

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] has a brief talk that he would like to make.

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

**A TIME TO BE PROUD**

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, this is a time for all Americans, and in fact for free people all over the world, to be proud. Today, in the Plain Dealer of Cleveland, Ohio, one of the Nation's great newspapers, an article was published by Philip W. Porter, an associate editor and a noted writer in my State of Ohio. He wrote about the feeling of pride that Americans have by reason of the firm, resolute, and unyielding action taken by our President following the unprovoked attack on August 2 on the destroyer *Maddox*, which was repelled.

Our destroyer then continued its patrol in international waters where this amazing event took place.

Then, on the night of August 4 two American destroyers, the *Maddox* and the *C. Turner Joy*, were assailed by North Vietnamese PT boats in a premeditated naval attack that lasted a matter of hours. At that time not only was the attack repelled, but also the attackers were either destroyed or dispersed.

The President made plain, both in his address to the Nation on Tuesday night and in his talk at Syracuse University last Wednesday, that the United States seeks no enlargement nor escalation of the conflict.

However, this Nation is united in its belief that, in President Johnson's words, "There can be no peace by aggression and no immunity from reply."

Whenever our Nation has faced international crises, the American people, regardless of political party, have united behind firm action by our Presidents. It is a firmly established tradition that politics stops at the water's edge when our national security is threatened. I am proud to have voted for the resolution supporting our President.

Mr. President, Philip Porter's article is entitled "A Time To Be Proud." This thoughtful and concise praise of President Johnson's action is the finest I have read anywhere since the crises began earlier this week. I commend this article to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Plain Dealer, Aug. 8, 1964]

**A TIME TO BE PROUD**

(By Philip W. Porter)

Something magnificent comes over Presidents of the United States when they face international crises that might lead to war, and they lay it on the line for the Nation to face. It happened to Lyndon Johnson this week over North Vietnam.

It happened previously to John F. Kennedy over Cuba, to Dwight D. Eisenhower over Quemoy and Matsu, to Harry S. Truman over Korea. It's been so long now that many may have forgotten Franklin D. Roosevelt after Pearl Harbor, but those who did hear him will never forget.

Roosevelt spoke his historic phrases to the Nation over the radio, for TV didn't exist then, and it was in its infancy when Truman had to cope with Korea. But the last three Presidents have spoken with grim and measured words over TV, and none who watched could doubt that in each case the man was speaking as the leader of a united nation, with deep conviction and far above politics.

One who watches and listens at such a time is bound to feel an emotional tug of pride in his country. It comes from the knowledge that no matter which man occupies that office of crushing responsibility and inescapable loneliness, when the chips are down he rises above petty politics, sectionalism, parochialism and personal faults, and becomes the President.

Our quality of closing ranks when the national safety or honor are threatened, even when civil strife and political partisanship have been filling the air, is something the governments and the people (they are not always the same) of Europe, Asia and South America seem unable to understand. We are the only big power that takes the golden rule seriously and gives away billions playing the Good Samaritan. For years we appear to tolerate, even enjoy being played for a sucker while cynicism and self-interest are the guidelines of all other nations.

But when the day suddenly comes that we know we have been pushed too far by a conscious aggressor, then look out. Overnight, the President turns from politician to statesman, the Nation closes ranks, and the opposition party speaks the same language as the President.

Senator GOLDWATER's prompt and strong statement in support of President Johnson was in the same vein of patriotism that brought Henry L. Stimson and Frank Knox, Republicans, into FDR's Cabinet; that induced Gen. George Marshall to serve President Truman, that transformed Arthur Vandenberg from just another Republican Senator to a world statesman.

As I listened to Mr. Johnson in grimly, measured tones, tell the audience at Syracuse that we had responded to attacks on our naval vessels, I realized all over again that no matter which party elects a President, our foreign policy is continuous. We debate it during elections, but we do what we must when aggressors try to push us around.

Up to now the Communists have played a slow, cagey game of infiltration, guerrilla warfare and the doublecross in Laos and Vietnam. They have cost us some lives and billions of dollars, and it seems likely to go on that way indefinitely. But when they openly attacked American naval vessels in international waters, miles off the coast, they were asking for retaliation, and they got it.

We can hope they'll learn, and believe what President Johnson said. For one, I felt mighty proud of him for saying it.

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.

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1965**

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11369) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this is the appropriation bill for military construction for the fiscal year 1965. As the Senate knows, there must first be a bill that authorizes these projects before there can be appropriations. The authorization bill went through the Armed Services Committee and was handled by a subcommittee that happens to have several members who are also members of the Appropriations Subcommittee which handled the appropriation bill.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is the ranking minority member of each of the subcommittees, and I am the chairman of each of the subcommittees. The two of us have followed these matters all the way through the year, and through two hearings. There were something like 1,200 items in the original authorization bill, and we took proof on each of those items, considered each one of them, and made a recommendation.

The requested authorization originally was \$1,850,912,000. The authorization bill as it passed the Congress authorized for military construction \$1,521 million which is a net reduction of \$329 million.

I emphasize the fact that in the authorization bill and the appropriations bill we did not take out any item that we considered a bone and muscle part of the military program. We did not take out any item that we considered in any way necessary or essential. However, we took out items that we thought should be postponed or that we did not think were practical or a necessary part of our military program.

In the authorization bill as passed by the Senate we were about \$68 million below the amount allowed by the House but we left an authorization for appropriations of \$1,534 million.

I shall review only a few of the larger items that were left out of the authorization bill, which are of some interest, and not dwell on them, unless Senators wish to ask some questions about them. Many of these larger figures are classified.

The Nike-Hercules items were left out. Certain items for the Navy were left out because we thought they could wait another year. We allowed some of them, and left out others. I have skipped over those that are classified. Most of the large figures are classified.

We took out the defense intelligence building in the District, an item of \$17,900,000. It is a matter in which there was some interest. I move on now to a brief statement. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will interrupt me or will make a statement of his own at any point that he may wish to do so.

1964

Mr. President, with that explanation of the authorization bill for military construction I will now move to an explanation of the fiscal year 1965 military construction appropriations bill as approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The bill passed the House with a figure of \$1,599 million. We have made a net reduction below the House of \$16,045,000.

The report of the committee, on page 1, carries a summary of the effect of the committee changes in the bill.

