

1955 - July

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8299

Mr. MANSFIELD. Truer words were never spoken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished members of the Senate conference committee on defense appropriations for their successful efforts which resulted in the preservation of funds for the Marine Corps.

It means that the Marine Corps will be able to keep itself in trim shape and be ready, as it has in the past, to defend our Nation in time of emergency.

I feel that this is a major victory for national defense, and, while my feelings on this matter are well known, I wish again to thank the distinguished members of the conference committee, and especially the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

I believe this action will prove in the future to be very beneficial to our national defense.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendments; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RICHARDS, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. VORYS, and Mr. JUDD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 928. An act for the relief of Eugenio Malda; and

H. R. 3194. An act for the relief of E. S. Berney.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN MILITARY, NAVAL, AND AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair lays

before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H. R. 6829.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which is in the nature of a complete substitute for the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senate is considering the so-called military construction bill for the budget year 1956.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize construction by the military departments and the Central Intelligence Agency in a total amount of \$2,357,313,300. This authorization is distributed \$527,027,000 for the Army; \$571,620,300 for the Navy; \$1,205,170,000 for the Air Force; and \$53,500,000 for the Central Intelligence Agency. I invite attention of Senators to the fact that the committee report contains a breakdown by States and by military department of the authorizations contained in this bill. The bill as introduced at the request of the Department of Defense totalled \$2,354,352,300. However, subsequent to the bill's introduction, the Department requested amendments increasing the authorization by some \$41 million. These amendments were for the purposes of providing additional facilities to accommodate the increased production of B-52's recently approved by the Congress, and to provide facilities for a new technique in air defense. Thus, despite the fact that the committee has made changes in the bill, our reductions unfortunately have been largely obscured by the addition of the authorizations requested after the bill was introduced.

In round figures, the pending bill as now presented is \$28 million under the total budget estimate submitted, and \$11 million, in round figures, under the bill as it passed the House.

The reductions and additions made by the committee are set forth in the committee report in summary form at the end of the title to which they pertain. At the conclusion of my statement, I shall be glad to discuss any item in which any Senator is particularly interested.

In the Army title, \$160 million, or 30 percent of the program, is for continuing the antiaircraft facilities commonly known as Nike sites. Sixty-four million dollars is for troop housing and troop support facilities. Eighty-eight million dollars is for family housing, \$38 million is for land acquisition. Twenty-six million dollars is to continue construction in Alaska and Okinawa, two of our most important strategic areas today. The remaining authorization, approximately 30 percent of the total, is intended to provide facilities for research and development, training, community facilities, medical facilities, and other miscellaneous requirements.

The Navy title, which totals \$571 million, constitutes another step in the program to keep the Navy's shore establishment adequate to service its ships, aircraft, and weapons. Approximately \$345

million of the Navy authorization is for operational facilities. Troop housing, which means barracks and bachelor officers quarters, constitutes about \$71 million. Family housing makes up \$56 million of the total. The remainder of the Navy program is for land acquisitions, research and development, training facilities, the acquisition of aviation easements around naval air stations, a pollution abatement program, and for welfare and recreational facilities.

The Air Force authorization is greater than that of the Army and the Navy combined. As Senators know, we are striving for a 137-wing Air Force in 1957. This Air Force construction program is intended to provide the additional facilities to support that force level. The Air Force construction is spread among 255 bases—151 are in the United States and 104 overseas. There are two new bases in the Air Force program. One at the Buckingham Weapons Center in Florida and the other a new Air Defense base in the Milwaukee, Wis., area. As has been true in recent years, the Strategic Air Command gets a lion's share of the Air Force authorization. Viewing the program from categories of construction, airfield pavements is by far the largest item.

Title IV of the bill authorizes the construction of a headquarters installation for the Central Intelligence Agency. I believe it is widely recognized, in Congress at least, that the Central Intelligence Agency is scattered among several temporary buildings in Washington, and that it could operate more effectively and economically in buildings designed to suit its requirements.

There is local opposition to some of the items in this bill, principally those pertaining to land acquisition. The committee has afforded everyone who advised us of his desire to do so, an opportunity to testify. Committee action on the more controversial items is summarized in the committee report on page 11. Some of our decisions were difficult ones and we claim no infallibility. We have, however, exercised our best judgment, bearing in mind the requirements of national defense and the views of the persons most directly affected by our actions.

Of special significance, I think, is the housing authorization contained in this bill. Scattered throughout titles I, II, and III are authorizations for the construction of almost 17,000 units of military family housing. In the realization that this request constitutes only a small part of the requirements for family housing, these authorizations have been left virtually intact. In approving this authorization, we have not been unmindful of the military housing authorization contained in the bill reported by the Banking and Currency Committee which later passed the Senate. That bill would provide \$1,350,000,000 in authority to guarantee mortgages on housing for military personnel. This authority could be used over the next 3 years and, if fully utilized, could provide 100,000 units. It is reported that this title has been eliminated from the bill in the House and we are unable to

estimate what will emerge from conference.

There is no questioning the fact that the need for additional family housing is one of the most serious problems of the Department of Defense. The Department has considered various methods, including deferred payment through annual appropriations, lease purchase contracts, working-capital funds utilizing unexpended balances of prior appropriations, creation of a military housing corporation with authority to issue bonds, and direct appropriations. The Department assured the committee that the simplest method, and the cheapest one in the long run, involved the providing of public quarters through the traditional use of funds directly appropriated for that purpose. I invite the attention of Senators to the charts appearing on pages 26 and 27 of the committee hearings. These charts illustrate that after 20 years these houses have paid for themselves, including interest and the cost of maintenance and operation.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I should like to add one thought in connection with the housing matter.

Mr. President, the full committee report points out the problem with reference to a housing program for the military authorities, put into one pattern. We do not know what provision, if any, for military family housing will be included in the so-called housing bill as it finally passes the Congress. There is need for more housing than is carried in the bill which is now under consideration. But the Armed Services Committee thinks there should be a complete re-study of the entire program, and it has directed a subcommittee to continue such a study until next January. We hope that by next year a definite centralized program and authority can be established, without duplication, without conflict, and without competition. Many Government agencies have provided family housing for military families. The committee thinks, as does the Secretary of the Department of Defense, that after all is said and done, the best thing in the long run for the Government is to appropriate the funds, build the houses, and then charge rent to the servicemen to be paid from their family allowances, so that in the course of events the Government gets its money back and still has the family housing.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, if my distinguished friend from Mississippi will yield for a brief statement in connection with the committee report, on page 13 there is a comment regarding the Air Force authorization request, referring to an item for air research and development, specifically, the decision of the Air Force to move this division from its present location back to the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, Ohio.

The construction authorization, as I understand, has been removed from Baltimore Air Field, but left in the bill is a provision for a location to be determined.

I was glad to see the comment, not because I am narrow and provincial, but because I feel that the location near Bal-

timore is undesirable. This facility was formerly at Wright-Patterson Airfield. We made no objection at the time it was moved, because we felt that, as Members of Congress, certainly we could trust the leadership of the Air Force in selecting the site which for their purposes would be in order. They selected the present site, and now they find it is not suitable and are asking that the facility be returned to the place where it should be, at Wright-Patterson Airfield. The fact that I come from Ohio is not important, but it is important that this facility be located at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base at Dayton, Ohio. If it were in Mississippi I would feel exactly the same way. If it were in Missouri I would feel exactly as I do now. But I think it is a mistake to move the facility. If it were in the State of Texas I would feel good about it, too.

If the Senator from Mississippi will bear with me for a moment, I should like to state the reasons why we feel the facility should be returned to its former location.

Ohio is the cradle of aviation. It would be a tribute to Dayton to have the facility located in that area. As I stated before, we did not object when the Air Research and Development Headquarters were moved away several years ago, because we had confidence in the good judgment of the Air Force officials, and we were sure they were doing what seemed best to them.

The Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Talbott, is requesting Congress to appropriate money to do the thing which he feels is best for the Air Force. I am sure there is nothing personal about it. I am sure that as a result of his great experience he is suggesting what he feels is essential to the efficiency of the Air Force.

I feel certain that the committee will take a second look. We have been talking about taking second looks. So I trust the committee will take a second look regarding this matter and will consider the value and the need for this facility to be where the Air Force wants it.

Mr. STENNIS. I assure the Senator from Ohio that I think the point he makes is well taken. I am glad he entered into the debate on the question. The committee's action is no refutation of the recommendation which was made by the Secretary of the Air Force. The committee proposes to follow the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio and to leave the question to a decision by the Air Force.

But, in view of the Cook report and the recommendations made to the committee as to the bill, we think the matter should be reexamined, or examined somewhat further. We indicate a willingness to provide a site, the present one being inadequate, but we do not feel like chopping it off at this moment, in spite of the conflict of testimony. So this is our proposal. Since we could not be sufficiently positive, we left the question open.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his cooperation in the matter. I am certain his committee was animated and activated by the

best motives in the interest of the Air Force.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Ohio; I sincerely appreciate his comment.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I wish to make an observation. About 2½ years ago, with the cooperation of the Department of Defense, I made a tour of all the principal producing centers of airframes and air engines throughout the country. At that time the manufacturers of airframes and engines were unanimous in their belief that the facility should be located at Wright Field or near Wright Field. They said it would be a cause of continuing confusion to have it separated from Wright Field.

I was sorry to see that the Cook report raised the question adversely. I believe that the experience of the industry and the present judgment of the Air Force should be taken into consideration. I hope the matter will be looked at from all sides before a decision is made.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the contribution to the discussion which has been made by the Senator from Vermont. He is unusually well qualified to speak on the subject, both from a technical standpoint and also as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. His contribution in this field has been valuable.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. I wish to congratulate my colleague, the junior Senator from Mississippi, and all other members of the committee, for the consideration which they gave the bill to the building of what I understand will be 17,000 family-housing units for the personnel of the Armed Services. I am especially interested because I happen to serve on the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which had very substantial testimony, extending over several days, from those who are interested in the problem. I am particularly interested in the statement which was made by Gen. Curtis LeMay, of the Strategic Air Command, with reference to the serious shortage which exists in satisfactory housing for military personnel as it pertains to his command, and the fact that something must be done, definitely, to retain in the service well-qualified, trained personnel of a type which can carry out its mission in any event.

Would the Senator from Mississippi be good enough to advise me as to whether in the course of the testimony before his committee—because I have not had an opportunity to go through the entire report—the shortage which was estimated to exist at present, as it pertains to the armed services, is somewhere in the vicinity of 300,000 family housing units. Certainly it is necessary to bring up the number of housing units to a point where we can retain our personnel, and adequate housing will be a very real advantage to them.

Mr. STENNIS. About 180,000 family type units are needed in the United

1955

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8301

States. In addition, there is a deficit of 11,000 in the Territories and possessions, and 56,000 in foreign countries. Thus, the total worldwide deficit is now estimated to be 247,000 units.

Mr. PAYNE. That is somewhere near the figure I mentioned. We were told by Assistant Secretary of Defense Floete, when he appeared, that approximately 300,000 units were needed.

It is true that under the direct appropriation it may be possible to continue on the same basis as we are proceeding this year, which is a step forward. It would take approximately 20 years to be able to bring housing up to the point where the shortage can be entirely relieved. That, of course, is the very reason why a provision was included in the housing bill for the construction of military housing by the Department of Defense by the issuance of bonds.

I sincerely hope that there may be both types of housing, in order that the job may be finished as quickly as possible.

Mr. STENNIS. The housing program as a part of the military program is just beginning to get under way, because there were other items which necessarily had to be given preference during the past 3 or 4 years. Almost all the runways had to be extended, and hangars had to be enlarged and, in some cases, replaced by new ones. Everything had to be done with reference to the operational end of the airbases.

