed to provide no new budget authority for military construction, Defense Agencies as provided in the House bill; however, the conferees restored authority to construct a logistics support facility for the National Security Agency (NSA) at Fort Meade, Maryland, which is to cost \$3,529,000.

The House receded from its action deleting this project as the result of changes of plans by NSA which would increase its utilization and of better information on cost savings. This project, along with other projects approved for the Defense Agencies, is to be funded by the transfer of unobligated balances contained in the Defense contingency fund, which is also carried under this appropriation.

Amendment No. 6, military construction, Naval Reserve: Appropriates \$22,900,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$20,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The committee of conference approves the \$2,600,000 requested by the Navy for rehabilitation of facilities to accommodate the move of Naval Reserve Headquarters units from Omaha, Nebraska and Glenview, Illinois to New Orleans, Louisiana. However, the conferees are concerned about the escalation of the cost of this project from \$1,500,000, which included approximately \$400,000 in operation and maintenance costs, to the requested \$2,600,000 for military construction. The Navy is directed to provide a detailed explanation of this cost increase to both Committees on Appropriations.

Amendment No. 7, family housing, Defense: Appropriates \$1,188,539,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,194,539,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8, family housing, Defense: Authorizes not to exceed \$97,947,000 for the construction of Navy family housing as proposed by the Senate instead of \$103,947,000 as proposed by the House.

The joint conference has agreed that the 150 units of housing at Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, will not be funded in the amount of \$6,000,000. A further agreement has been made that the Navy may fund these houses through a reprogramming action after a Status of Forces Agreement has been negotiated between the United States and the Icelandic Government if they are still required.

COMMISSARIES

The committee of conference has allowed two of the four commissary facilities which were in disagreement between the two Houses. Commissary facilities were approved at Fort Polk, Louisiana and Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas because of the particular need shown at these installations. The conferees are in agreement that the Department of Defense should take measures to increase the use of commissary surcharge monies or other nonappropriated funds for the construction of commissary facilities or recommend to Congress such changes in legislation as are necessary to effect this. Furthermore, the conferees agree that the Chairmen of the two Committees will write to the Secretary of Defense recommending that he study the use of surcharge funds or other nonappropriated funds to cover the cost of construction of all commissary facilities except those overseas or in isolated locations.

As noted in the House report, commissary operations are funded substantially from appropriated funds. They enjoy numerous advantages which allow them to further reduce their costs below those of commercial counterparts. It is for these reasons that the conferees feel that the use of appropriated funds for commissary construction can be reduced.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1974 recommended by the committee of conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1973 total, the 1974 budget estimate total, and the House and Senate bills follows:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973-----	\$2,323,221,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974-----	2,944,900,000
House bill, fiscal year 1974--	2,609,090,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1974--	2,670,972,000
Conference agreement-----	2,658,861,000
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973-----	+335,640,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974-----	-286,039,000
House bill, fiscal year 1974	+49,771,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1974-----	-12,111,000

¹ Includes H. Doc. 93-155 request for \$7,000,000 for Homeowners assistance fund, Defense; excludes H. Doc. 93-155 requests for an additional \$4,300,000 for Military construction, Army and an additional \$31,000,000 for Family housing, Defense, which were not considered due to lack of authorization.

ROBERT SIKES,
EDWARD J. PATTEN,
DAVID OBEY,
GUNN MCKAY,
GEORGE MAHON,
BURT L. TALCOTT,
ROBERT C. MC EWEN,
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,
Managers on the Part of the House.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
JOSEPH M. MONTROYA,
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
STUART SYMINGTON,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS,
HENRY BELLMON,
JOHN TOWER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the Foreign Assistance and related programs appropriation bill for fiscal year 1974.

Mr. SHRIVER reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

OFFSHORE SHRIMP FISHERIES ACT OF 1973

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8529) to implement the shrimp fishing agreement with Brazil, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROHIBITION ON THE IMPORTATION OF RHODESIAN CHROME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A bill (S. 1868) to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome and to restore the United States to its position as a law-abiding member of the international community.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1974—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on H.R. 11459, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT). The report will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11459) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by all the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Dec. 4, 1973, at page H10554.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the conference committee agreed on an overall figure of \$2,658,861,000 for military construction for fiscal year 1974. This is an amount of \$49,771,000 over the amount approved by the House, \$12,000,000 under the amount approved by the Senate, and \$286,039,000 under the budget estimate of \$2,944,900,000. The conferees agreed on the following amounts for the military services and the Department of Defense:

- Army, \$578,120,000;
- Navy, \$609,292,000;
- Air Force, \$247,277,000;
- Army Reserve, \$40,700,000;
- Naval Reserve, \$22,900,000;
- Air Force Reserve, \$10,000,000;
- Army National Guard, \$35,200,000;
- Air National Guard, \$20,000,000;
- Family housing, Department of Defense, \$1,188,539,000; and
- Homeowners assistance fund, \$7,000,000.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that the military construction bill this year is, indeed, an austere bill. The percentage of reduction from the budget estimate amounts to approximately 10 percent. However, I wish to point out that this bill provides for all the essential operating facilities needed by the military services and I wish to state categorically that there are no moneys in this bill for plush accommodations for the military services.

I do not intend to make a long and involved statement of the actions taken by the committee of conference. The conference report explains in a most succinct manner the complete actions.

Mr. President, this completes my statement. I believe that the conference committee has presented for the Senate's consideration a military construction bill that fits the stringent financial conditions in which this Government finds itself. I will be glad to answer any questions which individual Senators may have regarding construction projects in their States.

I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of my remarks on this bill, a tabulation comprising a summary of the conference action on the military construction appropriation bill for fiscal year 1974 be included in the RECORD.

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

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1973 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1974

Item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended by conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill
Military construction, Army	413,955,000	664,900,000	551,575,000	567,735,000	\$578,120,000	+\$164,165,000	-\$86,780,000	+\$26,545,000	+\$10,385,000
Military construction, Navy	517,830,000	685,400,000	587,641,000	608,467,000	609,292,000	+91,462,000	-76,108,000	+21,651,000	+4,825,000
Military construction, Air Force	265,552,000	291,900,000	239,702,000	261,198,000	247,277,000	-18,275,000	-44,623,000	+7,575,000	-13,921,000
Military construction, Defense Agencies	36,704,000	19,100,000	0	12,000,000	0	-36,704,000	-19,100,000	0	-12,000,000
Transfer, not to exceed	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	0	0	0	0
Military construction, Army National Guard	40,000,000	35,200,000	35,200,000	35,200,000	35,200,000	-4,800,000	0	0	0
Military construction, Air National Guard	16,100,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	+3,900,000	0	0	0
Military construction, Army Reserve	38,200,000	40,700,000	40,700,000	40,700,000	40,700,000	+2,500,000	0	0	0
Military construction, Naval Reserve	0	20,500,000	20,500,000	20,300,000	22,900,000	+2,400,000	+2,600,000	0	+2,600,000
Military construction, Air Force Reserve	7,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+3,000,000	0	0	0
Total, military construction	1,355,841,000	1,787,500,000	1,507,718,000	1,575,600,000	1,563,489,000	+207,648,000	-224,001,000	+55,771,000	-12,111,000
Family housing, defense	1,064,046,000	1,250,567,000	1,194,539,000	1,188,539,000	1,188,539,000	+124,493,000	-62,028,000	-6,000,000	0
Portion applied to debt reduction	-96,666,000	-100,167,000	-100,167,000	-100,167,000	-100,167,000	-3,501,000	0	0	0
Subtotal, family housing	967,380,000	1,150,400,000	1,094,372,000	1,088,372,000	1,088,372,000	+120,992,000	-62,028,000	-6,000,000	0
Homeowners assistance fund, defense	0	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	+7,000,000	0	0	0
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority	2,323,221,000	2,944,900,000	2,609,090,000	2,670,972,000	2,658,861,000	+335,640,000	-286,039,000	+49,771,000	-12,111,000

¹ Due to lack of authorization, does not include additional \$4,300,000 requested in House Document 93-155.