There is a table at page 40 of the report. It also carries the breakdown of line items by States, beginning at page 26. The appropriation request for family housing is shown in the report beginning at page 20. Similar material is found in the large tables.

There is one small item in which there is an increase over the budget estimate. That was an increase of \$4,800,000 for the Army National Guard nationwide construction program.

For military construction the bill contains \$965,318,000.

For family housing the bill contains \$617,651,000. That is a decrease of \$32,707,000 under the House, and \$93,349,000 under the original authorization.

In regard to family housing, I believe I should indicate clearly what the committee did. The budget request was \$711 million, for 12,500 family housing units for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. This amount was reduced to 9,886 family housing units in the authorization bill. The House in the appropriations bill provided for 9,590 housing units.

Our subcommittee has studied this program for a number of years. In view of rapid changes in the defense program and due to obsolescence, we thought there should be a yearly review.

We have adhered to this principle for several years. This year we have provided the necessary funds for 7,500 units. The Department of Defense has the responsibility of selecting the housing units that are to be built with this money, in accordance with a priority list within the services. In other words, the committee did not undertake to select the housing for each service, but approved the list and provided the money with which to build 7,500 units, with the Department of Defense making the selections as to how many units each service will actually build.

I point out that the cost of the worldwide military housing that we already have is \$3,260 million. The number of housing units we have worldwide is 374,398.

A large percentage of this housing is in the United States. However, we are satisfied that the building rate, as requested by the Department of Defense, is too rapid, in view of changing weapons and changing situations, and the possibility of reducing the manpower. We have approved a good, hard, steady program of 7,500 units for several years now, and that is rapidly taking care of most of the places where the need is urgent. The program has been completed in many places.

The housing program has been cleaned up since a few years ago, when we had

the Capehart program. This has no reference to former Senator Capehart, as an individual. It was named for him because he introduced the bill, under which we did not appropriate the money, although eventually we would have to pay for it. Through some bad contract awards, the Capehart program got into trouble, and the Congress terminated the program.

Now we have the program all cleaned up. We have a businesslike management of the funds, and we are now building houses through use of direct appropriated funds. The \$660,605,000 requested here seems like a very large figure; however, part of this is the cost to the Government of approximately \$850 a year to maintain each of these family housing units.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, who made a very fine contribution over the months. He attended the hearings and helped weigh the items in the bill, and gave his careful attention to the consideration of the bill, which in some ways is rather complicated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator. What I did, of course, I did under the guidance of the Senator's chairmanship. The Senator from Mississippi was very conscientious during the long hearings.

Did the Senator bring out the fact that the housing at this time consists of 374,398 units, and that the cost of taking care of the operation and maintenance and the debt payment on these units—the O. & M. account—is \$617 million this year? These are substantial figures.

Mr. STENNIS. They are very large sums, indeed; but we announced that program, even though it seemed high per unit, is being well handled now, and we are on the road to constructing the best family military housing we have ever had.

There is one other item I wish to discuss. It is the only item in the bill that is not in the budget. The subcommittee added \$4,800,000 to the budget estimate of \$6 million, making a total of \$10,800,000 for armory projects, projects as to which there is a local contribution, either by the State or by the county, and including for 25 nonarmory projects. We provide small sums nationwide each year, and these additions are nationwide additions for armories and nonarmories.

The committee does not select the items that will qualify for this amount of money, but we have a formula that is applied by the National Guard Bureau. It is fair and impartial. The money will provide for a few more armories throughout the Nation and also, I believe, for four National Guard summer training projects, for the benefit of men who have been called into the service for training. It is a small amount. It will provide summer training for some fine National Guard units. This sum will be used to build small messhalls, shops, supply headquarters, latrines, and items of that kind.

I observe the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in the Chamber. He has an interest in one item. I shall yield shortly to him for a question about it.

The bill has received thorough scrutiny. Each of the services has examined it, as have the Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. As a result of action by the Committee on Armed Services, the authorization legislation reflects substantial reductions. Reductions were also made in the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations.

The House subcommittees have done an extraordinary fine piece of work in handling these matters over the years. The Senate subcommittee has reviewed the bill carefully, and its work is reflected in this reduction.

I believe the bill is as austere as is desirable, if we are to provide adequately for the actual needs of our Armed Forces.

Much interest was expressed in the fieldhouse for the Air Force Academy. That item was authorized and is approved in the bill; but the full amount of money is not appropriated this year. However, we have allowed \$350,000 to be certain that there will be enough money for the architectural and engineering planning for the entire project, with the idea that we expect to approve the full amount for the project next year. This item was omitted entirely by the House, so the \$350,000 will be in conference.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I express deep appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction Appropriations. Like other appropriation bills, this one requires much attention, and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has given careful attention to it.

I realize that the House omitted the item for the fieldhouse for the Air Force Academy. The record should be made clear that the Air Force Academy has no adequate place where its cadets can obtain the kind of physical training that is needed on a year-round basis.

I sincerely appreciate the consideration given this item by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and also the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. I believe and hope that with the money that the committee has allowed for the planning of the fieldhouse, we shall be in a better position to submit a better, more forward-looking plan than would otherwise have been possible. I am very happy about the action that has been taken.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Colorado. I believe he is correct in his evaluation of the situation.

Did the Senator from Illinois wish me to yield to him for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will wait until the Senator has concluded.

Mr. STENNIS. I have practically concluded my remarks. I had not planned to discuss every item unless questions were asked about them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Perhaps the Senator from Massachusetts had better make his comment first.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My remark relates to the Air Force Academy fieldhouse. The fieldhouse had been authorized, and we feel we are moving ahead as fast as we can in a proper, careful manner, so as to obtain the best fieldhouse possible, and to have it constructed as economically and efficiently as possible. Therefore, we have included sufficient money this year to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. STENNIS. The money has been earmarked for that purpose, so that it will not have to compete with other planning money.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Also, there is other planning money that could be used should this amount not be enough.

Mr. STENNIS. That is a good point. Should the specific amount provided not be enough, there is other planning money that can be drawn on.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I notice on page 29 of the report that the committee recommends the appropriation of \$4,521,000 for construction at Fort Sheridan. I should like to ask if all of this has been caused by the projected transfer of 5th Army Headquarters from Chicago to Fort Sheridan.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. This transfer has required some new building. By the way, the Senate rejected one of these items for \$1 million in the authorization bill. We had to yield it in conference, but it is left out of the bill. However, I think we have it adjusted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, this "economy" move will cost \$4,500,000 extra?