Now we are getting around to the housekeeping, and family housing is one of the major items.

I hope the Senator from Maine will agree that since the program is beginning to develop and will have to be sustained over the years, a definite, unified policy should be adopted, and should then move forward on that front.

To that extent, the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which the Senator from Maine is a member, has provided this year that housing which will be built as a result of authorization by that committee must be under the jurisdiction of Assistant Secretary of Defense Floete.

Mr. PAYNE. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. That is a step in the right direction.

Mr. PAYNE. The reason for my making these remarks is that I am familiar with the situation. I happened to enjoy the privilege of being with the first group which was activated in the 20th Air Force under Gen. Curtis E. LeMay. Only last week I had occasion to be with two enlisted Air Force personnel—sergeants, as a matter of fact—who are being transferred from one base to another.

During the course of my conversation with them, because they happened to serve with me, I asked them whether they were going to make the Air Force their career. They had been in the service for some time.

The fact that they are being transferred to an area where there is not proper housing available is leading those men, who have been trained to perform important duties and who are giving their great experience to the Air Force,

to come to the definite conclusion that probably they will not reenlist again, because their wives will not join them at the location to which they are to be sent, since adequate housing is not available.

I think such a situation must be remedied.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Maine has made a fine summary of the situation which the committee also found to exist.

We found that the bill, which carries more than \$2.3 billion, had exceptionally fine backing from the service, especially from Assistant Secretary of Defense Floete and his staff. They had combed the bill thoroughly. The necessities and requirements were reduced to a minimum. The committee promptly approved every item in the bill, after a particular examination of it, line by line, and after receiving the advice of a civilian construction engineer who had been on our staff for many months, and who went into the entire matter, checked the unit costs for the various items, gave a final recommendation, and virtually approved the bill.

We wish especially to thank Assistant Secretary of Defense Floete and his excellent staff, as well as those in the service who worked on the bill.

The other members of the subcommittee are the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who made excellent contributions to the long, and sometimes rather laborious hearings which were held in the consideration of the bill.

I feel especially indebted to all the members of the Committee on Armed Services for their earnest attention and outstanding work on the bill. I hope each of them will have something to say about it. I wish especially to thank them, as well as our excellent staff member who has been particularly charged with responsibility in this matter, Mr. William Darden, who rendered outstanding service.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Can the Senator from Mississippi inform the Senate whether or not H. R. 6829 has already passed the House? It is my impression that it has passed the House, but I should like to have that point clarified. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The bill under consideration today has already passed the House.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the distinguished Senator from Mississippi anticipate that there will be any difficulty getting an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the measure, once a conference report has been agreed on?

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Appropriations Committee will have before it an appropriation for a major part of these authorizations, and, in addition, for authorizations from the previous year.

I cannot speak for the committee, of course, but as a member of the committee, and as one who is familiar with what will come before it, I think the answer to the Senator's question is "Yes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On page 23 of the report there appears an item of \$1,350,000 for housing at the Glasgow site in Montana. That means that \$1,350,000 of the \$4,706,000 would be allocated specifically to housing at the Glasgow site, would it not?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator have any idea how many housing units would be built for that amount of money?

Mr. STENNIS. In round numbers, 100. I wish to say to the Senator from Montana that I am not certain that item in its entirety will be asked for in the appropriation bill, but I think most of the item will be asked for. The appropriation bill will follow the authorization.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, there is an amendment which has been agreed to by the subcommittee, but which came in late and therefore was not before the full committee. The subcommittee has unanimously agreed to its adoption. It has to do with housing with reference to the Nike sites, and would permit the Secretary to rent or lease housing at the Nike sites rather than build them. We think the matter ought to be further developed in testimony, but we feel the amendment is worthy and that it should be taken to conference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator speaking of an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. STENNIS. It is an amendment to the bill, which is really a committee amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed at the end of the bill to add the following new section:

SEC. —. During the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense or his designee that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations: *Provided*, That not more than 1,000 housing units may be so leased and the rental cost to the Government for any housing unit may not exceed \$150 per month.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be happy to yield, or I can yield the floor, if the Senator wishes the floor in his own right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Particularly with respect to the pending amendment, I should like to have the RECORD show that I believe the amendment should be taken to conference, but before the conference is held there should be a hearing so that testimony can be taken on it. The amendment as drawn provides that the housing, if leased, may be assigned as military quarters. That implies forfeiture of military allowances to which military personnel are entitled

when housing is not provided. At the same time, the amendment provides that the housing may cost as much as \$150 a month, which would be in excess of the average quarters allowances.

There may be some special urgency for such housing in connection with the Nike program, and provision for housing where the Nike installations have been authorized, but before we make the exception and provide for what amounts to a raising of military quarters allowances, it seems to me some testimony should be taken, before the matter is finally acted on in conference. In order that the amendment may be taken to conference, however, I have no objection to its adoption at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. I heartily concur in the recommendations and sentiments of the Senator from South Dakota.

One of the general provisions of the bill is section 507, which amends section 407 of Public Law 765, 83d Congress, by increasing from \$25 million to \$100 million the authority to provide housing through use of the proceeds from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The revised section amends the provision with respect to the reimbursement of Commodity Credit Corporation and provides that the limitation of \$100 million shall apply to the amount of the expenditure of foreign currencies rather than to the value of the houses. This will enable the Department of Defense, in appropriate cases, to utilize troop labor without a reduction in the total of the authority to use proceeds from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities.

We feel that carrying out the program should be encouraged by the reflection that although \$100 million is a relatively very small amount, the authorization certainly indicates that a start is being made. I think the Secretary should be commended for his attitude and action.

Section 510 of the bill will cancel \$602 million in authorizations no longer required that have already been identified, as well as an additional authorization totaling at least \$300 million more. The section will cancel, as of July 1, 1958, all authorizations enacted prior to October 1, 1951.

Those authorizations were made during the early stages of the Korean war. Many of them were carried out. In others we found that changes were necessary. The provision does not cancel any authorizations where work is under construction or is felt to be needed.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator a question or two with respect to expansion of facilities at Fort Sill, Okla., for the cannon-firing range which is contemplated in the program for the Military Establishment.

First, I should like to preface my question by stating that, as I understand,

Fort Sill is to have its jurisdiction or territory expanded considerably under the particular authorization now under consideration. The purpose of that expansion is to make possible a firing range for modern weapons, so as to be able to accommodate the weapons.

Will the Senator tell me how many acres are contemplated in the expansion, and where the expansion is to come from?

Mr. STENNIS. I am going to ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] answer those questions. He was the one who took the testimony on this matter. I ask that he be permitted to answer the Senator's questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the total acquisition will be approximately 30,000 acres or, to be exact, 31,020 acres of land. Of this total, 10,700 acres are a part of the Wichita Wildlife Refuge. The remainder—20,320 acres—private land. Roughly, that is the total amount of acreage involved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the 10,700 acres be taken from private lands?

Mr. JACKSON. That acreage is a part of the Wichita Wildlife Refuge, which is owned by the Federal Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it a part of the national park system?

Mr. JACKSON. No; it is part of the Fish and Wildlife system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is used for the propagation of wildlife, is it?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield to me at this point, let me say that the part to be taken by this requirement has been on lease to the military for a number of years; it is not the part of the refuge which is used for wildlife propagation. In fact, the wildlife area is quite a number of miles removed from the portion being requested in connection with this measure.

Mr. JACKSON. It is my further understanding, I should like to say to the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, that the area where the public participates is farther north. The area we are proposing to take is not, for the most part, enjoyed by the public as a whole.

We had the problem of trying to make it possible for the Army to utilize its latest and newest field-artillery weapons—including the "Honest John," which has a very long range, and the 280-millimeter gun. I may say that the "Honest John" is still unreliable, according to the testimony presented before the committee; in other words, it is impossible to be sure just where the shells from that gun will land.

The committee heard testimony from representatives of the wildlife societies and from the private-property owners. We asked the representatives of those groups what they would do in this situation, in light of the military requirements. Roughly, the answer was, of course, that those who had private land would like to have the Army leave them alone, and go farther into the wildlife refuge. And of course the representa-

tives of the wilderness societies, and so forth, would like to have more private land taken.

What we did was, first of all, try to meet the public interest by insisting that the private owners adjacent to the area be required to give up their land.

I think the arrangement which has been worked out is the only practical one unless Fort Sill is to be abandoned. That is what this situation really boils down to, because at Fort Sill the conventional type artillery is still in use, as well as the new types of artillery. The same troops cannot be properly trained in all these weapons, if a part of their training is given to them half way across the country, and a part is given to them at Fort Sill.

At first I felt about this matter just as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota does, I am sure—in that I looked with great apprehension upon the acquisition of the lands involved. We have this problem in my State and all the other western States. Frankly, when we look at all the cold, hard facts, there is no alternative but to do what the Army has requested in this case.

I say frankly that this matter has been reviewed and rereviewed by all those in the executive branch. Finally, we asked all those who were involved to come in and sit around the table and listen to the statements by the Army representatives. Those who attended that meeting had to admit there was no alternative.

They did suggest the working out of an arrangement whereby the firing might be over the town of Fort Sill and over one of the main U. S. highways.

In terms of simple dimensions and mathematics, the question is just this: Where are we going to end?

I feel that every effort should be made to prevent this sort of thing; but when we are confronted with an actual situation, for which there appears to be no alternate approach, I do not see what else we could do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the acquisition of the 10,700 acres of the wildlife refuge in any way make unusable the other areas of the refuge which are set aside for purposes of wildlife propagation, and also for park and public use?

Mr. JACKSON. To my knowledge, it will not. It will preserve the integrity of the refuge.

Mr. MONRONEY. It will preserve the integrity of the refuge. The part to be taken is the most inaccessible part and the part which is used neither by the public nor for game propagation.

But it so happens that this particular plot lies in the only direction in which Fort Sill can expand. We are faced with a hard choice. Abandonment of investment of \$200 million or \$300 million in the finest artillery center the world has ever known, where artillerymen from all friendly nations are today being trained; or expansion of the firing range to accommodate newly-developed artillery weapons, anyone who visits Fort Sill today will see classes from our friendly allies being trained there. But the weapons of today have outgrown the firing range we now have. The entire area of the reservation is only about

74,000 acres in total size. I can assure the Senator from Minnesota that the Army has reduced its proposal for land acquisition to the bare minimum for purpose of a firing range; the Army is not asking for more ground for maneuvers or for building or housing sites but is asking only for land for a target range, so modern artillery weapons—which, of course, have been greatly increased in range—can be accommodated. Either we must close the center, which is dedicated to artillery training, and in closing it waste hundreds of millions of dollars and cause years of delay in setting up a new artillery center; or else we must have second-rate artillery, unless the additional land is acquired.

I am sure we do not want our field artillerymen and officers who are trained there to use anything less than the most modern weapons, developed and used to their full capacity. Unless we obtain this additional land, it will be absolutely impossible to maintain the artillery center at the proficiency at which it must be maintained, in view of the developments of today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator said the integrity of the game refuge will be protected. I assume he means that the jurisdictional boundaries will be protected. I wish to ascertain—and I should like to have a frank answer—whether, after the 10,700 acres are added to the artillery-target area, the remainder of the refuge will be made unusable?

Mr. JACKSON. No; not at all. Not all the remaining areas can be used by the public, and wildlife will still abound there, although perhaps not to the extent that it would if artillery firing were not going on. But the remainder will be tremendous in size. As a matter of fact, the highway will remain as it is, and people can enter the area as they did before.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is there any other area adjacent to Fort Sill which could meet the requirements of a modern artillery range? I certainly wish to say that we want the best we can have in this area of our defense. But is there any other area in the immediate vicinity, adjacent and contiguous to the existing property of Fort Sill, which could be used?