³ Includes \$7,000,000 requested in House Document 93-155.

² Due to lack of authorization, does not include additional \$31,100,000 requested in House Document 93-155.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the Senate is fortunate in having the distinguished majority leader as chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction. I think all the essential needs of the military were taken care of under the bill, and with a minimum amount of money and at a cost savings.

Mr. President, I hope the conference report will be agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I join the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee in his remarks

and I wish to say that as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee I concur strongly with the distinguished majority leader as well as the ranking minority member of my committee in saying this is a good bill, passed with a lot of give and take on both the House and the Senate positions. I strongly support it.

I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that this bill reflects the em-

phasis of Congress on personnel support assistance for the armed services. At a time when we are trying to attract an all-volunteer armed force in this country, it is incumbent upon us to do all we can to make living conditions as pleasant and safe as possible for our men and women in uniform.

I wish to point out that a large percentage of the money contained in the appropriation is for barracks, medical facilities, commissaries, and other things

designed to make service life more comfortable and attractive.

PROGRAM FOR TODAY

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to ask the schedule for the remainder of the day.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after this we will take up three unobjected-to items on the calendar and then go back to the unfinished business, the so-called Rhodesian chrome bill, at which time a motion for cloture will be laid before the Senate which will make the measure eligible to be considered Tuesday 1 hour after the Senate convenes.

This will be the last vote today.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1973

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Monday it is expected that we will take up S. 2176, the bill to provide for a national fuels and energy conservation policy, and S. 2686, legal services for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

On Tuesday the Senate will consider S. 2767, the rail service bill, and H.R. 8449, the national flood insurance program. The vote on cloture will occur on Tuesday.

On Wednesday we will consider the measure relating to the independent Special Prosecutor, unless there is some chance we can get it up on Monday, which we are endeavoring to do at this time. If the Senate will allow the leadership a little flexibility, we will do our best in that regard and give Senators the picture.

We hope that the Committee on Appropriations will be able to report the defense appropriations bill around Tuesday and with the consent of the Senate we could take that up on Thursday and Friday. It will consume 2 days.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I cannot speak for the chairman of the committee, but I think the supplemental will be ready ahead of the defense appropriation bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We will take them in order. I hope the Senate will not hold the leadership to the 3-day rule. We are trying to get out 2 weeks from today or tomorrow, at the latest.

As the Senator has indicated the supplemental bill will be reported this week. The defense appropriation bill will be reported this week. The foreign aid authorization should be reported this week, followed by the foreign aid appropri-

tion bill. I do not know what is going to happen to the District of Columbia home rule or conference bill, which was agreed to some days ago but has to be considered in the House.

That is as far as I can go at this time.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1973—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on H.R. 11459, making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the adoption of the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. NUNN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. NUNN), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) is absent because of illness in his family.

If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 0, as follows:

Abourezk	Fong	Muskie
Aiken	Gravel	Nelson
Allen	Griffin	Pastore
Baker	Hansen	Pearson
Bartlett	Hart	Percy
Bayh	Haskell	Proxmire
Beall	Hathaway	Randolph
Bible	Helms	Ribicoff
Biden	Hollings	Roth
Brock	Hruska	Schweiker
Brooke	Huddleston	Scott, Hugh
Buckley	Hughes	Scott,
Burdick	Humphrey	William L.
Byrd,	Inouye	Sparkman
Harry F., Jr.	Jackson	Stafford
Byrd, Robert C.	Javits	Stennis
Cannon	Kennedy	Stevens
Case	Long	Stevenson
Chiles	Magnuson	Taft
Church	Mansfield	Talmadge
Clark	Mathias	Thurmond
Cranston	McClellan	Tower
Curtis	McClure	Tunney
Dole	McGee	Weicker
Domenici	McGovern	Williams
Dominick	McIntyre	Young
Eagleton	Mondale	
Fannin	Montoya	

[No. 565 Leg.]
YEAS—80

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—20

Bellmon	Fulbright	Moss
Bennett	Goldwater	Nunn
Bentsen	Gurney	Packwood
Cook	Hartke	Pell
Cotton	Hatfield	Saxbe
Eastland	Johnston	Symington
Ervin	Metcalfe	

So the report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT). The clerk will state the amendments in disagreement.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$578,120,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$609,292,000".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 1 and 2.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Mr. President, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I intend to vote against concurrence in the amendments. I would like to ask the manager of the conference report some questions.

Mr. President, one of the items in disagreement is amendment No. 1. Members can see this on page 3 of the explanatory statement of the conferees. It shows a figure in the House amendment which relates to the military ocean terminal at Bayonne, N.J. The amount involved will be noted as something in the neighborhood of \$2.2 million.

This facility is located at Brooklyn, N.Y., at the present time. There has been a constant running back between the two Houses as well as the military authorities

and the State and the city relating to the movement of this facility in the sense of substantiation as to why it should be moved and why money should be provided to move it.

It has been stalemated for a considerable period of time. My colleague, the junior Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY) and I are strongly opposed to the proposition on the ground that no adequate showing has been made of the need or desirability.

This was fought for very strongly in the conference by Representative ROONEY of New York, and obviously without success notwithstanding his strong feeling on the matter and the fact that he is an important member of the Appropriations Committee in the other body.

Mr. President, another thing is important in this matter. I understand, and I have no reason to doubt the statement that has been made to me, that the money which involves a certain amount of loss of employment. I understand that this particular area has also lost a very considerable amount of money. In the Brooklyn Navy Yard an enormous amount of labor has been lost, as well as important credit to try to substitute some employment for the thousands of jobs lost when the navy yard was shut down.

Here again quite a fair number of jobs are involved, I understand something in the area of hundreds, without hopes as far as I can see that we can get approval of this amendment that is in technical disagreement, without any provision as to how this transition is to be made with some decent accommodation to the place where it is now and the loss to that place.

I would like to ask the manager of the conference report if he would tell us exactly what dictated this policy which is reflected by this particular appropriation and what consideration, if any, has been given to the need of this local area for some transition in respect of the facility which is in question here.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished senior Senator from New York, might I say that this is a matter which has been before the committee for the last 4 years and that during that period of time despite the fact that the Brooklyn Army Terminal has been closed, there was a certain amount of transiency in the process.