Mr. STENNIS. There will be a debit on the debit side of the ledger, to start with, against the alleged economy move. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad the Senator from Mississippi says "the alleged economy move." It is a proposal foisted into this bill by political interests which will cost \$4,500,000 in the name of economy. Blessed is the name of economy.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's sentiments. We were not saying there would be no economy. But we do not accept all the formulas that are thrown at us all the time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure the Senator remembers the amendment which my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I offered to the military construction authorization bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. That amendment was adopted by the Senate but was dropped in conference. I should like to make a plea for the incorporation of that amendment in this appropriation bill.

The amendment which we have prepared reads as follows:

None of the funds appropriated in this act may be expended for the purpose of constructing new facilities in any other State to replace the facilities of any installation ordered reduced or closed "for economy reasons" in any State pursuant to the announcement of the Secretary of Defense dated December 12, 1963, or April 24, 1964.

This language is similar to the language of the amendment offered to the authorization bill, accepted by the Senate, but dropped in conference.

There was a rather full discussion of the subject on the floor of the Senate in connection with the authorization bill. It is not my purpose to go over the same ground. However, it seems there is much sense in saying that if an electronics warehouse, for example, is in fine condition in the State of New York, it would be false economy to close that facility and build the same type of warehouse in any other State. The only purpose of the amendment is to preclude such a move. Perhaps it should have attached to it some qualifying language, to provide an opportunity for such action to be taken in extraordinary circumstances and under unusual conditions.

But it is difficult for me to conceive of circumstances under which it would be proper for funds to be expended in that manner.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I quite agree with the Senator from New York. This problem has concerned and disturbed me over a long period of time, because there are some facilities in Rhode Island which have been abandoned and have not yet been used for other activities. I realize that many complex problems are involved. The primary responsibility is always to do what is best for our country and its security, even when it means that a facility must be removed from one place and started again in another.

If there is a strategic reason for it, I do not believe that any Senator is so provincial that he would object to that. But the problem has not been exactly that.

Sometimes a facility is closed for reasons of economy and shortly thereafter that same facility springs up in another area. When it becomes necessary to reopen it, they do not wish to go back to the old location, they wish to go to a new one.

But I realize that this is a difficult problem to handle by an amendment because we could never provide for all the contingencies involved.

Possibly we should write into the conference report what the intention or the concern of Congress is with relation to this problem, and advise the Defense Department that if the facilities are required again to take into account the existing facilities, the skills which have been developed, and the money and the investment that would be lost if they were moved to another area.

I believe that the report should so state. I do not believe we could do it by amendment, because we could not cover all the complexities involved.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with what the Senator from Rhode Island has said. I believe I could add a comment to the Senator from New York, that if this admonition is put in the form of a report and added to it, if the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of any of the services finds that it is necessary to build a new plant where one has been closed, they should make a report to the appropriate committees of Congress and give the reasons why it is necessary, after having closed a plant, say, in New York, Rhode Island, or Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I recognize the force of what the distinguished Senators from Rhode Island and Massachusetts have said. I wonder whether it would not be appropriate to take the amendment to conference, with the idea that it should be discussed either in the form of an amendment or included in the report.

The language, which may be too tight, would be accepted with a proviso permitting some latitude on the part of the Secretary of Defense in the case of unusual circumstances, or it would be the basis for inclusion in the conference report of language indicating that it is the sense of Congress that such a thing should be done only under most unusual circumstances. A case should be made for it before it is done.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. I appreciate the Senator's position. Let me point out to him that I am not at all unsympathetic toward his problem, but this is a question of what is sound legislation. It is even down to the point of what is legislation on an appropriation bill.

I believe, as a whole, that there is a very rigid surveillance of these matters, first by the representation in Congress from the State, and next by the Department of Defense, which approaches this problem in an earnest way. Then the committee passes upon these matters when it recommends the appropriation. Nearly always some money changes are required, except with respect to the facility which was totally abandoned in Mississippi, involving a sizable Air Force training installation at Greenville. It was taken out. I mention that to show that I have been as much a victim as anyone else in the canceling out of installations.

I do not believe that we can put the Department of Defense in a straitjacket in any way. But we did consider the Senator's amendment at the last conference, as I stated. We took it and said that we would see what language could be worked out. Frankly, there was nothing in the language that could be worked out which the House felt it could support. But it was considered.

The Senator is eternally vigilant. We are at the point of legislation on an appropriation bill, especially since the Senator has had his day in court before, which is why I have to make this point. I would be in favor of language in the

report, as suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts, which would point out the problem, emphasize it, and underscore it, and ask for a report on these matters to the Congress.

Frankly, I will not permit myself to favor a report before there is any action at all, because that stirs up everything, and a new start is made. But the Senator from New York is entitled to the utmost consideration in these matters—as any Senator is.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Mississippi. I emphasize this point that this question involves only a case in which an identical installation is built somewhere else to do the work or perform the function of the abandoned facility. I suppose many Senators have had some installations taken out of their States. That is one thing; but this problem involves a very limited area, in which an installation is taken out, and a similar facility is built somewhere else. It seems to me difficult to justify that sort of action on grounds of economy.

I recognize the practical problem involved in endeavoring to get through an amendment in the face of united opposition from the distinguished committee, but we feel that many Senators have this problem and would be deeply appreciative, if it could be discussed in conference and if some language could be incorporated in the conference report which would make it clear that it would require unusual circumstances to justify doing the sort of thing which my amendment would prevent the Department of Defense from doing.

I would be the last one to wish to tie the hands of the Secretary of Defense or our armed services in any way in the proper performance of their functions, but some eyebrows have been raised over certain things which have gone on in the recent past. I believe that it is important that there be a continuing surveillance of this problem by the Appropriations Committee, as well as by the Armed Services Committee which the Senator serves so ably.

Therefore, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Mississippi and shall not press the amendment at this time.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's remarks. I assure him that we are in sympathy with his problem; but we could hardly carry through the remedy proposed.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I would like to join my able colleague from New York in requesting that the Conference Committee give very serious consideration to the wording of our proposal, which was initially incorporated in amendment No. 1076 which Senator KEATING and I introduced to H.R. 10300, the military construction authorization bill. That amendment's wording was as follows:

Sec. 610. No funds shall be authorized to be expended by this bill for the purpose of constructing new facilities in other States to replace facilities at installations ordered

reduced or closed pursuant to the announcements of the Secretary of Defense dated December 12, 1963, or April 24, 1964, for "economy reasons."