Mr. JACKSON. There are other areas which could be used, if the committee wished to take the risk of jeopardizing human life. We would have to extend the range in such a way as to have the guns fire across the main highway; and if that were done, a stray shot could kill people on the highway or in the town of Fort Sill.

Mr. MONRONEY. Instructions have been issued for the minimum firing of these heavy guns. If the full range were now to be used, the guns would be firing not only over one United States highway, but firing over two United States highways and over the town of Fort Sill. Unless a more satisfactory situation can be obtained—and this land is the only land in the direction in which the range can be expanded—then either the use of the best artillery must be sacrificed, or second-rate artillery instruction must be given.

Mr. STENNIS. Let me point out to the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. President, that the question now before the Senate is whether the taking of the land shall be authorized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. In just a moment. First, let me say that the same proposition will come before the same subcommittee, for there must be agreement with the Armed Services Committee regarding the final taking and use of the land.

If at that time there are any reasonable restrictions which can be imposed as a safeguard of the wildlife land, the subcommittee will certainly seriously consider them, and everyone interested will have an opportunity to be heard. I am sure that such restrictions will be imposed as are considered consistent with the necessary purposes for which the land is to be used.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I merely wish to supplement what the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee has said with respect to the careful consideration which will be given when the actual proposal for acquisition of this land comes before the subcommittee. There will be an effort to reach an agreement with the Committee on Armed Services with respect to land acquisition.

I hope the Defense Department will be on due notice that, at the time it makes its presentation it will be expected to show, if it is to justify this acquisition, that it is impracticable to consider the use of some alternate range in some other part of the country for the firing of the long-range pieces which are here involved.

As the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has well stated, there are only two practical alternatives to using Fort Sill for artillery-firing purposes, namely, either to obtain some additional range or to abandon the post.

I recognize that the tremendous investment the Government has at Fort Sill raises some very grave questions. At the same time, I am not insensible to the fact that we would be destroying a wildlife area which cannot be re-created, as one of the witnesses said, in a thousand years, if it is once destroyed. It may not be destroyed by the proposed operation. At the same time, its value as a wildlife refuge would be greatly impaired. Let there be no mistake about that.

Consequently, I feel that when the Defense Department comes before the subcommittee to make its presentation for the actual acquisition, and to discuss the terms of acquisition, it must be prepared to defend against an alternate proposal that the firing of the very long-range guns be transferred to a field exercise to be conducted in some other part of the country, where a long range—as much as 5 miles, or 25,000 yards—could be provided without the involvement threatened in this case.

I think the committee could take no other action than it took on the evidence

before it as to the military necessity. At the same time, this is not final action. The proposal will have to come before the committee again, and the alternative which I have mentioned can be considered at that time.

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

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, I wish to thank very much the Senator from South Dakota. I have a great regard for his judgment in these matters, as I have for that of the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Washington, the Senator from Oklahoma, and other Senators.

The thing about which I am concerned, and with respect to which I wish to express my concern, is that while we may be taking, or considering an authorization for taking, some 10,700 acres from the wildlife refuge area, it is somewhat questionable whether or not this will be adequate in the days to come. I gather that this is an almost irreducible minimum for the cannon and heavy artillery we now have. If that be the case, of course, we shall have to go out farther and farther.

It seems peculiar to be arguing the merits of a wildlife refuge, on the one hand, as against a great military installation, on the other; but I think the point is well made that there are not too many of the areas known as wildlife refuges left in the country. There is plenty of wasteland which would furnish a suitable place for the shooting of big cannon. In those areas such missiles are the only things which will arise from the earth or travel over the earth.

So, I hope if the authorization is completed in this bill that the responsible committees which will have to consider the question further will look into the long-range needs of the United States Army, particularly with respect to artillery, and see whether or not Fort Sill, as proposed to be expanded under the contemplated authorization, will be adequate.

I hesitate to try to pose in the role of a prophet, but, knowing a little about this subject from some of the information which has come to my attention, I am of the opinion that what we are doing is authorizing only enough now to get us over the hump momentarily. I predict that before long, in order to maintain Fort Sill as a going Military Establishment, it will be necessary to ask for additional land. I hope that will not be the case, but we appreciate the views of those in the Wildlife Service and in the great conservation organizations to the effect that that is what will happen.

I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi a question. Has there been in the hearings any evidence from the military which would indicate to members of the committee that the expansion of Fort Sill, under the contemplated increase of some 30,000 acres, will be adequate for the foreseeable future? Or is this, as I have indicated to be my opinion, only enough to get us by temporarily?

Mr. STENNIS. I understand that this is the minimum. I will ask the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] to answer that question.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I asked that question in connection with the hearings. The answer was that, based upon the present requirements, this proposed acquisition would meet the need. That includes provision for the "Honest John" and the 280 millimeter gun. I assume that it should meet the needs for some time. However, if we are to engage in the test-firing of long-range rockets, obviously that will have to be conducted in another part of the United States. These weapons, the "Honest John" and the 280 millimeter, are essential to the immediate support of the ground forces, and are extensions of what might be called conventional artillery. I am sure that if we undertake the test-firing of rockets, which involves a very substantial range, the test firing must occur in some other part of the country, because the Defense Department could not possibly find enough land in Oklahoma to meet the requirements.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Washington.

I conclude by saying that I think there are times when we must make so-called valued judgment choices. In this instance the taking of a section of a wildlife refuge might be justified because of the great investment already made in Fort Sill. But I invite attention to the fact that in the past the Army has not shown any reluctance to move in and take over highways, villages, towns, and communities when it saw the necessity for purposes of defense.

I hope that the limited area remaining in this country which can be devoted to wildlife refuges will be carefully protected. At times there seems to be the feeling that somehow or other this activity is not particularly important. However, with growing population, and with more and more people seeking opportunity for the enjoyment of outdoor activity, it seems to me that we ought to be doing our best to try to protect wildlife refuge areas.

I shall not offer any amendment. I know that the Senator from Washington has dedicated his entire life to conservation programs and the preservation of areas of recreation and wildlife refuge. I am deeply concerned about this question. I would be less than candid if I did not say that practically every conservation group in America has written to Members of Congress, including the Senator from Washington and myself. They are deeply concerned over what this authorization provides.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I share the Senator's concern, and I appreciate his comments.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] will probably recall our earlier colloquy about the Fort Sill project. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on this subject matter be printed at the point in the RECORD where the discussion about

the acquisition of additional land for Fort Sill was had.

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

STATEMENT BY HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

I am constrained to call attention to one item in this bill, S. 1765, which would authorize the acquisition of certain lands to be added to the Fort Sill Military Reservation near Lawton, Okla., including about 10,000 acres of the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge. This attempt on the part of the Army to gain control of a large segment of this important and urgently needed national wildlife refuge is one of the principal reasons for the introduction of my refuge bill, S. 2101. I earnestly believe that the Congress should give much more attention to this or any other attempt to break down the wildlife refuge system that has been built up with painstaking care over a period of many years.

The Wichita Mountains area, which is one of the oldest refuges, was established by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1905. For many years it was administered by the United States Forest Service, but in 1935, it was transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. It is a unique and magnificent wildlife area, and it is used heavily as a public recreation area. Three generations of Oklahomans and Texans are dependent upon the splendid facilities that are available for wholesome relaxation. Last year over 850,000 people used the recreational facilities, the better part of which are concentrated in the area that the Army proposes to take.

There is no real justification for this acquisition. Fort Sill has, for many years, had a close working relationship with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service whereby the Army has used portions of the refuge for gun emplacement positions for the firing of the heaviest artillery that they have. The shells have been landing on the present reservation. They also have used the refuge for firing some of the heavier rockets and there seems to be no reason why the present needs cannot be met by a continuation of this cooperative agreement. The taking over of this refuge land will not extend the length of the range unless they have additional acquisitions in mind which have not been made known. I would be the last one that would delay action on any measure that was needed for national defense. But, so far as I can determine, the needs at Fort Sill can be met just as well by a cooperative arrangement similar to that under which the Army has operated for many years. If that can be accomplished, the public still can have use of those outstanding recreational facilities, and that essential wildlife refuge can be preserved.

The Army presently seems to be conducting all of the operations at the Fort Sill Artillery School for which it claims that the additional land is needed. I have not had an opportunity to investigate all of the facts; however, it is believed that the so-called "Atomic Cannon," for which the Army says that it needs additional land to practice with at Fort Sill, already is considered obsolete and is no longer in production. These are some of the questions that should be explored more fully by the Members of the Senate before authorizing any such expansion of the installation in Oklahoma. Then again, I am wondering if that type of long-range firing should be practiced in such a populated area. Other such military operations have been performed in the more remote sections of Arizona and Nevada.

This appropriation calls for the purchase of more than 20,000 acres of good agricultural and ranch lands from protesting private owners. Representatives of the landowners

associations and national conservation organizations registered vigorous protests before the House Armed Services Committee. There is widespread public opposition to any reduction in the meager amount of land that has been reserved by the Federal Government for wildlife purposes. The opposition that has been registered by such organizations as the Wildlife Management Institute, the National Wildlife Federation, the Izaak Walton League of America, and the Outdoor Writers Association of America, is ample testimony of the public sentiment toward the repeated attempts to whittle away at the wildlife refuges, the national parks and national monuments, and the like.

The Army has been trying to get control of the Cabeza Prieta Game Range and the Kofa Refuge in Arizona, and of additional wildlife lands in Alaska, and I think that these efforts should be scrutinized more carefully. It is hoped that my colleagues will give prompt consideration to my refuge bill, S. 2101. We simply cannot, in the face of the constantly increasing need for outdoor recreational facilities for a growing human population, sacrifice any of the pitiful amount of refuge lands that are needed to preserve the valuable wildlife resources.

The Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Mr. John L. Farley, stated before a House subcommittee last July that the Federal Government should acquire and develop 4 million acres of the remaining refuge goal, and that the States collectively should acquire and develop a minimum of 5 million acres, if the wildlife resources are to be maintained at somewhere near their existing level. In other words, it is clear that we should not permit the Army to take over and close to public use 10,000 acres of the best recreational land in the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge. Aside from the good, clear-water lakes that provide public fishing, and several much-used picnic areas, the Army would close the door to Mount Lincoln, one of the spectacular mountains of the region. As it is, both the people of Oklahoma and Texas, and of Fort Sill, have free access to the scenic drives, the lakes and streams, the camping and picnic sites, and to the extraordinary wildlife and geological attractions of the rugged terrain that rises far above the Oklahoma prairies.

The Wichita Mountains are the blissful retreat of a vast horde of persons that annually seek a respite from the sweltering sun of the great semiarid Southwest.

The Wichita Refuge is the one remaining place in the United States where the present day Americans can get some concept of the waving grasses of the pioneer prairies. It is about the only place that the botanists, ecologists, and other scientists can study the original flora and fauna in somewhere near its original state. Nearly 1,000 buffalo (American bison) roam the vast expanses, along with deer and elk. America's biggest herd of longhorn cattle, more than 350 prized specimens can be seen at close range. Many of the steers have horns as long as 7 feet. The present-day Davy Crocketts can see some of the few remaining towns of prairie dogs, which formerly were common throughout the West. Pronghorn antelope and most of the other forms of original inhabitants of the plains add to the enjoyment of those that are privileged to visit the area.

The Wichita refuge has been the source of many animals that have been provided to public zoos. The surplus big-game animals are disposed of annually to keep the herds within the carrying capacity of the range. It is no wonder that the Army or anyone else would want to gain control of this fabulous wonderland that presents such a singular example of the kind of range-land that can be maintained under a sound management program.