This project is required to provide administrative space for relocation of Headquarters, Eastern Area, Military Transportation Management and Terminal Service from Military Ocean Terminal, Brooklyn, N.Y. Brooklyn is in excess to DOD requirements and is only partially utilized by DOD activities for administrative functions. The current annual cost of operation and maintenance of facilities under the present austere basis exceeds \$1.8 million. If the DOD activities remain at Brooklyn, major rehabilitation of the utilities systems must be accomplished. Numerous power outages and waterline breaks have disrupted operations repeatedly. Consolidation of the activities in existing facilities at Bayonne will permit savings by reduction in civilian and military manpower spaces,

equipment rental costs, and maintenance costs for unoccupied facilities.

This project—electric substation—is related to request for administrative facilities for Bayonne MOT, also requested in the fiscal year 1974 program. The project provides a new 3,000 KVA substation to provide additional electrical capacity at Bayonne MOT. The work is necessary to improve the reliability of the present system to meet the additional load generated by new tenants, that is, the Headquarters Eastern Area, Military Transportation Management and Terminal Service. This organization is scheduled to relocate to Bayonne from Brooklyn MOT and will occupy the requested administrative facilities.

It is my further understanding, subject to correction, that some of the employees from Brooklyn have been transferred to Bayonne, N.J.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, would the Senator be able to inform us whether the amount of savings contemplated are equal to or exceed the expense, which is not inconsiderable? There is \$2.2 million appropriated here alone for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The answer is in the affirmative.

Mr. JAVITS. May I also ask the Senator what assurance he can give us, as the city of New York is doing its best to fill up the gap—our experience is that not many employees, though I am sure some, transfer to another location—can the Senator give us any assurance that we will get some help from the committee or the department, so that a decent opportunity is provided to enable the transition to be made and enable the city of New York to find some other way to deal with the gap in employment which will be created?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; to a degree. I understand the Post Office Department has taken over half of the facility, and that some of the people from the Army terminal have gone into the postal facility, plus the fact that additional employees are needed. So I think that Brooklyn will be more than compensated as far as employment is concerned, on the basis of the post office moving in.

Mr. JAVITS. And could we have some assurance that if additional time is needed, we will have sympathetic consideration, at least from the committee which is sponsoring this measure, to help us to get it if we have a good case for it?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The committee will give most sympathetic consideration to any request of the two Senators from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me briefly?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it on the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, it is not.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator is not asking the majority leader to yield on this measure, I, too, have small matter which we wanted to take up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to concur in the House amendments to the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from New York and then to the Senator from Minnesota.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Senator CRANSTON, Senator MONDALE, and I were not in the Chamber because we were all engaged in a conference on manpower when the program was discussed, and one of the bills which the majority leader said he would put on for Monday was S. 2686, legal services.

We were not, because of our necessary preoccupation, privileged to participate in that discussion, and we would greatly appreciate it—I think I speak for my colleagues as well as myself—if the majority leader could, so that we might understand the situation, state whatever he informed the Senate about that particular bill, so that we might have our input into that situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, let me repeat what I said to the Senate in response to a question raised by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) as to what the program would be for the remainder of the day, next week, and insofar as the rest of the session is concerned.

Tentatively—and some flexibility has to be allowed—on Monday the program will be S. 2176, national emergency policy, and S. 2688, legal services, OEO.

Tuesday, S. 2707, rail services; H.R. 8449, national flood insurance; and a vote on a cloture motion which I shall file shortly.

On Wednesday, there is the Special Prosecutor's measure.

Thursday and Friday, supplemental and Defense appropriation bills, and in the meantime we should have an authorization bill, or rather during the next week or shortly thereafter, on foreign aid out of the Foreign Relations Committee; and a foreign aid appropriation bill which is awaiting the disposition of the authorization proposal.

Then it is my understanding that some days ago agreement was reached on the D.C. home rule bill. What action will I do not know, but action will be taken in the House of Representatives first.

What the leadership is endeavoring to do is to bring about an adjournment either 2 weeks from today or 2 weeks from tomorrow if at all possible.

That may well mean late sessions next week. I think we ought to conclude our work as soon as possible. Then we shall take a well-deserved rest, but on the basis of being subject to call at any time for emergencies with respect to energy, the Middle East, and so forth.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD, I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. This bill—the legal services bill, to which I refer—has been very much debated and very deeply considered, and has finally resulted in an understanding with the White House—a very unusual way. The understanding was in the form of a letter that, so far as the Senate bill was concerned, no effort

would be made to frustrate it, but that the Senate bill would then be enabled to go to conference with some degree of celerity. In the conference, of course, the administration reserved every right to do what it could to get a bill. With that, we had a clear track ahead.

With the number of associations very strongly in back of the bill with which we were presented, we had hoped to get action. But I think we have made it clear, and wish to make it clear again, that if any effort is made to filibuster the matter, we are perfectly willing to face the issue of cloture at a very early time. This is not one of those bills as to which people need to be educated, particularly. This bill has been gone through from end to end and has been most thoroughly considered by all kinds of experts.

So I would appeal to the majority leader that this matter, at the very least, be put on a second track on Monday, and we will do our part by assuring the majority leader that we are ready to face the issue at any moment that he or the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD) feels it is appropriate to consider the matter. I can assure the Senator that the bill can well be in conference, on a second track basis, at the end of next week.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New York. We have been working, together with the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), for a long time, first to work out a bill that was acceptable to the administration, a bill that would not be vetoed, and then to get it before the Senate. I think it is very important to get it there soon.

I am delighted that the majority leader has agreed to do everything he can to bring it before this body on Monday.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I should like to have an understanding of what the Senator from New York was saying. As I understand, it was his judgment, however sincere he may have been—although I do not agree with him—that this matter should be given short shrift.

Mr. JAVITS. Not at all.

Mr. HELMS. At what point would the Senator apply cloture?

Mr. JAVITS. We cannot apply cloture without a vote of two-thirds of the Senate.

Mr. HELMS. I understand.

Mr. JAVITS. But it is our contention that this particular bill, this broad plan for a legal services corporation, has been so thoroughly debated and considered here, in committee, and by experts outside the Senate that we believe that within a matter of days, giving second-track attention to this matter, keeping in mind that we shall probably be sitting until late hours next week, that whenever the leadership calls up the bill, we could, in good faith, seek cloture.

Mr. HELMS. I will simply say to my good friend, whom I admire and respect, that I personally think this matter deserves a great deal of discussion, notwithstanding those who think a bill approaching perfection has been agreed upon. I would hope that nothing sum-

mary would be done to shut off debate on this matter, because there are those of us who do feel very strongly about it.

Mr. JAVITS. I will, myself, be the first to assess the good faith of those who oppose the bill. But we will have to, just as the Senator from North Carolina will have to, if the Senator is going to decide that he wants to debate it and Senators in opposition will want to debate it—we will have to decide when to test the Senate as to whether the Senate thinks the bill has been debated long enough. If we are wrong, we will be penalized and will lose. We have just as much risk as does the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. I appreciate the Senator's remarks. I just did not want to labor under a misapprehension that a warning was being sounded to those of us who disagree that cloture was forthcoming immediately because I do feel that this measure deserves great consideration and debate.