That amendment was intended to prevent the Defense Department from spending funds to construct new facilities to replace facilities that were ordered closed pursuant to the announcements of the Secretary of Defense on December 12, 1963 or April 24, 1964. The amendment was considered by the Conference Committee on the military construction authorization bill, now enacted as Public Law 88-390, but was not adopted. Its purpose of insuring true economy with respect to the transfer of functions of installations ordered closed to installations in other States to be built, is, I believe, a most worthy one. I hope very much the conferees on the pending bill will give serious consideration to the intent of the proposal which Senator KEATING and I have advanced and will include language in their report to implement it.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has a point he wishes to make at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator. We in Massachusetts are acutely aware of the problem the Senator has outlined in the closing of the Watertown Arsenal, which has been an arsenal in the Army for more than 100 years.

Certainly, we are very sympathetic. We want to get something in the conference report to cover this item. The Senator realizes, I believe, that the conference report is for the House alone. The Senate can only get in the conference report what the House Members agree to put in.

I assure the Senator that I agree with the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. We shall try to have the item included in the conference report.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate that statement.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from New York.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is only one item concerning Florida. This came up late. It was discussed at some length when the authorization bill was being approved. It had to do with the Sanford Naval Air Station. I believe the question arose from the fact that the Navy decided to locate its bases of operations for long-range reconnaissance after their original budget request had been made up.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi if the item requested by the Navy to complete or to continue its increased facilities at that station is represented by the \$2,004,000 item, which I notice is included in the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. All four items for the Sanford naval installation are included in the bill. They are not included in the House version. But I believe that is due, as the Senator

said, to the lateness of their presentation.

We hope to have these items included in the conference report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it the understanding of the Senator that the Navy states very frankly that it made a change in its plans after the original budget request on this item, and that it is highly important in order to have it fulfill its mission in the South Atlantic and Caribbean area, that its request be granted as quickly as possible, so as to accommodate the long-range reconnaissance aircraft?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has correctly described the situation. We consider it to be an important item. We feel it will appeal to the House Members in conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the assistance which the Senator from Mississippi has rendered. The Senator knows that I never take up any military matters with him or with other members of the committee, except upon such a showing as this. My understanding has been that the Navy air authorities feel this is an urgent matter which should be taken care of this year.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his courtesy in this matter.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the interest of the Senator. I believe this item will survive the conference.

I thank the staff members who have been so faithful in their service. I thank Mr. V. M. Rexroad, the clerk to the subcommittee, and Mrs. Gloria Butland, who have rendered faithful and outstanding service.

I again thank the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] as well as other members of the subcommittee.

I yield the floor. We are ready for a vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I compliment the chairman on the conscientiousness of his work.

At the outset of my remarks let me pay tribute to the chairman of our subcommittee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] who once again has done a careful and painstaking job of reviewing the money requests for items in the military construction program. He has followed this bill with care through the authorization process where he and I sit on the Senate Committee on Armed Services when such matters are considered for authorization and again when they come before the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The result has been a carefully developed bill which I heartily support because it adequately cares for the needs of our military in the field of construction and at the same time it has effected savings which will benefit our overall economy.

The major sums involved in this bill are for defense and training establishments. In these two areas economies are difficult, for we cannot stint in the training of our men or in the retaliatory protection our missile bases give our Nation. As war plans change, our emphasis

August 8

seems to go in these two directions: Greater emphasis on the qualities of the individual soldier who must be trained in self-reliance under the most adverse conditions, and greater emphasis on the heavy retaliatory forces of the Air Force. Speaking from the Massachusetts point of view, our contribution is in the scientific and industrial backup which these activities need. But the Nation needs these facilities which form the base of our armed services.

I should like to speak first on the problem of general decisions which were made effecting this bill and then I should like to direct the attention of the Senate to some of the more important specific items considered in this bill.

One of the largest annual requests which is made is for family housing for the military in this country and around the world. My concern has not been so much over the amount of the annual construction cost but rather with the number of units which are already in our inventory and on which we pay in this bill over \$617 million for operation, maintenance and debt payments. We have in our housing inventory at this time 374,398 units. The budget request this year was for 12,500 units and the House appropriations bill funded 9,877 units at a cost of \$177.5 million. In our consideration of the family housing we decided to treat the matter as we have in the past 2 fiscal years and funded 7,500 houses at a cost of \$134.8 million, thereby reducing the cost by \$32.7 million. We treated this as though all of the units were authorized and available to be funded, and we have suggested that the Department determine the priority in building 7,500 homes for which we have recommended funds.

Turning now to the problem of bachelor officers quarters—we have decided to fund approximately one-half of the \$22.2 million and again request the Departments to place a priority on where these bachelor officer quarters should be constructed. We have thus effected a savings of over \$9.5 million and there remains in this bill as it is presented to the Senate the sum of \$12.6 million for the construction of bachelor officers quarters.

Turning now to some of the more important individual items which the committee considered in developing this bill, I should first mention the fieldhouse for the Air Force Academy which was denied by the House and on which considerable testimony was heard when the matter was before our committee. The House action was based primarily on the cost of the structure, as well as the planning which had gone into it. The House denied the item on the basis of the cost which was estimated at \$6.9 million. When the matter was presented to the Senate it was on the basis of a cost estimate of \$6.2 million. I, for one, feel very strongly that the Air Force Academy should be given a fieldhouse—not only because the other service academies have such an athletic structure, but also because it is badly needed for athletic activity which cannot be conducted on the outside in inclement weather.

I would be less than frank if I did not state that I have been deeply concerned over the many problems in construction which have been experienced at the Air Force Academy in the past. I need not recount that there have been serious defects discovered which could have been eliminated by better design and engineering. For this reason I was very glad to see this building delayed for 1 year. We have voted for the inclusion of \$350,000 for planning money so that when the matter is next presented to our committee we will have a better assurance of the cost and the design adequacy for constructing such an expensive building.

I will not dwell at length on the money which has been included in this bill to permit the move of the 5th Army Headquarters from Chicago to Fort Sheridan, Ill. I discussed this matter when the authorization bill was before the Senate. I feel this is a necessary move and that savings will be achieved by making available the present headquarters for the use of other Government agencies presently renting space in Chicago. We have removed from this bill an elaborate underground communications center and the cost figure has thus been reduced in excess of \$1 million by this reduction.