1955

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8305

It is my understanding that the Secretary of the Interior has given his consent to the transfer of the 10,000 acres of refuge lands to the Department of Defense. Evidently he is reluctant to take a stand against any kind of an appeal based on theoretical national defense needs. Perhaps he is not aware that those at Fort Sill have been after the refuge lands for a long time. This is merely a renewed attempt by the Army, as is evident by the letter that C. R. Gutermuth, secretary of the Natural Resources Council of America, sent to all council members on April 12, 1955. His enclosure, which I also would like to have entered in the RECORD, is from Bud Jackson, the field representative of the National Wildlife Federation. Mr. Jackson indicated quite well why there is local public support for this move, when he said, "This time, business interests in Lawton are being soft-soaped with the story that expansion will build a better Lawton, double Fort Sill's personnel, increase business and raise Lawton's dollar income. It would be quite interesting to know exactly how many tourists' dollars the city would lose with the loss of the refuge. The good burghers of the Oklahoma town may not have considered that angle."

Now then, in connection with H. R. 5306, which was introduced by the Honorable LEE METCALF, and which is a companion bill to my S. 2101, here is a letter that Chairman HERBERT C. BONNER, of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, received from Mr. John L. Farley, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Chairman BONNER had informed Director Farley that the House would not be able to take action on H. R. 5306 during this session, and requested that no action be taken by the Fish and Wildlife Service on the disposition of refuge lands without consulting his committee and without holding public hearings. From this you can see that Director Farley, under date of June 24, 1955, indicated that no such action was contemplated, and that the committee's request would be honored. It is difficult to reconcile this letter with the supposed consent that was given by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two communications which I received, one from the Natural Resources Council of America, and an exchange of correspondence involving the Honorable LEE METCALF, Member of the House of Representatives, Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and John L. Farley, Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.

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

NATURAL RESOURCES
COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1955.

To All Council Members:

The renewed attempt by the Army to take over the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge, and described quite poignantly in the enclosed copy of a letter by Bud Jackson in the last issue of Outdoors Unlimited, merits prompt attention.

Your secretary endeavored to ascertain whether or not an appropriation is being requested by the Department of Defense for the acquiring of additional land at Fort Sill, but to no avail. While the subject obviously is under consideration, the appropriation bill has not been formulated and is not available.

It is clear, however, that the defense appropriations will have to be considered by

the House committee before long, and when this money bill starts through the hopper, there will be little time for amendments or changes.

Sincerely,

C. R. GUTERMUTH,
Secretary.

WICHITA WILDLIFE REFUGE AGAIN IN DANGER
SPRINGFIELD, MO.

Mr. J. HAMMOND BROWN,
President, Outdoor Writers Association
of America, Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. BROWN: From a high Government official, I learn the disquieting news that the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge in southwest Oklahoma is again in great jeopardy, this time from a bold, open move by the Army Artillery School at Fort Sill, near Lawton, Okla., to absorb the refuge into the military reservation.

The military's recently announced budget reveals \$40 million for expansion of existing facilities. It was revealed simultaneously in Washington and in Lawton that \$2.7 million of it is needed to purchase lands around the Wichita refuge so that the refuge may be taken into the military reservation as a "paper transfer." Thus finally unmasked is the same group which so blandly spread its hands and insisted, "No savvy," when confronted last year with what it had thought were its "secret" plans for invading the Wichitas. The mnemonic abilities of the Army are startlingly poor.

New strategy apparently calls for adopting the open approach. We who've dealt with the Army in the past aren't unaware of the chamber-of-commerce techniques occasionally invoked by the military (and brought to their highest state of polish by the Corps of Engineers). This time, business interests in Lawton are being soft-soaped with the story that expansion will "build a better Lawton" (familiar?), double Fort Sill's personnel, increase business and raise Lawton's dollar income. It would be interesting to know exactly how many tourist dollars the city would lose with loss of the refuge. The good burghers of the Oklahoma town may not have considered that angle.

Actually, however, whether the refuge is economically more important than a double-in-size artillery school isn't the question. There are questions which suggest themselves, as follows:

1. Is there actual need for expanding Fort Sill's facilities to the degree that an area as large as the refuge need be taken over?
2. If so, cannot this expansion move in other directions than into the refuge?
3. Is it possible that this great yen for expansion into the refuge has its origins in the hunting and fishing instincts of the high brass, a not inconsiderable possibility from past experience?
4. Is national defense better served by turning a wildlife refuge over to the Army for playground purposes or by reserving it for the whole people?

For one, I am sick to the death of this sort of thing. It seems to me that we who are seeking to teach conservation fight most of our battles against instruments of the people who spend the people's money in planning coups against the people. The military spends too much of our money fighting us and too darned little fighting the enemy. Let's let our Congressmen in on the battle of the Wichitas.

BUD JACKSON.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT
MARINE AND FISHERIES,
Washington, D. C., June 29, 1955.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEE: In view of the heavy schedule of hearings by the Committee on Merchant

Marine and Fisheries, it is probable that there will be no opportunity to consider your bill, H. R. 5306, to protect and preserve the national wildlife refuges. Inasmuch as I share your concern for the future of the wildlife refuge program, I wrote the Director of Fish and Wildlife Service suggesting that notice be given to the committee before disposing of any refuge. The attached letter is his reply to my proposal.

In my opinion, the information contained in Mr. Farley's letter indicates that there is no urgency in connection with your bill and accordingly it is my intention to defer consideration until the next session.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., June 24, 1955.

Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant
Marine and Fisheries, House of
Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BONNER: I am more than pleased to assure you that this Service has no plan to dispose of any wildlife refuge at this time. Should any proposals for the disposal of any refuge be presented to the Service, I shall be glad to so inform you. No action would be taken on such proposals without a thorough review of the proposal, including appropriate public hearings, all of which would require more than the 30 days which you have suggested in your letter.

It would appear that you had received some information indicating that the Service has some definite plan of disposing of wildlife refuges, and I assure that no such plan or program exists.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. FARLEY,
Director.

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

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I share the feeling of alarm which has been expressed by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota over the diminution of the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge.

I think it would be useful and appropriate if, at this point in the RECORD, there should appear, for the information of Members of Congress, the executive department, and the country, some of the letters which I have received from the National Wildlife Federation and various other conservation groups regarding the reduction in size of the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge. I ask unanimous consent that the letters be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Takoma Park, Washington, D. C.,
June 23, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I appreciate your taking the time to study the proposed expansion of the Fort Sill Military Reservation in Oklahoma into the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge. This is one of the items in S. 1765, the military public works bill presently under consideration by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

May I request, Senator NEUBERGER, that in considering this particular item you keep these facts in mind:

(1) Wichita Mountains is one of the most historic and valuable of the national wildlife refuges. It was established by Executive order of President Theodore Roosevelt in 1905. It provides recreation for more than one million visitors annually.

(2) The Army presently is conducting all operations at the Fort Sill Artillery School for which it says it needs this additional land. We are reliably informed that the so-called atomic cannon, which the Army says it needs to practice with at Fort Sill, already is considered obsolete and is no longer under production. While we do not pretend to pose as military experts, we question the adequacy of even the proposed expanded Fort Sill Reservation to keep pace with modern military developments. These questions, of course, will be explored most thoroughly by the Senator.

(3) The conservation organizations of the United States are inclined to look upon this proposal as an unnecessary invasion of the limited areas that have been reserved by the Federal Government for wildlife conservation purposes.

Again thanking you for your time and courtesy, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
CHARLES H. CALLISON,
Conservation Director.

NATIONAL PARKS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1955.
The Honorable CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VINSON: H. R. 5700 includes an item authorizing extension of facilities at Fort Sill, Okla., amounting to \$3,058,000, of which \$2,500,000 is for land acquisition, according to testimony presented to your committee by representatives of the Army. The National Parks Association urges as strongly as possible that this land acquisition request be denied by your committee.

Army witnesses stated this money was to be used to acquire 20,300 acres of privately owned land adjacent to the Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge, and 10,000 acres within the refuge itself. Although they asserted this would not affect recreational or wildlife values significantly, they had been advised this land is of critical importance for these purposes. Within the refuge, the area includes its most beautiful mountains and three lakes essential to wildlife. The private lands to the south have considerable importance with respect to recreation and wildlife.

This refuge receives greater recreational use than any other in the refuge system, and is the most valuable recreational property in that part of Oklahoma and Texas, a region otherwise almost devoid of such facilities. It supports great number of bison, deer, and other mammals, and the only representative herd of long-horn cattle extant, all of which use the areas proposed to be acquired as an essential part of their range.

We understand it is intended to use this land as an atomic artillery range. A more catastrophic misuse of this refuge and its environs could hardly be conceived, and the activity would inevitably spread destruction beyond the lands directly involved. Safety and security precautions would almost certainly prevent any significant recreational use of the area in any event.

In 1953, Army authorities made a direct attempt to gain jurisdiction over the whole refuge, and it is not unreasonable to presume their ambition has not changed. The military now controls hundreds of square miles of desert where such activities can be conducted with minimum damage; if there is some slight inconvenience involved, that

is a small price to pay for preservation of one of the best recreational and wildlife reserves in the United States.

In the reply to our protest to the Secretary of the Army of April 6, 1953, we were advised studies following the deletion of the similar land acquisition item from the 1954 budget demonstrated this acquisition was not necessary.

The Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army have long had sound working agreements that permit use of some refuge lands for nondestructive military purposes, and these have been functioning without disadvantage to either department.

The last paragraph of the Secretary of the Army's letter reads:

"The Army has decided to endeavor to carry out its mission at Fort Sill without acquiring additional land, either privately owned or in the refuge, for an indefinite period in an effort to determine if the problem of range requirements can be resolved short of acquisition. Accordingly, there are no plans for expansion into the wildlife refuge in the immediate future."

We accepted this reassurance in good faith, and assumed the Secretary was honest in his statement. His letter has not been canceled, and the conditions promoting it do not appear to have been changed. There appears to be no justification whatever for the revival of this proposal, and we urge it be denied, and that your committee advise the Army authorities such acquisition will not be allowed unless and until a national emergency arises that is so serious as to make it essential to the national security.

It is requested this letter be made a part of the official record.

Yours sincerely,

FRED M. PACKARD,
Executive Secretary.

Whereas the Oklahoma Ornithological Society, Inc., has been informed that an attempt is being made to include in an appropriation bill the amount of \$2,300,000 to be used for the purchase of land adjoining the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge and to transfer a portion of the wildlife refuge to the military; and

Whereas the said wildlife refuge is one of the few remaining untouched areas of our country abounding in buffalo, deer, elk, antelope, wild turkey, and other forms of wildlife including the only remaining herd of longhorn cattle; and

Whereas the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge is important as an education and scientific area and its wildlife and recreational values cannot be replaced; and

Whereas we believe that the invasion of this refuge by the military places in jeopardy all of the area of the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge and all such national parks and monuments; and

Whereas we believe that the preservation of the natural beauty of our country and the protection of its disappearing wildlife is important to the American way of life; and

Whereas, acreage in less populated and unused areas is available and offers less danger to the lives of many people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oklahoma Ornithological Society, Inc., assembled in its annual State meeting at Craterville Park, expresses its disapproval of the efforts being made to acquire the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge to be used for military purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be made a part of the permanent records of the Oklahoma Ornithological Society, Inc., and that copies be sent to the Oklahoma delegation in the Congress of the United States, and to other interested persons.