Mr. JAVITS. Senator HELMS, we are too adult and we have too much respect for this body and our colleagues to make any threats or to issue any warnings around here.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY).

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which the clerk will state.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I first ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 579, 580, and 581.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. CAPITOL HISTORICAL SOCIETY STUDY

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 169), to provide for a feasibility study and to accept a gift from the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, which has been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 2, in line 20, after "Representatives" strike out "and to the majority and minority leaders of the Senate" and insert in lieu thereof and to the United States Senate Commission on Art and Antiquities," so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States Capitol Historical Society is authorized, under direction of the Architect of the Capitol, to prepare a feasibility study to determine the desirability of installing within the United States Capitol Grounds, at the east front of the United States Capitol, all items of equipment and other facilities required for a sound and light performance, consisting of an interplay of light, music, narrative, and sound effects (without the use of live actors), which, when projected onto the imposing facade of the east front of the

United States Capitol, will re-create the evolution of American history, based on a foundation of thorough historical research, subject to the following conditions:

(1) Such study and all expenditures connected therewith will be borne by the United States Capitol Historical Society.

(2) Upon completion of such study, the United States Capitol Historical Society, at its expense, will furnish the Architect of the Capitol a report detailing the results of such study, installations, and programs proposed, and estimates of cost required to implement such project without expense to the United States, including maintenance and operating expenses.

(3) The project may not be implemented, beyond the report stage, except as provided in section 2 hereof.

Sec. 2. The Architect of the Capitol shall review such report and submit the same, with his recommendations, to the Speaker and majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives and to the United States Senate Commission on Art and Antiquities.

If the project, as presented, with or without modifications, meets with the approval of such House and Senate officials, the Architect of the Capitol, notwithstanding any other provision of law, is authorized after such approval—

(1) To accept, in the name of the United States from the United States Capitol Historical Society, as a gift, such sum or sums as may be required to further implement such project, and such sum or sums when received, shall be credited as an addition to the appropriation account "Capitol Buildings, Architect of the Capitol".

(2) Subject to section 3 hereof, to expend such sum or sums for all items of equipment and other facilities required for the sound and light performance, and for any other items in connection therewith.

Sec. 3. The Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the House and Senate officials designated in section 2 hereof, is authorized to enter into contracts and to incur such other obligations and make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of said section 2.

Sec. 4. Sums received under this joint resolution, when credited as an addition to the appropriation account "Capitol Buildings, Architect of the Capitol", shall be available until expended. Following completion of the installation, such sums may thereafter be used by the Architect of the Capitol, in whole or part, to defray any expenses which he may incur for maintenance and operation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Public Works Committee be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 766, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 736), to provide for a feasibility study and to accept a gift from the United States Capitol Historical Society.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to strike all after the resolving clause and insert the text of Senate Joint Resolution 169 as reported with amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the joint resolution.

Office of Attorney General are those which were in effect on January 1, 1969."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reports indicate that the Soviet Government is continuing to arrest and imprison its citizens on trumped-up charges. Of particular concern is the imprisonment of 43 Jewish "prisoners of conscience" who have been completely cut off from their families and the outside world.

The Soviet Government and the Red Crescent, the Soviets' counterpart to the Red Cross, have not responded to pleas made by the American National Red Cross and the International Committee of the Red Cross at Geneva urging humanitarian treatment for these prisoners.

A different result might be forthcoming if Members of Congress voice their concern and join in the effort to persuade the Soviet Union to permit the flow of clothing and food and mail to Jewish prisoners in labor camps. We have seen in the past that the force of world public opinion can have an effect on the internal policies of the Soviet Union.

On Tuesday, I joined with Congressman FEYSER in circulating a "Dear Colleague" letter asking all Members of the House to write to officials of the Red Crescent and the International Red Cross in Geneva, urging relaxation of Soviet restrictions on incoming packages to Jewish prisoners during the Hanukkah-Christmas season. We seek information on the prisoners and assurances that mail and prayer books and other religious articles will be allowed to reach the prisoners. This is a modest request, but powerful, if it comes from Members of Congress.

A strong congressional initiative can make a difference and will result in improved conditions for these prisoners.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 11459, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1974

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11459) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 4, 1973.)

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given per-

mission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the conference action on the military construction appropriations bill which is before us represents both a prudent and an economical resolution of the many items under consideration in the military construction request for fiscal year 1974. The amount of the conference agreement, \$2,658,861,000 in new budget authority, represents a reduction of \$286,039,000 from the budget request which the Appropriations Committees considered for fiscal year 1974. This is a reduction of nearly 10 percent, and few appropriations bills will come to the House with comparable reductions or with any meaningful reduction. The conference agreement represents by far the greatest percentage reduction in any appropriations bill thus far passed by the House or approved by Congress for the fiscal year 1974.

The military construction appropriations bill is small, both with regard to other Defense appropriations and in relation to the objectives which it should accomplish. This bill provides for construction of facilities for the Army, Navy, Air Force, the Defense agencies, and the Reserve forces. The total provided for these essential programs is \$1,563,489,000. The estimated deficit for these programs is \$23.2 billion if all needed work were to be performed. The conference agreement carries \$1,088,372,000 in new budget authority to provide the total cost for the construction, operation, and maintenance of military family housing both in the United States and overseas. There are 10,541 new units provided, whereas the estimated backlog of needed housing units is on the order of 212,000. Finally, the bill funds the homeowners assistance program which guards against excessive losses to Defense employees as a result of decreased values of their homes affected by base closures and reductions.

In other words, the program recommended in this bill is a modest program. Yet I hope that we have provided in this conference agreement an amount which balances our immediate needs in this area against the need to make savings which are possible.

The major increases over the amounts allowed by the House are \$20,000,000 for a hospital at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y., which had been deleted by the House and \$12 million to provide for the relocation of portions of the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range from the island of Culebra in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The latter item was not considered by the House. A Defense Department request went to the Senate after the House had concluded its hearings.

In both of these cases, funds have been approved for fiscal year 1974 along with firm directions to the Department of Defense to plan for these activities in a manner which will insure that they effectively carry out their mission and avoid excessive expenditures by the Treasury. There have been a long series of disappointments with the construction program at the Military Academy. It has been difficult to ascertain the factors

which keep the construction costs high at that location and cause them to increase so rapidly. I do not feel that this is a situation for which the Army is responsible or can control. In any case, a replacement for the current antiquated hospital at West Point is overdue.

When this bill passed the House, it contained none of the \$25 million in funding which the Army had requested for this hospital in fiscal year 1974. It was felt that the facility proposed by the Army was too large and too expensive. Since then the Senate has reduced the scope and the cost to \$20 million. We feel that, with the language contained in our conference report and the apparent willingness of the Army to do a thorough restudy of this project so as to reduce its scope and cost, we will be able to obtain a facility which will do the job required but not be goldplated. Furthermore, by providing the funds in this bill we will be able to avoid further delays which will escalate the cost of medical facilities which are constructed.