Turning now to the matter of gymnasiums, athletic and recreational facilities and commissaries. The committee has attempted to determine the need for these, based on the remoteness of the area in which the base is located, and the fact that such facilities are not available in the surrounding communities. We feel that such matters are required by our servicemen who are called upon to perform duty in remote areas.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I want to say again that this bill has been carefully considered and I feel it is deserving of the support of every Member of the Senate. It allows a measured increase of military facilities and housing which is determined by the pace of our defense needs. I am pleased to support our able chairman in presenting this bill and in recommending its passage.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, construction funds for fiscal year 1965 were requested for only one military installation in Utah, Hill Air Force Base. The military construction authorization bill passed by Congress, approved renovation and modification of facilities at Hill Air Force Base in the amount of \$2,108,000.

Unfortunately, when H.R. 11369 was considered by the House, a misunderstanding arose in regard to maintenance facilities to be used for repair and overhaul of the F-4-C aircraft. Two members of the House committee interrogated Air Force witnesses as to the possibility of F-4-C maintenance being accomplished by the Navy or at some other Air Force installation without the necessity of expenditure of additional funds. Although the Air Force made a strong presentation, the House Appropriations Committee eliminated all funds for the F-4-C mission at Hill Air Force Base, leaving only \$321,000 in the bill for

construction of a new gymnasium at the Utah installation.

The decision to place the F-4-C maintenance mission at Hill Air Force Base was made only after careful and detailed studies by the Office of the Secretary of Defense and by the Secretary of the Air Force. These studies included review of capability of all other Air Force installations and research into the possibility of having the Navy perform cross-service maintenance on the F-4-C, since this is a jointly used aircraft.

These resource utilization studies concluded that Hill Air Force Base was superior to any other air materiel area for the F/RF-4C mission.

All of the funds requested for the F-4-C mission are for modification and updating of existing facilities to permit Hill Air Force Base to perform work on new super-high thrust engines. Because modern jet aircraft are constantly being improved, it is necessary from time to time to modify Air Force facilities which perform overhaul and maintenance missions. Hill Air Force Base will utilize approximately \$21 million in existing facilities in support of the F-4-C mission. The nearly \$2 million requested in the military construction bill will permit modification and minor facility additions required for the F/RF-4C maintenance program.

The line items required are:

Turbojet engine test cell, \$244,000; communications and electronics shop, \$590,000; logistical facility depot, \$738,000; sound suppressor engine runup hangar, \$215,000.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the Senate will concur with the Appropriations Committee and fully restore the \$1,787,000 deleted by the House for modification of facilities at Hill Air Force Base, so that there will not be any delay in performing this assigned mission.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, speaking as one who is not on this subcommittee, I appreciate the fine work that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and their associates have done on this committee.

All Senators possess the same view that I have, that on these matters under no circumstances should a Senator make a request unless it is based on something that he has been told by the components of the service is of great importance to include. That has been my own method of procedure.

We find Senators to be most competent in meeting what they understand to be the real needs for the protection and defense of our country.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. His attitude is always helpful. I appreciate it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a comparative statement of appropriations for fiscal year 1964, and the estimates and amounts recommended for the bill for the fiscal year 1965 be printed at this point in the Record.

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

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1964, and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1965

Item	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965	House bill
Military construction, Army	\$200,646,000	\$408,000,000	\$301,000,000	\$311,977,000	+\$111,331,000	-\$96,023,000	+\$10,977,000
Military construction, Navy	198,853,000	278,000,000	247,000,000	250,899,000	+52,046,000	-27,101,000	+3,899,000
Military construction, Air Force	468,276,000	406,000,000	346,000,000	342,986,000	-125,289,000	-63,014,000	-3,014,000
Military construction, Defense Agencies	24,000,000	34,000,000	12,656,000	12,656,000	-11,344,000	-21,344,000	
Military construction, Army Reserve	4,500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	+500,000		
Military construction, Naval Reserve	6,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	+1,000,000		
Military construction, Air Force Reserve	4,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	+1,000,000		
Military construction Army National Guard	5,700,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	10,800,000	+5,100,000	+4,800,000	+4,800,000
Military construction, Air National Guard	16,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	-2,000,000		
Loran station	20,500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	-15,500,000		
<b>Total, military construction</b>	<b>948,474,000</b>	<b>1,168,000,000</b>	<b>948,656,000</b>	<b>966,318,000</b>	<b>+16,844,000</b>	<b>-202,682,000</b>	<b>+16,662,000</b>
<b>FAMILY HOUSING</b>							
Family housing, Army:							
Construction	34,681,000	52,728,000	40,446,000	32,216,000	-2,465,000	-20,512,000	-8,230,000
Operation, maintenance, and debt payment	183,396,000	173,328,000	173,328,000	173,328,000	-10,068,000		
Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps:							
Construction	68,248,000	96,219,000	72,481,000	59,144,000	-9,104,000	-37,075,000	-13,337,000
Operation, maintenance, and debt payment	98,944,000	97,739,000	97,739,000	97,739,000	+3,795,000		
Family housing, Air Force:							
Construction	61,027,000	88,635,000	64,013,500	52,873,000	-8,154,000	-35,762,000	-11,140,500
Operation, maintenance, and debt payment	193,514,000	198,859,000	198,859,000	198,859,000	+5,345,000		
Family housing, Defense agencies:							
Construction	50,000	981,000	981,000	981,000	+931,000		
Operation, maintenance, and debt payment	2,546,000	2,511,000	2,511,000	2,511,000	-35,000		
<b>Total, family housing</b>	<b>637,406,000</b>	<b>711,000,000</b>	<b>650,358,500</b>	<b>617,651,000</b>	<b>-19,755,000</b>	<b>-93,340,000</b>	<b>-32,707,500</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,585,880,000</b>	<b>1,879,000,000</b>	<b>1,599,014,500</b>	<b>1,582,969,000</b>	<b>-2,911,000</b>	<b>-296,031,000</b>	<b>-16,046,000</b>

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the total appropriation recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee amounts to \$1,582,969,000. This is an amount of \$16,045,500 under allowances provided by the House and \$296,431,000 under the budget estimate of \$1,879 million.