J. E. MARTIN,
President.

Attest:

HELEN BANGS,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF THE TULSA, OKLA., AUDUBON SOCIETY

Whereas the Tulsa Audubon Society has been informed by the press that an attempt is being made to include in an appropriation bill the amount of \$2,300,000 to be used for the purchase of land adjoining the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge and to transfer a portion of the wildlife refuge to the military; and

Whereas the said wildlife refuge is one of the few remaining untouched areas of our country abounding in buffalo, deer, elk, antelope, wild turkey, and other forms of wildlife, including the only remaining herd of longhorn cattle; and

Whereas the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge is important as an educational and scientific area and its wildlife and recreational values cannot be replaced; and

Whereas, we believe that the invasion of this refuge by the military places in jeopardy all of the area of the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge and all such national parks and monuments; and

Whereas we believe that the preservation of the natural beauty of our country and the protection of its disappearing wildlife is important to the American way of life; and

Whereas acreage in less populated and unused areas is available and offers less danger to the lives of many people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Tulsa Audubon Society, assembled in a general meeting in Tulsa expresses its disapproval of the efforts being made to acquire the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge to be used for military purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be made a part of the permanent records of the Tulsa Audubon Society, and that copies be sent to the Oklahoma delegation in the Congress of the United States and to other influential persons.

Approved April 29, 1955.

ALFRED STEITZ, Jr.,
Vice President.
Mrs. RALPH KELTING,
Secretary.

PRESERVATION OF THE WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM

Whereas America's wildlife refuges are relatively small, strategically located areas of particular importance to the conservation of native plants and animals; and

Whereas the Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge is an outstanding and historical refuge, possessing scientific, educational, and recreational values; and

Whereas the United States Army desires to acquire this area by transfer and the surrounding lands by purchase for an artillery range, thereby obliterating the refuge and destroying its unique collection of fauna and native grassland; and

Whereas such an act would jeopardize other refuges which might be desired by other or the same agencies; and

Whereas the Oklahoma Federation of Garden Clubs is strongly opposed to an unnecessary abandonment of a refuge as adequate alternate sites are available: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Council of State Garden Clubs, assembled in Chicago, Ill., on the 25th day of May 1955, urges that Congress withhold sanction and funds for the purchase of the lands around the refuge for military use; further

Resolved, That the Department of the Army withdraw plans for the acquisition of the refuge lands; further

Resolved, That the National Council expresses its opposition to the reduction or abandonment of wildlife refuges so long as the resources which they preserve are dependent upon such protection for their continued existence; further

Resolved, That this resolution appear in a forthcoming issue of the National Gardener.

1955

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8307

Presented by Paul Shepard, conservation chairman.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to point out to the Senator from Mississippi, to the Senator from Washington, and to the Senator from South Dakota, who have worked so hard on the pending bill, that the reason why I share the misgivings of the Senator from Minnesota is that all over the country there is a great deal of pressure to reduce the size of the national parks and the national forests and the wildlife refuges. In my own State there is a great deal of pressure to cut down the size of the Tule Lake Wildlife Refuge in northern California and southeastern Oregon. There is also a great deal of pressure to reduce the size of the Hart Mountain Refuge.

In the State of Washington, as the distinguished Senator from Washington knows, certain lumber companies would like to reduce the size of the Olympic National Park. I feel none of the situations can be separated one from the other.

Furthermore, as the Senator from South Dakota has so frankly admitted, taking 10,700 acres from the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge will not help the refuge, of course. Anyone as candid as the Senator from Mississippi will admit that once the 10,700 acres have been taken for other purposes, the value of the wildlife refuge will be impaired. Of course the next reduction will be much easier to make. Certainly there can be no doubt about that.

As the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] knows, the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge is one of the most historic wildlife refuges in the United States. I believe it was established as long ago as 1905 by President Theodore Roosevelt, who was one of the most illustrious conservationists.

I know the distinguished members of the subcommittee will scrutinize very carefully the whole situation before an appropriation is made and before the Army is authorized to go ahead with the project and take land from the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge.

The Senator from Oklahoma knows that thousands of people in his own State have had the privilege of enjoying wholesome recreation in this area, and that once it is seriously breached and destroyed, its usefulness as a recreation facility will be gone. I thank the members of the committee for their careful consideration of this matter.

Mr. STENNIS. I am entirely in sympathy with the Senator's sentiments and remarks. I assure him that the members of the subcommittee will do all they can, when the matter comes before the subcommittee again, to preserve the wildlife refuge, with all its functions.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to express my apprehension with regard to the naval magazine installation at Port Chicago, Calif., which is provided for on page 96 of the bill, in lines 22 and 23, as follows:

Naval magazine, Port Chicago, Calif.: Ordnance facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,929,000.

The committee, in its report, at page 12, states:

While the land acquisition at Port Chicago has been approved, the committee is seriously disturbed that entire towns, including Port Chicago, will be left within the danger zone. The committee believes that the Department of Defense should restudy the safety problem at Port Chicago and submit to the Congress a program that will comply with the Department's own regulations on safety distances at this location.

I have been informed that the House committee, in considering the request of the Navy Department for money with which to purchase additional properties, was greatly concerned with the problem involved at Port Chicago, particularly with respect to the town itself, and for that reason declined to approve the request of the Navy Department.

My colleague from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is not in the Chamber at the moment, and I do not desire to speak for him, but I do wish most urgently to remind my friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, that the city of Port Chicago, which is in the San Francisco Bay area, was almost completely destroyed during World War II by a tragic explosion of ammunition, which had been stored there.

I believe the Navy Department, in its desire to purchase additional land, has been influenced in part by considerations of safety. My point is that the decision of the Navy Department should be so provably correct that no one would be able to quarrel with it. By reason of the concern felt by the people of that community, I am not in a position to accept the recommendation of the Navy Department.

In view of the fact that the House committee declined to approve the item, I wonder whether I may ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if, during the conference on the bill, the position which the Members of the House committee took will be thoroughly explored.

Mr. STENNIS. I can certainly assure the Senator from California that that situation will be thoroughly explored, and that the reasoning of the Members of the House committee will be carefully considered. It is one of the most serious problems that came before the committee in its consideration of the bill. We tried to effect a consolidation of the two ammunition bases in that area, but that proved to be impracticable. We therefore authorized the acquisition of the land at Port Chicago. However, we still had great concern, even after doing it. We were greatly concerned by the entire problem. The problem will remain with us even if the land is acquired. There is no absolute solution to it. The matter will be brought back to the committee, and we will consider any suggestion which may be made to us.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is personally familiar with the location and with its history. I shall be glad to yield to him for a statement, if he desires to make one.

Mr. JACKSON. The only comment I wish to make is that I believe the distinguished chairman of the subcommit-

tee has made an excellent statement on the situation. As the chairman has indicated, the committee was in a terrible dilemma on this matter. \$30 million has been invested at Port Chicago. The replacement cost is \$70 million. We were confronted with a land acquisition program which was entirely inadequate to provide even the security established by the Defense Department.

I certainly share the concern of the members of the subcommittee and the concern expressed by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. I shall keep an open mind—as I know the other members of the committee will also—in trying to find a solution to the problem. I believe it requires further explanation. It is certainly a very bad situation at the moment.

Mr. KUCHEL. I appreciate the comment of the Senator from Washington, particularly because there is a continuing hazard at Port Chicago, Calif. I appreciate the fact that we are considering an authorization bill, not an appropriation bill, and the Senator's statement relative to the required justification, which the committee will require the Defense Department to produce before any moneys will be made available, is satisfactory. On the other hand, if there is any reasonable ground upon which the present decision of the Department of Defense is based, I would urge the conference committee to go slowly. If I understand the statement of the Senator from Washington, the whole matter will be completely re-explored in the conference committee.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to assure the Senator that we shall look into it very carefully. I might add that, as the Senator probably knows from the record, we spent considerable time listening to outside witnesses and we went into the whole question thoroughly. I hope that a better solution may be reached than that which has been proposed by the Army and the Navy.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am most grateful to the Senator from Washington.

I should like to make this brief statement in connection with the problem.

The authorization for land acquisition, if followed by an appropriation, would effectively remove approximately 5 percent of the taxable real property of the county involved. If I correctly understand, the Defense Department would not utilize this land by way of any improvement until M-day. If that be true, it constitutes another reason for proceeding slowly, and I think that is something which the conference might well consider.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I notice that in the bill as reported by the committee the Fort Jackson, S. C., medical facility has been stricken from the bill. The House had included the sum of \$8 million for that item in the bill as it came to the Senate. I wish to assure the Senator from Mississippi that there is a dire need for that facility at the present time, and I should like to know the attitude of Senators so far as con-

cerns giving the item due consideration when it comes before the conference.

Mr. STENNIS. It is an open question. We did not hear, consider, and then reject the item of the hospital for Ft. Jackson. We have an open mind on the question, and have in mind very distinctly and definitely the idea of giving it every consideration in the conference.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wanted to bring it to the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee at this time. I imagine the House will want the item to be retained. I wished to ascertain, if I could, the attitude of the Senate conferees.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I certainly shall give it most sympathetic consideration in the conference. As the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has pointed out, we did not have an opportunity in the committee to consider the matter on a formal basis. The question, of course, will be taken up in its entirety in the conference, and I wish to assure the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina and the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina that I shall give it most sympathetic consideration.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I notice that the bill has been changed with reference to the Charleston, S. C., Air Force base in several particulars. When we speak of air defense we realize that we must keep prepared in the air to meet all opposition which might come in case of another war. I, for one, feel that this item is very important and that it should be retained. I should like to get the attitude of the chairman of the subcommittee on that particular item.

Mr. STENNIS. We appreciate the interest and the comment of the Senator from South Carolina, and I assure him that the item to which he now refers is in the same category as the one previously explained.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I feel the same way about it.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I should like to invite his attention and the attention of the other members of the committee to the importance of the hospital at Fort Jackson. During World War II no other camp trained more soldiers than did Fort Jackson. It is an installation containing more than 200,000 acres of land, with hundreds and hundreds of buildings, and it is one of the finest training grounds to be found anywhere. The nature of the soil is such that shortly after a rain the soldiers can resume training. There is an absence of mud and other deterrent factors.

We must preserve this splendid training camp for the Defense Department. For a long time there has been a vital need for a permanent hospital there. The hospital existing at the present time is a frame building which is not in good

repair and is not adequate to meet the situation. I am sure the Defense Department feels that there is a great need for a modern hospital. The people of Fort Jackson and Columbia also realize the need for it.

We are anxious to have the item retained, but for reasons which the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and other members of the subcommittee have told me, my distinguished colleague and I have decided not to offer an amendment at this time. We appreciate the attitude of the members of the committee with reference to taking the matter to conference. It is a worthwhile authorization, and we shall appreciate every consideration that can be given to the matter in conference.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina has spoken to me about the matter several times, and there is considerable merit in his statement. There seems to be some question as to whether Camp Jackson as a whole is in the category of what is called a permanent installation, or whether it is in the category of a wartime training camp. Naturally, whether it is in one or the other of those categories, has some bearing on the question.

As I have said, there is some question as to whether the camp is of a permanent character or is more of a wartime training installation. I think some evidence on that point might be presented to the members of the committee with profit before the conference takes place.

Another point is that the \$8 million suggested is a larger allocation for a hospital than was presented, so far as I can remember, for any other hospital in the entire bill. Most hospital units have carried a smaller amount.

I think there should be some showing as to why an \$8 million hospital should be proposed, when for most installations, even when they are of a permanent nature, a lesser figure has been provided.