There was no request to the House for funding of the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range relocation. This was brought out in the discussion of this project between the Delegate from Puerto Rico (Mr. BENTLEY) and myself at the time this bill passed the House. The Senate added \$12 million at the Navy's request to fund this first portion of the relocation cost. We have included these funds at the urgent request by the Secretary of Defense with the understanding that the Committees on Appropriations will review the agreement between the Navy and the Government of Puerto Rico to insure that adequate range facilities will continue to be provided for our naval forces, that the land to be released will be used only for park purposes, and that decontamination costs will not be borne by the American taxpayer.

These two items account for \$32 million of the \$49,771,000 increase allowed over the House bill by the conference. In addition, there were other significant increases in other areas which account for the remaining \$17,771,000 increase. They include \$5 million for access roads; \$4,250,000 for two commissaries, one at Fort Polk, La., and one at Bergstrom Air Force Base, Tex., which appear to have sufficient need to justify funding at this time; \$4,006,000 for facilities at and relocation of the Military Sealift Command, Atlantic to the Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, N.J., which the services have strongly recommended for years; and \$3,600,000 for an engineering building at the Naval Underwater Systems Center, New London Laboratory, Conn., for important studies in submarine warfare.

I strongly urge the adoption of the conference report and the proposed amendments to the two items which were brought back in technical disagreement.

History has taught again and again that military forces depend on many factors other than numbers of personnel and quantity of materiel. Morale and leadership are essential to military effectiveness. In the dangerous world in

which we live today, we need a fully effective Military Establishment. It has long been recognized that a fully effective Military Establishment includes an adequate base structure with proper housing, proper training facilities, proper research facilities, and proper storage

facilities. We need a base establishment which is compatible with the surroundings and which accepts the responsibilities for maintenance of a wholesome atmosphere with clean air and clean water. All of these we contribute to in this bill. The price is modest in comparison

with the results which we believe will be achieved.

A table showing the comparative statement of new budget—obligational—authority for 1973 and budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 1974:—

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1973 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1974

Item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended by conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill
Military construction, Army.....	413,955,000	664,900,000	551,575,000	567,735,000	\$578,120,000	+\$164,165,000	-\$86,780,000	+\$26,545,000	+\$10,385,000
Military construction, Navy.....	517,830,000	685,400,000	587,641,000	608,467,000	609,292,000	+91,462,000	-76,108,000	+21,651,000	+325,000
Military construction, Air Force.....	265,552,000	291,900,000	239,702,000	261,198,000	247,277,000	-18,275,000	-44,623,000	+7,575,000	-13,921,000
Military construction, Defense Agencies.....	36,704,000	19,100,000	0	12,000,000	0	-36,704,000	-19,100,000		-12,000,000
Transfer, not to exceed.....	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)				
Military construction, Army National Guard.....	40,000,000	35,200,000	35,200,000	35,200,000	35,200,000	-4,800,000			
Military construction, Air National Guard.....	16,100,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	+3,900,000			
Military construction, Army Reserve.....	38,200,000	40,700,000	40,700,000	40,700,000	40,700,000	+2,500,000			
Military construction, Naval Reserve.....	20,500,000	20,300,000	22,900,000	20,300,000	22,900,000	+2,400,000	-2,600,000		+2,600,000
Military construction, Air Force Reserve.....	7,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+3,000,000			
Total, military construction.....	1,355,841,000	1,787,500,000	1,507,718,000	1,575,600,000	1,563,489,000	+207,648,000	-224,001,000	+55,771,000	-12,111,000
Family housing, defense.....	1,064,046,000	1,250,567,000	1,194,539,000	1,188,539,000	1,188,539,000	+124,493,000	-62,028,000	-6,000,000	
Portion applied to debt reduction.....	-95,666,000	-100,167,000	-100,167,000	-100,167,000	-100,167,000	-3,501,000			
Subtotal, family housing.....	967,380,000	1,150,400,000	1,094,372,000	1,088,372,000	1,088,372,000	+120,992,000	-62,028,000	-6,000,000	
Homeowners assistance fund, defense.....		7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	+7,000,000			
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority.....	2,323,221,000	2,944,900,000	2,609,090,000	2,670,972,000	2,658,861,000	+335,640,000	-286,039,000	+49,771,000	-12,111,000

¹ Due to lack of authorization, does not include additional \$4,300,000 requested in H. Doc. 93-155.
² Due to lack of authorization, does not include additional \$31,100,000 requested in H. D. 93-155.

³ Includes \$7,000,000 requested in H. Doc. 93-155.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

(Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. Speaker, I did not sign this conference report. While I expect this report to be approved, I do consider that an explanation of my failure to sign it is in order. I do not expect and I did not expect that one individual's point of view can be determinative of a conference report; but I do believe that when a concept has been strongly endorsed in the committee, in the full committee and in the House by the passage of a bill without amendment, that principle should not be easily conceded in a conference report on a personal note or on a political basis.

Specifically, I refer to the House committee's position and the House position with respect to tax-funded commissary construction in the contiguous 48 States.

We have one commissary in Georgia that had been destroyed and, of course, funds were provided to replace that. That presented no problem to me.

We had one in Adak, Alaska. Of course, the isolation of that place made the tax-funded construction of that project no problem for me; but there were four in the continental United States, one in Georgia, one in Arizona, one in Texas, and one in Louisiana. I do not question that there is a need for these commissaries; but the needs are not new. They have been sort of a cumulative thing. Perhaps the same position could be urged in our other continental U.S. installations as well; but it was a concept adopted in our committee and by the House that in these areas we need

to make it plain that construction in the future should be other than on a tax-funded basis.

I have the feeling that these new commissaries, and the others that will be coming down the line, are being constructed not just to serve our people in uniform, but on the basis of a dollar business volume, for a large number of people not in the armed services who are permitted under law to trade at these commissaries at cost prices about two-thirds the comparable commercial prices in the communities in which they are located; so our concept was abandoned in the conference, not on a defensible basis, but on other bases.

So that two of the commissaries were accepted for public funding and the other two went by the boards.

There is one other provision in the conference report that bothers me, and that is the explanation of why two of these amendments have been brought back in disagreement. The total funds provided for Army and Navy military construction exceed the amounts that were provided in either the House bill or in the Senate bill. I think this is a bad habit for us to get into, and this was the second part of the conference report that was unacceptable to me.

There were some problems that were resolved much to my satisfaction, and so this explanation of why I expect this conference report to be approved. For instance, No. 1, we had a problem with respect to the new hospital up at West Point.

The House had provided no funds; the Senate had put in \$20 million. The \$20 million is in there, but if the Members will note the statement on the part of the managers, it does require some very definite revisions from the concept that had

been submitted to our committee of a \$25 million, 100-bed hospital designed to serve a great many other people and not primarily to serve the cadets and the permanent military force stationed at the West Point community.

We did provide military construction funds for certain installations in Iceland. The Senate committee deleted all of those funds. I think the nature of our tenure there, the negotiations that are now in progress, justified the inclusion of those funds in the conference report, but again with some very definitive language that limits the obligation of those funds until certain very practical considerations have been dealt with.

We had a briefing in our subcommittee with respect to our giving up the use of the island of Culebra off Puerto Rico. but we were not requested to provide funds. By the time the bill reached the Senate, that request had been made. We concurred in the necessity for providing those funds, but again because of some circumstances there that caused us concern, the statement of the managers contained some very definitive language with respect to these proposed funds.