For military construction for the Active Forces of the Department of the Army, the committee has approved an amount totaling \$311,977,000. This is an increase of \$10,977,000 over the amount of \$301 million approved by the House, and a decrease of \$96,023,000 from the budget estimate of \$408 million.

For military construction for the Active Forces of the Department of the Navy, the committee has approved an amount totaling \$250,899,000. This is an increase of \$3,899,000 over the \$247 million allowed by the House and a decrease of \$27,101,000 from the budget estimate of \$278 million.

For military construction for the Active Forces of the Department of the Air Force, the committee has approved an amount totaling \$342,986,000. This is a reduction of \$3,014,000 from the \$346 million allowed by the House and a decrease of \$63,014,000 from the budget estimate of \$406 million.

For the Army Reserve, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$5 million, which was the budget estimate figure and the amount allowed by the House.

For the Naval Reserve, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$7 million, the budget estimate, and the same amount as was allowed by the House.

For the Air Force Reserve, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$5 million, the budget estimate and the same amount as was allowed by the House.

For the Army National Guard, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$10,800,000, which is \$4,800,000

more than the House allowance and budget estimate of \$6 million.

For the Air National Guard, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$14 million, the budget estimate, and the same amount as was allowed by the House.

For the Department of Defense agencies, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$12,656,000. This is \$21,344,000 below the budget estimate and is in agreement with the amount allowed by the House. The appropriation breakdown is as follows:

Defense Atomic Support Agency, \$6,546,000; National Security Agency, \$1,711,000; Defense Supply Agency, \$1,954,000; and other projects, \$743,000. This appropriation recognizes a saving of \$298,000 from prior years funds for which an adjustment has been made. The committee also recommends for the Department of Defense general support program, including planning, design and minor construction, \$2 million. The committee has approved an appropriation of \$5 million for Loran stations. This is the same as the budget request.

For the Department of Defense family housing account, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$617,651,000. This appropriation consists of the following: For Army \$205,544,000; for Navy \$156,883,000; for Air Force \$251,732,000; for Defense agencies, \$3,492,000.

FAMILY HOUSING

Mr. President, at this point I would like to go into more detailed discussion of the Department of Defense family housing. The Department of Defense has a worldwide housing inventory of 374,398 housing units with an acquisition value of \$3,260 million. There are 286,607 units located in the United States and 87,791 units overseas. In maintenance and operation and debt payment alone, these housing units cost the American taxpayer \$469,926,000. From 1952 to about 1960, the armed

services, under the Wherry Act, the Capehart Act, and Appropriations Act, built approximately 16,000 units of housing per year. I point out these figures to show that in the past, the Congress has been rather generous in providing homes for our service people. In the past 2 years, the Congress has provided 7,500 units a year. For fiscal year 1965, the Department of Defense asked for 12,500 units. The authorizing act provided 9,886 units and the House Appropriations Committee reduced the housing units further to 9,590. The Senate Appropriations Committee, after due consideration recommended 7,500 new housing units. At this point, I would like to break down the cost figures.

The Department of Defense requested approval of a family housing program for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Defense agencies amounting to \$711 million. This amount was reduced by the Congress in the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1965—Public Law 88-390—to \$660,605,000. The House of Representatives, in the appropriation bill H.R. 11369 which this bill accompanies, has further reduced the amount to \$650,358,500. The committee has approved the amount of \$617,651,000. This figure includes, for Army construction, \$32,216,000, and for maintenance, operations, and debt payment, \$173,328,000. For the Navy, the committee recommends for construction, \$59,144,000, and for operation, maintenance, and debt payment, \$97,739,000. For the Air Force, the committee recommends for construction, \$52,873,000, and for operation, maintenance, and debt payment, \$198,859,000. For Defense agencies, the committee recommends for construction, \$981,000, and for operation and maintenance, \$2,511,000.

The 7,500 new housing units will cost \$134,804,000 broken down as follows: Army 1,621 housing units at a cost of \$29,116,000; Navy 3,149 housing units at

a cost of \$56,594,000, which includes 100 units for the naval shipyard, Bremerton, Wash.; and for the Air Force 2,730 housing units at a cost of \$49,094,000.

Mr. President, I want it clearly understood that the committee did not delete any specific housing project from the bill. A total of 9,877 houses are on the eligible list, but funds are made available only to provide for the construction of 7,500 units. The committee charges the Department of Defense with the responsibility of selecting the housing units and the sites on which they will be built on the basis of priority within each of the services.

Mr. President, the Appropriations Committee believes that the housing program proposed is a realistic program and one which will adequately meet the Department of Defense requirements.

#### UNOBLIGATED BALANCES

One of the large restorations made to the bill from the House reduction is that of the unobligated balances. The restoration for the three services amounted to \$15,779,000. This is the largest restoration made in the entire bill.

The amounts restored were approved by the committee on the basis of the testimony presented by each of the services that these cuts would have the effect of preventing construction of approved projects. According to testimony, all of the unobligated balances are required to construct or complete authorized projects previously cleared by this committee.

The committee was advised by letter dated July 24, 1964, from the Deputy Secretary of Defense:

Another serious reduction made by the House is the cut in the estimate not associated with any adjustments to the line items, but a lump-sum reduction against the total program estimate. We have no basis to forecast, at this time, bids for the items supporting the program which may generate a savings in the magnitude of the House cut. As in the past, we hope that minor savings will be generated, but any such savings will be utilized to finance projects not previously approved by the Congress, only after our normal practice of requesting approval from the Appropriations Committees. Thus, the Congress through these committee approvals exercises control over the use of savings or surplus funds which may be generated throughout the course of a fiscal year.

We most strongly recommend these restorations to the House approved estimates.

The committee recognizes that certain projects will be constructed at a cost less than was anticipated, but these savings will be needed for other projects for which bids are not favorable and to finance true emergency items which arise during the year. Many of these projects, such as work in Vietnam which this committee recently approved, cannot await normal programming cycles without adversely affecting the defense effort.

Furthermore, facilities destroyed by fire, typhoon, and earthquake must also be funded from savings or project deletions within these military construction appropriations.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Mr. President, to review briefly, the committee approved an appropriation of \$327,777,000 for military construction within the Department of the Army. This represents an appropriation of \$311,977,000 for the active forces, \$5 million for the Army Reserve and \$10,800,000 for the Army National Guard. This is a reduction of \$91,223,000 from the budget of \$419 million. Later in my discussion, I will cover the National Guard items.