I say that in all candor and because I think evidence on those points would be proper for the conference committee to consider.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the two Senators from South Carolina have certainly impressed the subcommittee with their interest and with the need for this hospital. Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina has conferred with me many times on the floor about it, and Senator THURMOND has written to me about it and has explained and repeatedly urged the merits of the matter in conferences. I wish to assure them that the matter will have full consideration, but we cannot make any commitment as to what we can agree to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to say, in answer to the junior Senator from South Dakota, that my information is that there has never been a formal order contravening the order of General Marshall, placing Fort Jackson on a permanent basis. Several years ago, for some reason, Fort Jackson was omitted from the permanent list, but

there has not been a formal order striking it from the permanent list of stations. I am quite certain the records of the Department of Defense will bear out my information on that point.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I may supplement the statement by the Senator from South Carolina by observing that I think it would be helpful if we had some information as to the nature of the other buildings on the post—that is, other new construction of a permanent, temporary, or mobilization type. I am not expecting an answer to my suggestion now; but in the very finest spirit of friendship and candor I mention this, because I think when specific information of that sort is available, it helps a committee in conference.

I may say that I have admired greatly the interest of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] in all matters pertaining to national defense. He has come before the Committee on Armed Services on many occasions, particularly at times when the committee was considering the subject of the Reserve components of the Defense Establishment. His experience in this field is always helpful, I can assure him. Therefore, his presentation in connection with this matter will receive very serious consideration.

Mr. THURMOND. The kind words of the Senator from South Dakota are highly appreciated. Although there are no brick buildings that I know of on the base, there are some very fine buildings, nevertheless. Since there has been no formal order striking Fort Jackson from the permanent list of stations—as a matter of fact, it should still be on the list—consideration of the item by the committee will be appreciated.

The Charleston Air Force base is one of the finest to be found anywhere. The people of Charleston and Columbia have been most cooperative with the service personnel. It is my sincere hope that the appropriation for the Charleston Air Force base will be restored by the committee of conference.

We are living today in a very dangerous age, an age in which a plane, in 22 minutes' time, can bomb New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington. It is an age in which aircraft can fly from Moscow to Los Angeles in 10½ hours, from Moscow to Chicago in 7½ hours, and from Moscow to Washington in 8½ hours.

I feel that the defense appropriations for the air bases are most essential. It is my earnest hope that the appropriation for the Charleston Air Force base will be retained.

Again, I express my deep appreciation to the able junior Senator from Mississippi and his distinguished colleagues for their encouragement and their sincere consideration of these appropriations.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. What I am about to say is intended more to help the committee in the future than

to be of any assistance in connection with what the Senate is considering this morning. I assume the Senator from Mississippi, in considering the appropriations, has given much attention to the consolidation of stations and posts throughout the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. The committee certainly gave consideration to that subject, I do not know if we have made much progress, but we have urged the consideration of the matter, and I think something was accomplished along that line before the bill came to the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I realize that it is a most difficult problem. In my own State, we feel that our installations probably are the most important from a national defense standpoint. However, since there has been a consolidation of the land, sea, and air forces in one department, it seems to me that a great number of posts and stations throughout the United States could be eliminated. That would apply probably particularly to the service side of the Armed Forces. Every post or station requires a commander, a certain amount of staff, and protection. Personnel are being used for servicing the posts who probably should be a part of the combat forces.

The time has come when the cost of defense in this country must be reduced. I think much could be done to accomplish that end.

I know that in Pennsylvania we will strongly object to the removal of any post or station. I do not remember now the number of establishments that are located in Pennsylvania. However, I merely say this to encourage the Senator's excellent committee to study the matter further. It will be up to all of us to assist in every possible way to eliminate obsolete military, naval, and Air Force installations.

Much more ground is needed now for the training of troops than was formerly the case, even at the close of World War I. Instead of 15,000 or 20,000 acres, 250,000 acres are now needed in order properly to train the ground forces. In like manner, air bases having much longer runways are now necessary.

I think the time has come when all of us must assist the Committee on Armed Services in every way possible in order to bring out the facts and to assist in effecting greater economy.

Mr. STENNIS. The members of the committee appreciate the sentiments and the excellent contribution to the discussion which has been made by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to add a few words in reference to what the senior Senator from Pennsylvania has said. Emphasis or attention is generally devoted to the items which are contained in a bill. Of course, the bill under consideration deals partially with new authorizations; but one of the important jobs of the subcommittee is to pass upon real estate disposal proposals for the selling or liquidation of excess

land areas. That is done in sessions of the committee which are held on call of the committee; no special publicity is given to those sessions.

However, I think that in view of the remarks by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, it would be helpful if the clerk of the committee were to compile, for the RECORD, a summary of the disposal projects which have been considered by the subcommittee during the past year. I myself have been impressed by the increasing number of projects which have come before the committee. A tract of land may consist of a fraction of an acre, or in some instances several acres. But I dare say, as a guess, that the committee at this session of Congress has approved not less than 20 or 30 disposal projects, comprising land which has been declared excess to the needs of some branch of the Defense Establishment. It would be enlightening for all Members of the Senate to know what has been and is taking place in this respect.

Mr. STENNIS. We appreciate the recommendation made by the Senator from South Dakota.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First let me compliment the Senator from Mississippi, and his subcommittee, and the whole committee, for what I consider a very excellent job done in presenting this most important bill.

I wished to ask a few questions relating to family housing. The Senator is, of course familiar with the provision for housing for military personnel under an insured mortgage plan, which was contained in the overall housing bill recently passed by the Senate. Does this bill in any way replace, displace, or supplant such housing, or is it supplemental to it?

Mr. STENNIS. The committee does not have the idea that the bill displaces the program of housing contained in the bill presented by the Banking and Currency Committee. We think the pending bill represents the primary military-housing program, and that the program to which the Senator from Alabama referred is a supplemental program; but in my opinion there is no conflict between the two, under present conditions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I noticed there was a discussion with reference to Wherry housing. Might I assume that the committee had in mind such housing, even though the bill does not specifically refer to Wherry housing?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. Reference was made to so-called Wherry housing or a similar plan.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I take it from the statements in the report that the great deficiency which exists in military housing is recognized, and that over a period of a number of years it will be necessary to use all possible means in order to attain our goal. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. In the opinion of the Senator from Mississippi, the effort will continue for some time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There have been complaints which I wish particularly to

call to the attention of the Senator from Mississippi. With reference to housing bills authorizing direct appropriations for different branches of the armed services, oftentimes housing will be built at a particular installation without taking adequately into consideration the housing needs of the community as a whole, or the ability of the community as a whole to supply housing. For example, we have heard of a number of instances of private industry having gone into an area and built houses which were being rented at reasonable figures, and then the military establishment building houses on its own. As a result there was created a surplus of housing in the particular area. Is there any provision in this bill to make certain that an analysis of the situation prevailing in a certain area will be made before housing is built?

Mr. STENNIS. The justification sheets presented to the subcommittee represented that consideration had been given to each line item. Consideration had been given to civilian housing, to so-called Wherry housing, and other so-called insured housing. In addition to that, it was shown that there was a need for the particular line item of housing indicated.

Let me say that the housing bill which is now before the Congress requires that military housing shall be cleared through the Secretary of Defense. We have been assured by Assistant Secretary Floete, who is the representative of the Secretary of Defense in these matters, that there will be coordination and planning. Based on his successful consideration of like matters in other fields, I think that so far as the point the Senator is making is concerned, we may expect improvement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Under this bill is each branch of the armed services simply authorized to build so many units, and then must it come back to Congress for an appropriation?

Mr. STENNIS. These are specific authorizations for particular bases. Unless land has to be acquired, the Department does not have to come back to the committee, but it does have to get an appropriation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The committee has studied each of these locations with reference to the availability of private housing, and has been satisfied that there is a deficit and that the housing provided for by the bill is needed. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The armed services will not be authorized to build other projects without coming back to the committee and asking for them. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator mean additional authorizations?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. We have had an understanding that even though the Banking and Currency Committee bill, if it should become law, will not require express approval by the subcommittee, at the same time the subcommittee will be taking appropriate matters into consideration, and will make reports available, and advise and

counsel as to the progress of the program.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Mississippi will recall that an amendment to the bill along that line was accepted.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There is one other phase, that of cost, about which I should like to inquire. I notice that the average cost for buildings in the continental United States is \$13,480. That is very close to the figure provided in the other bill, which I think was \$13,750, including utilities and site preparation. The site preparation does not include the value of the land, does it?

Mr. STENNIS. It does not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It includes making the land ready for the builder, does it not?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator may recall that our late beloved colleague, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, Senator Maybank, who was chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, used to object to the high cost of housing built by the Armed Forces under direct authorization. Does the Senator feel that situation will be pretty well controlled by the pending bill?

Mr. STENNIS. It is our opinion that that problem has been met, and that a reasonable unit cost basis has been arrived at.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. With reference to the amendment offered by me, let me say that I was not assuming the other bill would become law. Even if it does not become law, the Secretary of Defense has promised that the programs involving housing will be at least cleared by our subcommittee. I think the Senator from Alabama has raised a good point, and I commend him for his contribution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have studied with gratification the very important report submitted on Thursday by the Committee on Armed Services, authorizing construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations.

The significant place my own State of Texas occupies in the national-defense picture is evidenced by the long list of construction projects authorized for military installations located there. Texans always have been proud, and with reason, of their contributions in peace and war to our national security.

These construction projects are important and necessary, in keeping our physical defenses up to date, in providing training facilities second to none in the world, and in building the morale of our men in uniform.

Speaking for the Texas communities which will be affected by these projects, I can say with assurance that they will continue to offer the fullest cooperation to our armed services and to welcome the military personnel manning these installations.

Mr. President, in my judgment, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and members of the Armed Services Subcommittee deserve high praise for doing, and doing well, a hard and painstaking—and eminently necessary—job. They have made a noteworthy contribution to our national defense, and I wish to express my personal appreciation for their fine work.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

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

Mr. ELLENDER. As the distinguished Senator from Mississippi will remember, I called his attention to a project located in the southern part of my State, but I took no part in the committee's consideration of the project, except to point out to the Senator from Mississippi the Appropriation Committee's policy of insisting upon the selection of the best possible place, at the least cost to the taxpayers, for any military training facility including naval training.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Navy basic training.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, New Iberia, where the new naval airbase is to be built, is within 100 miles of Houma, the site of a naval air facility which was built during World War II. Has the Senator from Mississippi satisfied himself that the land and other facilities at Houma are not suitable for this new air facility, and that it will be more economical to have the Navy build at the site selected near New Iberia?

Mr. STENNIS. I can say to the Senator from Louisiana that after the most careful as well as the fullest consideration, the entire 3-member subcommittee reached the conclusion, on the facts, that the New Iberia location, for the purposes needed and required, was the one we would have to authorize. We did that over considerable personal inclination in favor of the landowners at New Iberia and in favor of utilizing, if possible, the land already owned by the Government. But in the final analysis, the military necessity had to prevail; and the proof on that point was very pronounced. So we reached that conclusion.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator from Mississippi knows, the Appropriations Committee, of which we are both members, has always taken the position that whenever possible existing Government-owned facilities should be utilized before a new facility is erected.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct, and that is the attitude of our subcommittee, also.

Mr. ELLENDER. That has been the extent of my interest in this matter.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. My interest in the location of this new facility stems from the fact that the Navy spent from \$17 million to \$18 million on the now-deactivated facility near Houma. It was my feeling that the existing facility there should be used if possible in order to recapture, to some extent at least, some of the money previously expended by the Navy.