The Senate committee had taken a \$20 million swipe at our NATO infrastructure funds. There was no delineated explanation of this other than the feeling that we were perhaps doing too much in the way of prefinancing. I think we can all sympathize with their feelings in that regard, but we also need to keep in mind that there are some critical areas where, unless we do prefinancing and then go back at a later time for reimbursement from the NATO infrastructure program, some of the operational facilities for the U.S. forces are not going to be timely built.

I think, generally speaking, that while

This conference report does contain a rather sizable reduction from the budget, from the requests that were made, that we must give credit to the authorizing committee for the major share of the reductions—credit or otherwise, depending upon an individual point of view.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that this conference report, as submitted to the Members, does contain very few reductions in the amount that was authorized by the legislative committees.

So, Mr. Speaker, while I recognize that many significant problems have been very properly dealt with in their resolutions, for the two reasons which I have cited, I could not sign this conference report.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I find that the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS), has made some useful comments on the conference report as a whole, and I want to thank him for his contributions and for his help in the preparation of the bill, just as I wish to thank other committee members and the staff.

It has been a great privilege to work with the members of this subcommittee and the staff in the preparation of the bill. While we have not agreed upon everything, we feel that a workable and a sound bill has been presented.

On the matter of commissaries, the only disagreement was in accepting two of the four within the United States that were in controversy. The Senate conferees and a substantial majority of the House conferees felt that we were on safer ground in including the two. But we are all in agreement that additional steps should be taken to reduce some of the dependence upon the taxpayers of the United States in the construction and operation of commissaries for service personnel. That is spelled out carefully on page 8 of the report which is before you.

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to yield first to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, Mr. LONG, a member of the subcommittee, and then I shall yield to the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. GROSS.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG).

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As with Mr. DAVIS I did not sign the conference report, and I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin citing some of the same reasons.

I also felt strongly about the commissaries, because commissaries are heavily subsidized, to the extent of nearly \$300 million a year in appropriated funds which go to pay the salaries of the employees who work in them.

The armed service has a proposal to allow the prices to go up 1 percent to pay for any new construction. Commissaries are already allowing a 30 percent cut in price below what stores in the neighborhood are charging.

No appropriated funds are needed to build any more commissaries.

In fact, the existing commissaries can be used for a while longer. I thought it was a great mistake on our part to yield in conference to give appropriated funds for commissaries. This goes against the principle of our legislation and, in any case, the commissaries could have soon been constructed by raising the surcharge a bit.

I also feel strongly that we should not give the Army \$20 million for the West Point Hospital until sound plans are forthcoming. Instead, we are giving \$20 million for a project for which there has been no valid economic analysis.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out another item which was deleted in the committee bill for \$3.5 million, but restored in conference, for a structure at the National Security Agency at Fort Meade to house a unit that was taken out of nearby Fort Holabird. This was also a great mistake.

Fort Holabird is standing there empty, and many, or most, of the buildings have been appraised by the Army as useful until 1994. And yet the Army proposes—because these buildings are not new and shiny and quite what they would like to have—to move to other areas where they can get the Congress to approve much newer and pleasanter buildings near Washington, D.C. and be closer to the "throne."

We deleted that structure in the bill then only to find it put back in in conference—again a project without a sound economic analysis.

One of the things that has bothered me about this committee—and I am very proud to be associated with my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Florida, and glad to be a member of the committee—is that we do an awful lot of hard work for nothing.

I probably have never put so much hard work into any committee in my entire time in Congress as I have this year.

We study each item line by line. We mark up a sound bill. Then we go to the conference and let the Senators put most of the projects back in. For years I have noticed that the conference figure is very much closer to the Senate figure than to the House figure, although it is pretty clear that the Senators are only there to get particular items for their States. They are not doing the work we are, and yet we yield to them. It is wrong in principle, and wrong in practice to develop a bill in committee, but really make the law in the conference. That is why I strongly protest this conference report, and the way it came out; and also why I did not sign it.

I hope in the future we will have the fortitude to stand on our own and come out with a bill that we can stand by in the conference with the Senate.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. SIKES. I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wish the gentleman would yield some time to me so I might ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand the gen-

tleman's contention is that the commissaries ought to be self-supporting or at least far more so than they are presently?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That was the position which our entire subcommittee took. It boiled down to the question as to whether we could more effectively bring this about by leaving out all of the commissaries in the continental United States or whether, as was finally done here, to put the money for two of them in and then put some strong language into the report.

My view was that we put strong language into committee reports around here many, many times, and I was just as confident as I was sitting in that room that we will have before us in the 1975 military construction bill requests for some more tax-funded commissaries. That is the reason why I took the position that I took.

Mr. SIKES. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. I think you will find, if you will look at the report language on page 8, it is quite strongly stated and it is straightforward. It is quite clear that we expect realistic action and consideration of the committee's position. This is shared by the Senate and House committees.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I just wish to make a comment on that. I do not differ basically with the gentleman from Florida, who is a great chairman, except to say that he has been on both this subcommittee and on the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee for a long time. I think he will agree with me that we have put some very strong language in both of those reports from time to time only to see those comments ignored by noncompliance. So the only difference that the chairman and I have is I felt the language is not going to do as much good as the chairman seems to have confidence it will.

Mr. GROSS. I fully agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that except under the most exceptional situations these commissaries ought to be far more self-supporting if not totally so. I commend him for raising the issue here and for his statement.

I yield back whatever time I may have.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may require to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to speak at length in connection with this conference report. It was a compromise, as conference reports always are. We did the best that could be done under the circumstances. I commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) for his able leadership and the entire subcommittee for the long weeks of effort to achieve the best bill possible.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the inclu-

sion of \$20 million for the proposed new hospital at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in this conference report is especially gratifying.

As a freshman Member of Congress and a Member of the Academy's board of visitors, the culmination of the necessary legislative approvals for this long overdue project is a most rewarding experience.

I commend the members of the Military Construction Subcommittees on Appropriations in both Houses whose concerns I share in making it possible for this project to finally become a reality after years of arduous planning and numerous frustrations.

To be sure, rapidly increasing construction costs in recent years is the most prominent of the frustrations. For this, however, the Academy is not singularly unique. That the Appropriations Committees in both Houses meticulously screened and pared the new hospital proposal attests to their concern of the taxpayers' interests.

Having visited the existing hospital and having carefully scrutinized the voluminous documentation of the Army pursuant to the proposed hospital, I am convinced of the increasingly urgent need for a modern medical facility of which this military institution, one of the finest in the world, is justifiably deserving.

The existing hospital, after serving the West Point community for more than 50 years, is ready to be retired for other less demanding, but nonetheless essential, uses in the Academy's on-going expansion program. This Congress has the opportunity of assuring that a first-rate medical facility will, within the foreseeable future, be available to meet the medical and health care needs of the expanding Cadet Corps and the community it serves in the years to come.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report in full recognition that while we might delay the benefits of a modern medical facility by failing to commence construction of a new hospital at the earliest possible date, we could not postpone further increased costs.