The program before the Congress represents the Army's most urgent construction needs and has been coordinated with Army programs related to materiel and research and development. Many of the projects in this bill meet the requirements generated by the expansion of existing Army missions and the replacement of existing temporary inadequate facilities. By the way of explanation, nearly one-fourth of the Army's physical plant is comprised of temporary World War II structures. These facilities were constructed more than 20 years ago for rapid mobilization for World War II. The committee is pleased to note that the Army is instituting a replacement program particularly in the field of troop housing. Fort Hood, Tex. and Fort Dix, N.J., have extensive troop housing programs in this bill.

Mr. President, rather than go through the bill, item by item or by the Army's organizational structure, I will proceed to outline by function and mission groupings that are used within the Department of Defense for all programming. The first category is Continental Air and Missile Defense Forces for which an appropriation of \$600,000 was approved. I might say that at this point in the authorizing bill, this program was reduced by \$45 million. This was mainly authorization requested to move the Nike Hercules batteries to inland positions. The second grouping, General Purpose Forces, the committee approved approximately \$60 million. Major items included in this appropriation are aviation support facilities, additional training and maneuver areas for the STRAC divisions at Fort Riley and Fort Carson. In addition, troop housing complexes were approved at Fort Hood, Fort Dix, and Fort Carson. Improvements in our logistical facilities have been made in Korea. The third category, Airlift and Sea Forces, contains a small request of \$1,200,000 to enable the Army to relocate activities from Fort Mason to Oakland Army Terminal in keeping with the Department of Defense program to increase efficiency and reduce costs through consolidation wherever feasible.

The next grouping is research and development for which the committee recommends an appropriation of approximately \$40 million. The major portion of this appropriation contains \$30.6 million to provide facilities supporting the test and evaluation of the Nike X system, upon which a decision concerning future deployment of the antimissile system will be based.

Also included in the aforementioned sum are projects for a clinical research building at Edgewood Arsenal and Range Instrumentation Facilities at Whitesands Missile Range.

The last grouping for the Army concerns general support which includes training, supply, maintenance, military services, communications networks, and Army Security Agency requirements. I should add, also, that included in this category are the funds for planning, design, minor construction and access roads. An item of special interest is the construction at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, for which the committee approved \$20,228,000. The bulk of this item is for the construction of the new Washington Hall barracks complex. I might say in passing that this is the beginning of a \$10 million program to renovate the physical plant of the Army Military Academy. Construction at West Point is a very expensive proposition, due to the fact that the construction costs approximately 100 percent more than comparable construction in the Washington area. This increase in construction cost is due primarily to the fact that West Point is located practically on solid rock, labor costs and transportation costs.

#### ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

The committee approved \$10,800,000 for the Army National Guard. This is an increase of \$4,800,000 over the budget estimate. This increase will allow the National Guard to proceed with a firm program of 40 armory and 25 nonarmory projects.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$257,899,000 for military construction for the Department of the Navy. This amount is composed of two parts—\$250,899,000 for the Active Naval and Marine Corps forces, and \$7 million for the Reserve forces. It is \$27,101,000 less than the budget estimate of \$278 million and \$3,899,000 greater than the appropriation approved by the House of Representatives.

This year's program of the Navy is a continuation of a long-range program for the orderly development and modernization of its shore installations. The primary aim is to improve fleet readiness. This objective will be achieved by providing proper facilities to support modern ships, aircraft and weapons, updated training programs and adequate personnel accommodations.

This Navy program consists of six program groupings. Program I, strategic retaliatory forces: This includes a total of approximately \$8 million for Polaris support facilities. It will provide necessary facilities for the continued buildup of the Navy's Polaris weapon system and will increase the ability of this deterrent force to prepare for and, if necessary, to wage warfare in ocean areas generally far removed from our shores.

Program II, continental air and missile defense forces: This includes the total of \$3,484,000 for projects in support of our oceanographic facilities, missile

defenses and antisubmarine defense effort.

Program III, general purpose forces: This includes a total of \$109 million for ships, aircraft, and weapon system support. These line items support operations of the fleet in protecting our sea lines of communication. This program also contains those projects required for the training and effective utilization of the Marine Corps in support of national objectives.

Program IV, Reserve and Guard Forces: This program includes a total of \$7 million for facilities required in support of essential Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve training to provide a cadre for immediate mobilization in the event of any national emergency.

Program V, research and development: This program includes a total of \$25 million for new and expanded facilities required to insure technological development of our fleet units.

Program VI, general support: This program includes a total of \$100 million for repair, expansion, or replacement of many facilities which now provide overall logistic support to the operating forces, but which are nearing the end of their useful life.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The committee has approved a total of \$361,986,000 for military construction: \$342,986,000 for the Active Forces, and \$19 million for the Reserve Forces. These amounts are exclusive of family housing. The committee allowance represents a reduction of \$63,014,000 in the budget estimate of \$425 million and is \$126,289,000 below the funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1964.

The \$342,986,000 program for construction of facilities for the Active Forces includes projects at 144 of our major installations worldwide. Of these, 107 are in the 50 States and 37 are outside. In addition, the program provides facilities at a number of other locations and minor sites, including those of the A.C. & W, networks, communications sites, missile range stations, and sites of classified activities.

A major portion of the strategic program, or 28 percent of the total, provides facilities in direct support of the forces of the Strategic Air Command. This amount consists of facilities for the intercontinental ballistic missiles, and for manned bombers and their supporting tanker aircraft.

As the Senator knows, we have completed the construction of facilities for the Atlas and Titan systems and these missiles are now in an operational status. The construction of facilities for the first four wings of Minuteman is complete. Construction for the fifth wing is approximately 98 percent complete and well ahead of schedule. A contract for construction of the sixth Minuteman wing, sited at Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak., was awarded in February of this year. The Grand Forks wing will be the first of the improved Minuteman, or Minuteman II, as it has now been designated.

Included in the missile package is \$90.2 million for additional facilities to

support these intercontinental ballistic missile systems, primarily the Minuteman. Of this amount, \$57.6 million will provide facilities for a single Minuteman II squadron to be collocated with one of the first five wings. A further \$27 million included here will be used to complete the facilities for the sixth wing previously mentioned. The program also includes \$1.1 million for technical-type support facilities at existing support bases.

Aerospace defense continues to be a vital requirement for national security. Further improvements are needed and this construction approval includes approximately \$10 million to continue providing our aerospace defense forces a more survivable, dispersed, and flexible fighter-interceptor capability and ground control environment.