The committee has taken all of these factors into consideration, I understand,

and has concluded that by selecting the New Iberia site, not only will the Government obtain a better and more effective site, but the entire cost of erecting the new facilities at New Iberia, including land purchases, will be less than the cost of renovating or reconstructing the facility at Houma. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; it will be more advantageous to the taxpayers, despite the fact that the Government already owns land at Houma.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my understanding that the land at New Iberia is in a potential oil-producing area, and at the present time an oil company is exploring there for oil. Has the committee considered the additional amount of money which will have to be spent to acquire that site, in contrast to other possible sites for this project. The Senator from Mississippi well knows that if oil is discovered there before the Navy purchases the land in question, that factor will inevitably increase considerably the cost of the land to the United States Government. Did the committee take into consideration that fact, namely, that the area is in a potential oil field, and that a company is now in the process of exploring for oil there?

Mr. STENNIS. That was included in the proof we took, and the subcommittee definitely considered that fact. Of course, we could not have before us any actual figures of a valuation on that basis.

The Senator from Louisiana will understand that the same land project will come back before our subcommittee, not only in connection with this project, but also in connection with others; and at that time we hope to work out an arrangement for the highest possible utilization of those mineral rights, despite the use to which the land will have to be put.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course the Senator from Mississippi knows that before final action is taken on this matter, the proposal will have to come before the Appropriations Committee, where the amount proposed to be spent must be justified.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; at that time it must be finally justified and finally determined.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President—

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to say that the committee was greatly impressed by the testimony submitted by Vice Adm. A. K. Doyle, Chief of Naval Air Training. He testified on several occasions before the committee. In particular, I refer to his testimony which begins on page 738 of the hearings, where Senators will find that Admiral Doyle testified that in September 1954 he received a directive to make a special study of the matter of a site. He said he examined, by means of their airway charts, all possible sites in the United States; and then he said:

It is an amazing thing that there is no spot in the United States that has access to the gulf that has not already been preempted by the Air Force, Navy, or Army ex-

1955

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8311

cept down from New Orleans toward Lake Charles.

Then, following considerable discussion and considerable questioning by the committee regarding the several sites—New Iberia, Houma, and others, Admiral Doyle finally said, as appears on page 746 of the hearings:

New Iberia was the only one where the taxpayer will get a safe return on his investment in our opinion. The others are not a good second best.

After he had reviewed the soil conditions, the price, the elevations, and all other factors, that statement by him was such a categorical one—and I emphasize that it was the testimony of the Chief of Naval Air Training—that, to me, it was quite persuasive. I repeat it:

New Iberia was the only one where the taxpayer will get a safe return on his investment in our opinion. The others are not a good second best.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield further to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not also a fact that testimony was produced showing that although the facility at Houma was erected several years ago by the Navy, yet, because of the additional weight of the aircraft which will use this new facility, the present runways at Houma are inadequate?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; and the problem of extending the airways raised many complicating factors.

Mr. ELLENDER. I also understand that the housing facilities at Houma are for the most part unusable, and also that because of soil conditions at Houma, the additional cost of pilings for buildings, and so forth, will be substantial. As a matter of fact, I went into the matter with our naval officials quite carefully. As I have said, my sole interest in it was to see to it that the Navy got the site it needed in order to carry out its training program, and at the same time that it selected the site which would cost the least to erect and maintain.

Speaking frankly, it has always been my policy as a United States Senator to confine my influence in matters such as this to determining whether the Government agency involved is making the most efficient use of the facilities it already has available. I have not favored any proposed site over another, since I feel it is my duty to represent all the people of my State. I merely wish to see that the Navy has the facilities it needs, at the place they are needed and where they can be best utilized at the least possible cost to our taxpayers.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, we greatly appreciate the sentiments of the Senator from Louisiana on that matter. His views certainly were helpful to us; and that certainly was his position all the way through, quite consistently.

We were concerned about this matter—so much so, Mr. President, that after we heard all the other proof, we had Admiral Doyle return before the subcommittee, along with Admiral Perry, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks; and Admiral Clark; and Admiral Russell,

who is Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics; and at that time we had a very thorough hearing, with testimony from them, in order to obtain their opinion and their judgment as to the possible alternatives.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long, but I desire to speak briefly on the bill, and with a special emphasis on two or three of its features.

Mr. President, this is the third of the military works authorization bills with which it has been my privilege to be associated. On the basis of that experience, I would say that the representations made to us, this time, by the representatives of the Defense Establishment were in the best shape of any that have been submitted to the committee in connection with any of the three bills. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations, Mr. Floete, and his assistant in charge of construction, Mr. Fulling, and the members of their staffs, and the other representatives of the services, have done an excellent job. The careful presentation of the proposed appropriations is ample justification, in my opinion, for the creation of the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations. Before that position was created, the committees necessarily had been confronted with presentations by interested witnesses—that is to say, representatives of the particular branches of the service which were involved.

Here we had the benefit of an overall look, and the overall look was presented by men who were qualified to look at the proposals and the various projects from the standpoint of the total defense needs. On other occasions I have referred to the fact that General Marshall used to say that his problem as Chief of Staff was to overcome the "localitis" which often crept into presentations from a particular field when allocations of materiel or personnel were requested. The same situation, of course, exists when we are dealing with the three main services. Each one sees the problem or the mission from its point of view. It is necessary and helpful to have someone review the projects from the standpoint of the needs of the Defense Department as a whole and the budgetary questions which are involved.

It was a great privilege to serve on this subcommittee under the chairmanship of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I have been associated with him in many activities—in the Committee on Public Works, the Committee on Armed Services, and this particular subcommittee for 3 years. He brings to the position of chairman the benefit of great experience, the tact and diplomacy which are characteristic of his personality, and the ability which is the outgrowth of the fact that he is a great student, a great lawyer, with great ability for analyzing evidence. I pay tribute to his excellent leadership in this chairmanship.

It was also a privilege to work with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. The Senator from Washington brought to this committee a particular quality growing out of his long association with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and his experience on appropriations in the House of Representatives. Many of the projects which are proposed to this committee deal with facilities for the housing or utilization of nuclear weapons. The background of the Senator from Washington in that field was invaluable to the committee in its consideration of those particular projects.

There has already been considerable discussion on the floor with reference to the housing program. I should like to supplement what has been said by mentioning two things.

First, the committee is continuing its study of the housing program. The committee has issued a specific directive to the Defense Department which will result in the submission of additional figures and data to the committee between now and January. The report calls attention to the fact that the committee will continue its study of housing.

We recognize that housing is an important factor in the strength of the Military Establishment. Reference has already been made by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], to the testimony by General LeMay as to the value of good housing in obtaining reenlistment of trained personnel. That factor has always had a great deal of importance, but never so much as in the present day, when we have such a high requirement for training in the Navy, the Army, and the Air Force. If we lose a man who has spent 6 or 10 years in training, it requires a long time and the expenditure of a great deal of money to replace him adequately. Consequently, the subject of housing has greater importance in the efficiency of the Military Establishment than ever before.

As a collateral of the longer period of training required for technicians and for pilots in the modern Military Establishment, we have the natural fact that some men reach the age where they become married and have families. So family housing has a much greater part to play in maintaining the efficiency of the Military Establishment than ever before. That is why, in this bill, the committee has provided as much as \$250 million or more for military housing.

The second aspect of the matter is that raised by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in asking the question as to whether or not the committee had carefully considered the existence of other housing, rental housing in the community, Wherry-type housing, or other housing, in approving the allocations here requested. For the Record, I invite attention to the table which appears at page 11 of the committee report. I ask unanimous consent that that table may be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

8312

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 1

Analysis of family housing requirements at installations with existing Wherry projects and for which housing would be authorized by the bill

Name and location of installation	Family housing requirements	Existing Wherry	Existing government	Community support	Net deficit	Authorized in bill	Unsatisfied deficit
ARMY							
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.	1,442	796	73	200	373	36	337
Fort Lee, Va.	1,267	300	8	493	466	150	316
Dueway Proving Ground, Utah	495	400	30	0	67	16	49
Fort Belvoir, Va.	1,814	450	608	350	406	114	292
Fort Devens, Mass.	2,182	202	111	594	1,275	400	875
Fort Dix, N. J.	2,841	800	35	985	1,021	400	621
Fort Knox, Ky.	3,815	1,700	422	1,232	3,469	360	743
Fort Benning, Ga.	6,627	1,000	934	690	1,023	150	3,100
Fort Bragg, N. C.	8,074	2,000	243	2,500	3,331	400	2,841
Fort Campbell, Ky.	8,476	1,200	336	3,390	3,550	400	3,149
Fort McClellan, Ala.	164	140	40	400	375	150	225
Fort Hood, Tex.	7,367	568	1,372	2,963	2,464	400	2,064
Fort Riley, Kans.	2,432	400	208	1,543	691	200	491
Fort Sheridan, Ill.	414	100	121	40	153	100	53
Sandia Base, N. Mex.	1,428	300	322	300	506	90	416
NAVY							
Camp Pendleton (M.C), Calif.	6,894	1,562	760	1,119	3,453	332	3,121
Twentynine Palms (M.C.C.), Calif.	631	493	0	148	290	2	298
AIR FORCE							
McGuire Air Force Base, N. J.	2,238	200	10	895	1,133	270	863
Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho	1,192	600	124	55	613	150	363
Shaw Air Force Base, S. C.	1,979	600	152	487	840	300	540
Total	63,462	13,611	6,009	13,294	25,488	4,511	20,977

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I shall not read the table, but I invite attention to the fact that it represents an analysis of the major housing proposals, where Wherry projects exist, in relation to the authorizations carried in the bill.

The first column cites the family housing requirements. The second column shows the existing Wherry units. The third column shows the existing Government units. The fourth column shows the community support in the way of family housing. The fifth column shows the net deficit. The sixth column shows the authorization in the bill. The final column shows the unsatisfied deficit. I think the fact that the final column shows an unsatisfied deficit, even after all the existing housing is listed, plus that proposed by the bill, is a complete answer to the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Alabama. Even with the housing proposed in the bill, even with the community housing, even with the existing Government housing and the existing Wherry housing, there still remains an unsatisfied deficit. I think that provides an answer to anyone who may have any fears on that score.

This bill and the two prior bills in this field clear up some old existing authorizations. In the bill 2 years ago the committee rescinded authorizations totaling approximately half a billion dollars. We made re-application in that bill of approximately \$290 million of prior authorizations. That was whittling away at the \$80 billion authorizations outstanding, which the Defense Department inherited when the Eisenhower administration took over.

In this bill we cancel the old authorizations in this field prior to 1951, with the exception of those with respect to which a start has been made, or with respect to which appropriations and commitments have been made. We continue the authorizations only to the ex-

tent of completing the projects with respect to which starts have been made. That helps to put us on an even keel.

When the subcommittee was overseas, I for one, was astounded at the antiquity of the authorizations under which construction was proceeding. We found that, 7 or 8 years prior to the fall of 1953, authorizations had been made under which construction was then proceeding. Obviously, when that same situation exists both abroad and at home, we have authorizations outstanding which are antiquated, which do not bear a realistic relationship to current missions or stations, and which need review. The committee reviewed many of them and decided that the authorizations which were made prior to 1951 should now be extinguished unless they were in process of liquidation by construction. I think that is a constructive result which this committee accomplishes by the annual review of military authorizations.

The chairman of the subcommittee has already alluded to the progress now being recorded in utilizing surplus commodities for the acquisition of overseas housing. Overseas housing presents one of the most difficult questions which confront the committee from time to time. We have several programs for providing housing overseas. One means, of course, is rental. Another is the payment of allowances, with a special allowance for the cost of living at any particular station, under which military personnel can rent housing if it is available. But many times it is not available in any satisfactory degree or quality, or proximity to the military station. Consequently, the committee is under a great deal of pressure to provide housing either by direct appropriation of funds or by a guaranty of occupancy for rental projects. That has caused a great deal of concern to the committee.