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the House will shortly vote on the Military Construction Appropriations Conference Report. This report on H.R. 11459 contains several items that I consider fiscally irresponsible, and wasteful, not only of Federal tax dollars, but wasteful of badly needed energy and fuels.

Originally, the House, on recommendation of the Appropriations Committee, declined to provide the over \$4 million permitting construction of administrative facilities for the Military Ocean Terminal, and Military Sealift Command, plus an electric substation, which alone will cost over \$400,000.

However, the House receded in conference with the Senate. It is my understanding that the House agreed to recede from their position of deleting construction in Bayonne, on the basis of figures supplied by the Army, outlining the fuel costs for servicing the facilities now operating in Brooklyn. These figures supplied to my office by the House Appro-

priations Committee, state that the facilities now in Brooklyn total 65,800,000 cubic feet, of which a total of 36,600,000 must be heated. This costs \$256,000 per year in fuel. Unfortunately, costs of heating and servicing the largely empty Bayonne facilities now in existence, and those planned for the future are not available.

But clearly, Mr. Speaker, based on the above figures, it is even clearer that the Bayonne facilities should not be built at this time. The facilities presently used by these military transportation agencies are perfectly sufficient to their administrative needs. The facilities now used are more efficient—they burn only 12,000 gallons of oil daily, as opposed to the over 20,000 burnt daily by facilities already operating in Bayonne, N.J.—the site proposed for the relocation of these agencies. The facilities in Brooklyn are also sufficient in size to accommodate the total administrative and supply operations presently in Bayonne, at an obvious saving of 8,000 gallons of oil per day. Also included in this energy and fuel savings are the power, heat, and light that will be needed to service these newly constructed facilities. Also included should be the fuel and energy expended in building and finishing these new facilities, plus the additional fuel and costs involved in having thousands of workers drive daily from Brooklyn to Bayonne, in order to keep their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is now facing an energy crisis and a fuel crisis, the proportions of which are still yet unknown. Projections have been made of a total fuel shortfall of between 16 and 30 percent, depending on the degree of the Arab oil embargo, weather conditions during the duration of the winter, and the success of conservation efforts throughout the Nation.

This Nation is also facing, because of administration economic mismanagement and administration-fostered inflation and shortage, a budget deficit in this fiscal year, of \$1 to \$3 billion. The budget deficit for next fiscal year should top \$5 billion, and could go as high as \$10 billion. And, parenthetically, I might mention here that because of the 7 and 8 percent inflation we have been experiencing over the past 2½ years, the Government is providing less and less service, at an increasing cost in continually inflated dollars.

In other words, administration-inflation, while seeming to increase Federal revenues, actually accrues no actual increase in purchasing power, and it further tempts the administration to try to balance the budget at a horrible human and social cost to the American people. Just a quick look at what the administration is trying to do to health, education, and welfare programs makes my point with a lamentable vengeance.

Mr. Speaker, we have discussed our Nation's critical condition in energy and finance. Energy arguments have been used by the Army in this case. Well, I think they should cut both ways. Energy arguments were used, somewhat mysteriously, in arguing for the shutdown of a facility employing about 2,000 in Brooklyn. Well, these same arguments

should be applied across the military construction board. An immediate specific moratorium should be placed on the planned Brooklyn-Bayonne move until the GAO has completed a comprehensive, energy-impact study.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I am preparing legislation which will mandate a moratorium on military construction, during the remainder of the energy crisis and the fiscal deficit period we have been experiencing. I will be circulating a dear colleague letter and a draft of the bill in the early part of next week.

I think that the time for shortsighted thinking is past and urge my colleagues to make clear to the American people that everyone is going to have to tighten their energy belts, including the military.

I am aware of the fact that the Pentagon has ordered reductions in fuel used for training, and in selected operations. A few limousines have been mothballed, and the President has slowed Air Force One to under 500 miles per hour. But, Mr. Speaker, when you realize jobs are going to be sacrificed; homes go unheated; cars, buses, trucks, and the entire economy slowed and sacrificing, then I think we should take a little closer look at the sector of our energy-consuming economy that is presently siphoning about 10 million barrels a month from oil that should be going to serve our domestic and civilian needs.

The Military Establishment should take far more seriously the magnitude of this crisis and should voluntarily order a moratorium on all but that construction most clearly allied to the direct security interests of the United States. This moratorium should serve until the passage of legislation such as I propose.

Not only would we realize savings of several billions of dollars a year, thus erasing the projected deficit for this year, but we should, in the next year or so, be able to see just how well the military has been able to bear its fair share of the sacrifice demanded of each and every American. We will also see how well it has been able to make do with the facilities that have been in use serving the military so well in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I have recently been honored by appointment to the Ways and Means Committees Task Force on Energy. I have, thus, a special responsibility to help devise ways in which the Nation can move forward in meeting these crises in fuel, energy, and power. Part of this solution will be to encourage oil-consuming nations to join together in presenting common positions of solidarity to the oil-producing powers. Certainly a willingness on the part of the U.S. military, and its civilian leadership, to make significant sacrifices, during the remainder of these crises, would serve as one of the best bona fides we could take to expected world energy conferences.

Today, I call for just this kind of sacrifice by the military—a sacrifice in direct consumption of fuels needed to heat homes and preserve jobs, and further, in a moratorium in constructing new facilities that will take further energy

ances to build and serve with heat, light, and power.

Mr. Speaker, we are not asking the military to do anything that the American people have not been asked to do.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, by way of summation, let me point out that the result of the Congress' action on the authorization was to cut below the budget request by \$221 million.

Then in addition to that, in the appropriation bill, the House initially cut \$114 million. The conference action resulted in a cut of \$65 million in appropriations for a total reduction below the budget of \$286 million.

As I stated earlier the two principal items contributing significant increase to this agreement over the amount approved by the House were the \$20 million for the hospital at West Point, and \$12 million for relocation of bombing activities from the Island of Culebra, both of which were very strongly supported by the Department of Defense and by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. 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 329, nays 40, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 635]
YEAS—329

Adams
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Armstrong
Balfanz
Baker
Bauman
Bell
Bennett
Bevill
Blaggi
Blaster
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bowen
Brademas
Bray
Breaux
Brackinridge
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burger
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Miss.
Burkison, Tex.

Burlison, Mo.
Burton
Butler
Byron
Carney, Ohio
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clancy
Clay
Cleveland
Cohen
Coller
Collins, Tex.
Conable
Conte
Cotter
Coughlin
Cronin
Culver
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
Daniels
Dominick V.
Danielson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
de la Garza
Dellenback
Deans
Dent
Dorwinaki
Dickinson
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Downing
Dulski

Duncan
du Pont
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evens, Tenn.
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford,
William D.
Forsythe
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Froehlich
Fulton
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gettys
Giaino
Gibbons
Gilman
Ginn
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Grover
Gude
Gunter
Guyer
Haley
Hamilton

Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hanrahan
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey
Haestings
Hébert
Heinz
Henderson
Hicks
Hinshaw
Hogan
Holifield
Holt
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Huber
Hudnut
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kazen
Kemp
Ketchum
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kyros
Landgrebe
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lent
Littton
Lott
Lujan
McClary
McCloskey
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McFall
McKinney
Madden
Madigan
Mahon
Maillard
Mallary
Mann
Maraziti
Martin, Nebr.
Martin, N.C.
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Matsunaga
Matsumura
Mazzoli
Meeds

NAYS—40

Abzug
Archer
Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspin
Barrett
Carey, N. Y.
Chisholm
Collins, Ill.
Davis, Wis.
Delums
Devine
Drinan
Edwards, Calif.