Projects directly associated with improved capabilities for fighter-interceptor aircraft were approved in the amount of \$3.2 million. These projects consist of improvements to aircraft ready shelters and alert facilities and the construction of additional maintenance and support facilities at the locations of the interceptor units.

A total of \$7.8 million was approved for facility improvements at bases of our control and warning systems.

A substantial portion of the Air Force construction program, over \$41 million is devoted to facilities for operation and direct support of the general purpose forces. These forces consist primarily of the tactical fighter and tactical reconnaissance units, and include our oversea forces. The projects we approved are needed to give an operational capability to new units of these forces and to new types of equipment.

The committee is pleased that the Air Force has been able to accommodate major portions of the expanding airlift capabilities of transport aircraft with existing base facilities. Some additional facilities have been added, however, primarily to provide adequate servicing and maintenance facilities for new types of transports. This construction request contains \$9 million for support of the airlift forces. Of this total, \$6.4 million will provide necessary facilities for MATS and TAC transport aircraft at eight bases inside the United States.

We all recognize the need to stay ahead in development of military capabilities and the tremendous military and economic advantages to be derived by our research and development efforts. The level of research required or to be undertaken is, of course, no automatic indicator of the extent of associated facility or construction requirements. The unique and technical requirements of many approved R. & D. programs are such, however, that provision of additional or special facilities is inherent to accomplishment of the research effort.

To provide such facility support for Air Force research and development programs, we approved appropriations in the amount of \$27 million.

Projects totaling approximately \$155 million are contained in the general support grouping. This portion covers gen-

eral force support services and various activities and missions not included in the primary systems and programs previously discussed.

The \$25 million for design will provide those funds needed in fiscal year 1965 primarily to complete design of the fiscal year 1965 military construction program and to initiate design of the fiscal year 1966 construction program.

The committee approved a total of \$13.2 million for minor construction in fiscal year 1965. These funds are applied only to urgently required projects not otherwise authorized by law. Each project so funded is estimated to cost over \$25,000 with a maximum limit of \$200,000. Projects in excess of \$25,000 must be approved by the Secretary of the Air Force and if over \$50,000, by the Secretary of Defense. Therefore, all Air Force minor construction projects funded from this appropriation are approved at the Washington level. The present atmosphere of rapid change and technological advances, and the need to respond to worldwide military contingencies, makes the availability of this authority essential.

The amount of \$6 million is approved to finance the Air Force portion of requirements for construction of off-base access roads and improvement or relocation of existing public highways where the need is generated by Air Force operations. Right-of-way acquisition and construction work related to these roads is performed for the Air Force by the Bureau of Public Roads after certification by the Secretary of Defense. One-half of the funds requested will be used for provision of access to the ballistic missile sites. The balance will be applied to improvement of access to existing bases.

Mr. President, this completes the presentation of the military construction appropriation bill for fiscal year 1965. The committee believes this to be an austere bill; however, we are certain that only those essential items were approved which will materially contribute to the combat effectiveness of the U.S. military forces both home and abroad.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment, and that no points of order be considered waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "\$301,000,000" and insert "\$311,977,000".

On page 2, line 14, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "\$247,000,000" and insert "\$250,899,000".

On page 2, at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "\$346,000,000" and insert "\$342,986,000".

On page 4, at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$10,800,000".

On page 5, line 17, after the word "law", to strike out "\$650,358,500" and insert "\$617,651,000".



18090

On page 5, line 22, after the word "construction", to strike out "\$40,448,000" and insert "\$32,218,000".

On page 6, line 2, after the word "construction", to strike out "\$72,481,000" and insert "\$59,144,000".

On page 6, line 6, after the word "construction", to strike out "\$64,013,500" and insert "\$52,873,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the questions is, Shall it pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in the family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut

[Mr. DODD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 523 Leg.]

YEAS—64

Alken	Hartke	Morse
Allott	Hayden	Mundt
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Nelson
Beall	Hill	Neuberger
Bennett	Holland	Pastore
Bible	Hruska	Prouty
Boggs	Humphrey	Proxmire
Brewster	Inouye	Ribicoff
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Robertson
Carlson	Keating	Russell
Case	Kuchel	Saling
Church	Magnuson	Saltonstall
Cooper	Mansfield	Smith
Cotton	McCarthy	Sparkman
Dominick	McClellan	Stennis
Douglas	McGee	Thurmond
Eastland	McGovern	Walters
Ellender	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	Mechem	Williams, Del.
Fong	Metcalf	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	Miller	
Gruening	Monroney	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—36

Anderson	Hart	Muskie
Bayh	Jackson	Pearson
Byrd, Va.	Javits	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Randolph
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Clark	Kennedy	Simpson
Curtis	Lausche	Smathers
Dirksen	Long, Mo.	Symington
Dodd	Long, La.	Talmadge
Edmondson	McNamara	Tower
Goldwater	Morton	Yarborough
Gore	Moss	Young, N. Dak.

So the bill (H.R. 11369) was passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the vote whereby the bill was passed be reconsidered.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. STENNIS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. HRUSKA conferees on the part of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
 APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1275, H.R. 11202, the Agriculture Department appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11202) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, we now have under consideration H.R. 11202, the annual supply bill providing appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies. Appropriations in the bill as recommended by the committee are \$5,338,672,525, an increase of \$56,176,525 over the House bill—as adjusted. It is \$344,784,075 below the amended budget estimates and \$907,624,690 under the 1964 Appropriation Act.

May I digress to say that printed records of the hearings are available. Printed reports of the committee are available. I believe all Senators will be able to inform themselves completely about the details of this rather long bill from the papers which are available to each of them.

Subsequent to the passage of the bill by the House, amended budget estimates were sent directly to the Senate in Senate Documents 82, 83, and 85, involving increases totaling \$46,250,000 and decreases totaling \$51,547,000 for a net decrease of \$5,297,000. All of the decreases had already been made by the House.

Title I of the bill covers the general activities of the Department; title II covers the credit agencies; title III covers corporations; and title IV, the Farm Credit Administration. For titles I and II covering the general activities and credit agencies, the committee recommends \$1,630,579,524—a decrease of \$20,329,690 below 1964 appropriations, \$81,176,525 over the House bill—as adjusted—and \$1,544,075 below the amended budget estimates.