Some years ago Congress authorized a commitment of \$100 million for guaran-

teeing the rental for 95 percent occupancy of projects built overseas. The projects have to be submitted to the committee as they come up. The committee has been very reluctant to guarantee that kind of occupancy anywhere except where there is a substantial number of United States personnel, and also the committee has been reluctant to approve any project where a rental guarantee would extend beyond 5 years. In a few instances during the past few months the committee has approved some 7-year guarantees, in and around Paris and at some other centers, where it appears that such a long guarantee could be made without, in effect, providing that we would supply the money and someone else would build the projects at a substantial profit to the builder.

A proposal for the use of some surplus agricultural commodities was placed in the public works bill a year ago. We are pleased to have a report from Assistant Secretary Floete that the program is beginning to produce some results. He cited 3 or 4 instances of acquisition of some military housing projects through the sale of surplus agricultural commodities for local currencies. We are assured that procedures have been worked out to extend that activity. There is in the bill a provision for the acquisition of military quarters in a more direct fashion where the housing is available by the use of funds derived from the liquidation of loans extended by the Commodity Credit Corporation or the purchase funds which it may have invested in the surplus commodities. This will give assurance of the extension of that approach to the problem of overseas military housing.

There is very little further to be said on the bill so far as the minority members of the Committee on Armed Services are concerned. The bill was presented to the full committee yesterday. In the committee there was full discussion of it by both the majority and minority members. The questions raised in committee were the kind of questions which have been raised today in debate on the floor. The bill was unanimously endorsed by the full committee. There was no dissenting vote. Therefore the bill comes to the Senate with the unanimous support of the Committee on Armed Services. I hope it will be passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, before a vote is had on the bill I shall suggest the absence of a quorum. First, I wish to thank especially Mr. George Vinzant, of Vicksburg, Miss. He is a civilian engineer with the Corps of Engineers. He was on loan to the subcommittee for about 60 days, at personal sacrifice to himself. He rendered very able service to the subcommittee in the capacity of a practical construction engineer. His review of all the work was quite helpful to us. He approved the bill as to unit cost and as to need in virtually every item.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks which the Sena-

tor from Mississippi has made with reference to the beneficial service record by George Vinzant. The Senator from Mississippi has already alluded to our staff. I should like to associate myself with those remarks also. We believe, too, that the services of William Darden, the clerk of the subcommittee, have been invaluable. He has been indefatigable in his efforts to further the work of the committee. He has always been a source of information to us and has always been ready to supply it. He was always on call whenever we wanted to ask for information. He has certainly done a good job, and I should therefore like the RECORD to show my appreciation of his good work.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. The provisions in the bill reflect only in part his very fine knowledge of the subject matter. There is no way to calculate or estimate the extent of the valuable services of the Senator from South Dakota not only this year, but also in the previous years when he acted as chairman of the subcommittee. He has carried a heavy load, and he has certainly made a fine contribution.

I should like to point to a proviso in the bill which has not been mentioned. It reads:

Provided further, That at such time as the Central Intelligence Agency occupies the headquarters installation authorized by this title, the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to accomplish the demolition and removal of temporary Government building space in the District of Columbia of equivalent occupancy to that relinquished by the Central Intelligence Agency.

If this provision is carried out it will lead to the demolition of at least a part of the temporary buildings on the Mall and on Constitution Avenue, which are now occupied by the Central Intelligence Agency. They will be demolished without displacing anyone, because the present occupants will be moving out of them.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. 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.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6829) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish at this time to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator

from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], for the very excellent work they have done on the bill which the Senate has just passed. There are few measures which are more tedious and which require more exacting work than does one of these comprehensive military construction authorization bills. The subcommittee has rendered a real service to the Senate and to the country by the very careful attention they have given to this measure.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 697, Senate Resolution 120.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 120) providing for the manner of the appointment of the Select Committee on Small Business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution (S. Res. 120) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the chairman and members of the Select Committee on Small Business, created by Senate Resolution 58, 81st Congress, 2d session, shall be appointed in the same manner and at the same time as the chairmen and members of the standing committees of the Senate at the beginning of each Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 12, 13, 27, 35, 37, and 46 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 30 and 49 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the

following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 727. An act to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the salary of the judge of the District of Columbia tax court, and the salary of the judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 989. An act for the relief of Dr. Louis J. Sebille;

H. R. 990. An act for the relief of Takako Riu Reich;

H. R. 1111. An act for the relief of Phillip Mack;

H. R. 1163. An act for the relief of Lee Houn and Lily Ho Lee Houn;

H. R. 1247. An act for the relief of Carol Brandon (Valtrude Probst);

H. R. 1255. An act for the relief of Ferenc Babothy;

H. R. 1281. An act for the relief of Carlo Nonvenuto;

H. R. 1283. An act for the relief of Olga Joannou Georgulea;

H. R. 1287. An act for the relief of David Mordka Borenstajn, Itta Borenstajn nee Schipper, and Fella Borenstajn Reichlinger;

H. R. 1357. An act for the relief of Chin York Gay;

H. R. 1417. An act for the relief of Charles (Carlos) Gerlicz;

H. R. 1467. An act for the relief of Stjepo Bulch;

H. R. 1472. An act for the relief of Victor Manuel Soares De Mendonca;

H. R. 1473. An act for the relief of Eleanore Hauser;

H. R. 1474. An act for the relief of Ross Sherman Trigg;

H. R. 1475. An act for the relief of Wing Chong Chan;

H. R. 1525. An act for the relief of Ardes Albacete Yanez;

H. R. 2470. An act for the relief of T. C. Elliott;

H. R. 2933. An act for the relief of Mrs. Berta Mansergh;

H. R. 3069. An act for the relief of Eufonio D. Espina;

H. R. 3070. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lee Tai Hung Quan and Quan Ah Sang;

H. R. 3075. An act for the relief of Virgil Won (also known as Virgilio Jackson);

H. R. 3271. An act for the relief of John Lloyd Smelcer;

H. R. 5502. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6042. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 1, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 727) to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the salary of the judge of the District of Columbia tax court, and the salary of the judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of con-

ference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of June 30, 1955, pp. 8276-8277, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to register my opposition to the action of the conferees in agreeing to the cut of \$4 million under the budget request for the international exchange activities. The budget request was for \$22 million, and the Senate approved that amount. The House originally voted for only \$12 million, but in the conference the sum of \$18 million was agreed to. The \$18 million figure represents an actual cut of \$577,000 below the 1955 appropriation.

Such action takes no account of the recommendations which have been made over the past years by Members of the Congress, disinterested officials at the highest level of Government, and leading private citizens, in countless fields of activity throughout the country who through close observation of the program have become convinced of its efficacy in achieving the country's aims in world affairs and strengthening free-world solidarity.

The execution of the program in past years has built a strong basis for greatly increasing the effectiveness of this vital instrument in our foreign relations through a modest increase in the scope and level of operations. The proposed budget represented sound, careful, and realistic planning based on up-to-minute requests from the United States missions overseas. It would have permitted a strengthening of the program in the critical areas of the Far East, the Near East, south Asia, Africa, and Latin America, where educational exchange might well throw the deciding weight in determining the direction which people and governments will take in world affairs.

I call attention also to the fact that as the report puts it, "None of the funds made available in this item shall be used to pay the cost of sending foreign students from their country to study at a foreign university of another foreign country."

It is my understanding that the budget request of the Department did not include any proposal to use funds for such a purpose. As the record of the hearings clearly indicates, the Department proposed to spend \$35,154 for grants to 222 foreign nationals to attend, not a "foreign university of another foreign country," as the conference report limitation reads, but to attend American-spon-

sored schools or institutes of American studies—for example, the Salzburg Seminar in Austria, or Roberts College in Istanbul—in other foreign countries. I assume that since foreign currency grants of this type are clearly authorized in Public Law 584, the limitation stated in the report will not cripple this activity. I also assume that the fact that, in some cases, foreign governments and universities—the University of Oslo, for example—are so receptive to the program that they offer the use of their physical facilities for these purposes, will not militate against the continuance of this activity, which is very modest in scale and very effective in reaching key groups overseas who cannot come to the United States.

Mr. President, the effort to restrict the program by this provision is but another example, in my view, of the usurpation by the Committee on Appropriations of a legislative function. Public Law 584 specifically authorizes the sending of foreign students to American institutions abroad; and the meaning of "American institutions" has been, by a long course of action, developed to include institutions such as Roberts College in Istanbul and the Salzburg Seminar in Austria. I think this is either an effort directly to override the specific legislative authorization, or is a misconception of what actually has been taking place under the program. I think this is a provision which should not be included in any appropriation bill, report, or act. I am glad to say that the Senate did not include such a provision; it was placed in the report at the insistence of the House.

The limitation of \$3,300,000 for administration is not adequate to carry out a program of \$18 million with probable private contributions of an additional \$8 million to \$9 million. The cost of administration in 1955 was \$3,899,015 for a program of the same level. To cut back approximately \$600,000 will seriously cripple the program and the Department's effort in encouraging private contributions to supplement the grant program paid with appropriated funds. I have seen or heard nothing in the conference report or elsewhere that would justify this apparently arbitrary limitation.

Of course, the administration of the program is a very complex and difficult matter. I suppose it is difficult for members of the committee to realize that individuals, human beings, cannot be handled in the same way as guns, bags of wheat, or sacks of cement. A large proportion of the total amount is for administration; but the key to the success of the program is an intelligent administration, especially the wise and careful selection of the individuals who participate.

The success of the program hinges completely upon the wisdom of the procedure of selection, and that procedure, of course, accounts for the chief cost of the administration of the program. The binational commissions which are created and set up in each of the participating countries cost some money, but they are essential to the success of

the program. If they are eliminated, the program will fail.

It is interesting to note, also, that one of the principal criticisms of the opposition in the other body is that the program is not administered efficiently. Can they really believe that a drastic cut will improve the administration of the program? Obviously it will only injure it.

Finally, the report reflects what I consider to be an extremely shortsighted policy which has not been justified in any way by the evidence presented. Such action is even more astonishing today, when we are spending billions for military and economic aid to foreign countries.

Certainly military and economic aid are important and necessary. Their primary aims, however, are specific, and are geared to short-range objectives. They are in no sense a substitute for the solid basis of mutual understanding which is achieved by the educational-exchange program.

This program has proved that it is one of the most effective means at our disposal to influence those foreign nationals who are directly or indirectly responsible for the formulation of national policy and molding public opinion in their respective countries. It seems to me particularly unfortunate that we should even consider retrenchment at this time, when it is evident to anyone that our antagonists are beginning to emphasize the use of cultural activities in their efforts to win the cold war.

I believe the action of the conferees is not in the best interests of the country. We profess in this country an interest in peace. We seek to enlighten the free world so that it may settle its differences by reason and by peaceful procedures. I believe the majority of the people of the United States deeply desire to follow such a course of action.

But, Mr. President, the action of Congress, especially of the other body, negates such a policy. The Members, as is evident everyday on the floor, are eager to appropriate vast sums for guns and for military bases throughout the world. It is notable that on one base in North Africa, according to a report we had last year, more was wasted than the total cost of the program I am discussing since its beginning. But the Members are eager to appropriate money for bases and for guns. Recently, only a day or two ago, with scarcely any question, and certainly no criticism, almost \$32 billion was appropriated for such purposes.

The small program now under consideration, for which \$22 million was requested, has now been cut \$4 million, nearly 20 percent. I think that is somewhere in the neighborhood of one-twentieth of 1 percent of the amount which was appropriated in one bill for guns and armament.

I cannot help feeling very sorrowful, and in a sense I am humiliated, as a citizen of the United States, that every year this one program, sponsored by the Government, which can be said to be