NOT VOTING—63

Abdnor
Addabbo
Badillo
Beard
Berglund
Blackburn
Blatnik
Brasco
Brinkley
Burke, Calif.
Camp
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.

Melcher
Mezvinaky
Michel
Milford
Miller
Mills, Ark.
Minish
Mink
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead,
Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Obey
O'Brien
O'Hara
Owens
Parris
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyster
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Powell, Ohio
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Pritchard
Rallsback
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Regula
Rhodes
Riegler
Rinaldo
Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncallo, Wyo.
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roy
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Scherle
Schneebell
Schroeder

NAYS—40

Abzug
Archer
Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspin
Barrett
Carey, N. Y.
Chisholm
Collins, Ill.
Davis, Wis.
Delums
Devine
Drinan
Edwards, Calif.

NOT VOTING—63

Clawson, Del
Cochran
Conlan
Conyers
Corman
Crane
Delaney
Denholm
Diggs
Esch
Fisher
Grasso
Gray
Griffiths

Nedzi
Nichols
O'Neill
Podell
Price, Tex.
Quie
Quillen
Reid

Roberts
Rooney, N.Y.
Rousselot
Runnels
Sandman
Shipley
Stephens
Stokes

Symms
Ullman
Van Deerin
Walsh
Wiggins
Williams

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Harrington against.
Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Conyers against.
Mr. O'Neill for, with Mr. Badillo against.
Mr. Brasco for, with Mr. Mitchell of Maryland against.

Until further notice:
Mr. Bergland with Mrs. Burke of California.
Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Hays with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Runnels with Mr. Crane.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Lehman with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Van Deerin.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Hillis.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Conlan.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Beard.
Mr. Denholm with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. McKay with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Abdnor.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Cochran.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Reid.
Mr. Brinkley with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Rousselot.
Miss Jordan with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Symms.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Walsh.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Wiggins.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:
Senate amendment No. 1: Page 2, line 3, strike out "\$551,575,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$587,735,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SIKES

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:
Mr. SIKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$578,120,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the last amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:
Senate amendment No. 2: On page 2, line 13, strike out "\$587,641,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$608,467,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SIKES

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:
Mr. SIKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$609,292,000".

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the matter discussed in connection with the conference report on the military construction bill and to include statistical facts and tabular material.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 9256, INCREASING CONTRIBUTION OF GOVERNMENT TO HEALTH BENEFITS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. DULSKI submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 9256) to increase the contribution of the Government to the cost of health benefits for Federal employees, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 93-706)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9256) to increase the contribution of the Government to the costs of health benefits for Federal employees, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6 and 7.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 5, and 8 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted in the House engrossed bill by Senate amendment numbered 2 insert the following: "in 1974".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the matter proposed to be inserted in the House engrossed bill by Senate amendment numbered 3 strike out "55" and insert in lieu thereof "60".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted in the House engrossed bill by Senate amendment numbered 4 insert the following: "in 1975 and in each year thereafter."

And the Senate agree to the same.

T. J. DULSKI,
DAVID N. HENDERSON,
JEROME R. WALDIE,
LAWRENCE J. HOGAN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

GALE W. MCGEE,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
QUENTIN BURDICK,
H. L. FONG,
TED STEVENS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9256) to increase the contribution of the Government to the costs of health benefits for Federal employees, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

GOVERNMENT HEALTH BENEFITS CONTRIBUTIONS

Amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5:

House bill

The first section of the House bill amended section 8906 of title 5, United States Code, to increase the Government's contribution for Federal employees' health benefits plans from 40 to 55 percent beginning in 1973, with an additional 5 percent increase in each subsequent year until 1977, when the Government's contribution would reach 75 percent for 1977 and each year thereafter. Under section 4 of the House bill, the initial increase from 40 to 55 percent would become effective at the beginning of the first applicable pay period which begins on or after the 30th day following the date of enactment. Each additional 5 percent increase would become effective in January of each subsequent year.

Senate amendments

Senate amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 amended the above-discussed provisions of the House bill so as to provide, in aggregate effect, that the Government's contribution for Federal employees' health benefits plans shall be increased from 40 to 50 percent beginning in 1974 and from 50 to 55 percent beginning in 1975 and applicable in each year thereafter.

Conference agreement

Under section 8906 of title 5, United States Code, as modified by the conference agreement, the Government's contribution for Federal employees' health benefits plans is increased from 40 to 50 percent beginning in 1974 and from 50 to 60 percent beginning in 1975 and in each year thereafter. The latter increase of 50 to 60 percent was not contained in the House bill as proposed to be modified by Senate amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, and is considerably less than the increases proposed by the House bill in the form in which it passed the House.

STUDENT CHILDREN

Amendment numbered 6:

House bill

The House bill, in the form in which it passed the House, contained no provisions relating to student children.

Senate amendment

Senate amendment numbered 6 proposed the insertion of a new section 4 in the House bill which amended section 8901(5) of title 5, United States Code, to extend health benefits coverage to an unmarried child, regardless of age, who is dependent upon the enrolled parent for more than half of his support and who is in regular full-time attendance at a high school, trade school, technical or vocational institute, junior college, college, university, or comparable recognized educational institution.

Conference agreement

The conference agreement does not contain the student children provisions of section 4 as proposed by Senate amendment numbered 6.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT

Amendment numbered 7:

Amendment numbered 7 is a purely technical amendment which renumbers section 4 of the House bill (in the form in which

it passed the House) as section 5. This amendment is not necessary because of the omission by the conference agreement of the new section 4, relating to student children, as proposed by Senate amendment numbered 6. The Senate recedes.

BEGINNING DATE OF INCREASES IN GOVERNMENT HEALTH BENEFITS CONTRIBUTIONS

Amendment numbered 8:

House bill

Section 4 of the House bill, relating to the beginning date of the series of increases proposed in Government health benefits contributions, provided that the first section shall become effective on the first day of the first applicable pay period which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment.

Senate amendment

Senate amendment numbered 8 provided that such first section shall become effective on the first day of the first applicable pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1974.

Conference agreement

Under the measure proposed by the conference agreement, the effective date of the first section, which provides the increases in Government health benefits contributions, is that proposed by Senate amendment numbered 8. This date is necessary to reflect the change from 1973 to 1974 made by the conference agreement in the calendar year in which the series of such increases is to commence. The House recedes.

T. J. DULSKI,
DAVID N. HENDERSON,
JEROME R. WALDIE,
LAWRENCE J. HOGAN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

GALE W. MCGEE,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
QUENTIN BURDICK,
H. L. FONG,
TED STEVENS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

PROVIDING INCREASES IN CERTAIN ANNUITIES UNDER CHAPTER 83 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 673 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 673

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. 9107) to provide increases in certain annuities payable under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes. 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 Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio