the seas, will be overcome by NOAA. Unlike our space programs, this Nation's involvement in the oceans is a partnership between these various elements of society. Each is contributing substantially and each has a rightful role to fulfill in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support Reorganization Plan No. 4 and thus to disapprove House Resolution 1210.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yeilding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say I too regret that I must disagree with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) about this reorganization proposal.

Our committee, as has been pointed out before, on oceanography held weeks and months of hearings on the problem of NOAA. I regret that the reorganization plan did not make the agency a separate and independent agency. I think that would have been the proper approach. I regret also that the Coast Guard was not included in the reorganization.

However, I believe this is a step forward and eventually probably will result in a separate independent organization with even more of the constituent agencies.

I have heard the argument that because sports fishing and commercial fishing would be transferred they would suffer at the hands of commerce. I do not share that feeling. I believe just the opposite will be the result.

People must realize that all of the current employees basically who are now administering those programs will be transferred almost in toto. They will not have new personnel come in who are against any of these programs. Rather, I believe this will be given new impetus and new force in the Department of Commerce, because this will be the major effort now of the Department of Commerce. It will be the largest part of its budget, and the major emphasis of the Department of Commerce will be now in this area, and I believe we are going to see added help for sports fishing and the whole fisheries environment.

I am encouraged that this will happen. I am sure our committee will do oversight on all the activities they may carry out, and I am sure this will be the result.

I also believe they will give this added budget strength. Certainly, when we look at what has been done in the past with respect to sports fisheries and commercial fisheries, it is nothing which any of us can wave the flag about. We are far down on commercial fishing. We have gone down compared to other nations. I know I am not satisfied with respect to the activities of sports fishing off the coast of Florida. We ought to be doing more to protect and conserve the sports fisheries.

This is what I anticipate will be done. I would urge rejection of this resolution and approval of this plan as a first step in eventually bringing about an independent organization for the development of the resources of the sea.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the defeat of the resolution of disaproval to Reorganization plan No. 4 which would establish in the Department of Commerce a new National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. I enthusiastically endorse NOAA as an essential requisite in the formulation and implementation of a national policy for the oceans. And there is no doubt in my mind that there is a need for such a policy and such an organization as man turns increasingly to the sea for new solutions to the problem of survival. As former Maritime Administrator Andrew E. Gibson put it:

> It is the sea of which we must look . . . to feed a growing population. It is this sea from which we must harvest not only foodstuffs buts its vast resources of minerals. It is the sea to which we must look by means of desalination for the very water necessary to sustain life in the future. . . . Put succinctly, as a nation and people . . . we will live or die by the sea.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress recognized this back in 1966 with the passage of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act. In that act we established a National Council on Marine Resources in the Executive Office of the President, and we authorized a 2-year study to be made by a newly created Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources under the able chairmanship of Dr. Julius A. Stratton. The results of that exhaustive study were released in January of last year in the report, "Our Nation and the Sea." One of the top priority recommendations of that Commission was the creation of a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency.

In the words of the Stratton Commission report:

> We believe that it will mobilize the resources of our Government in the most effective manner to lend strength and power to the Nation's marine commitment. The incremental cost in taking prompt action for consolidation will in itself be relatively small. The added effectiveness for the fulfillment of the national program should be enormous.

The Commission report went on to note that the proliferation of marine programs throughout some 23 departments and agencies of the Government made virtually impossible any unified national thrust in the oceans, and therefore, "a new, strong Federal focus for marine activity" was urgently needed.

Mr. Chairman, after reading the Stratton Commission report early last year, I concluded that this was a major area for national concern, and I testified before the Oceanography Subcommittee of this body in favor of a new organization for the oceans. All told, that subcommittee heard some 92 witnesses on the NOAA proposal, most of whom urged affirmative action on this proposal.

I think we owe a great debt of gratitude to the Stratton Commission, to the Oceanography Subcommittee, to the Ash Commission, and finally to the administration for bring this proposal to full fruition in this reorganization plan. While this NOAA differs in some respects from that originally proposed by the Stratton Commission, it still draws heavily from their recommendations both as to structure and role.

Under this reorganization plan, a number of Federal marine-related missions will be brought together under NOAA in the Department of Commerce for the purpose of fully and effectively exploring and developing our marine resources while avoiding the type of oceanic environmental degradation and depletion which might result from a haphazard approach. This plan recognizes the need and indeed the necessity for a coordinated and unified national ocean policy to avoid the perils of pollution and overpopulation and deliver on the promises and potential of this last great frontier on earth. If we do not organize effectively for the careful exploration and constructive exploitation of this last great frontier, we will soon be faced with a global resource problem of crisis proportions. It would be little consolation to know that this would be our last crisis on earth.

Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of this resolution so that we can get on with the very exciting and urgent task of meeting the challenges and possibilities which lie waiting beyond our shores.

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

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

I should just like to say this is an important plan, as we note when we study the number of employees, 13,250 positions, and the projection of 13,750.

Most of these functions that are to be transferred over to this one entity are related services and related functions in the field of national oceanic and atmospheric programs. We are proliferating these programs all over the map, and there has to be some concentration of them so that we will know where they are and can handle them as an entity rather than in fragmented areas.

The success of this agency will depend, in my opinion, more upon adequate funding and adequate programs than it will on the actual structure involved. It can be good the way it is, or it can be just as good or perhaps better if it is put together into one agency, but in the last analysis it will depend upon how much financial support is given to these agencies and functions that are outlined under this consolidation of like functions.

I believe that the President under the reorganization plan procedure has set up a plan which is orderly and which in general comports with the purposes of the Reorganization Act. Therefore I am supporting the plan.

Again, because this is a resolution of disapproval, those who vote on this plan who are for the plan will vote "no" on the disapproving resolution and that automatically will be a vote for the plan.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and it has been stated on the other side that there are no further requests for time.

Approved For Release 2003/03/25 : CIA-RDP72-00337R000200260010-8

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 1210

Resolved, That the House of Representatives does not favor Reorganization Plan Numbered 4 transmitted to the Congress by the President on July 9, 1970.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be rejected.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Resolution 1210, to disapprove Reorganization Plan Numbered 4, he reported the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair, the resolution, not having the affirmative vote of a majority of the authorized membership of the House, is not agreed to.

So the resolution was rejected.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

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

There was no objection.

THE AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL AS VIEWED BY A MAN WHO NEVER THROWS ANYTHING AWAY

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, we were treated last week to another of those campaign-year reliables, the "rating" of Senators and Congressmen according to the ideological lights of a particular organization.

The new entry in this field calls itself the American Security Council, listing headquarters at 1101 17th Street NW., here in Washington.

The council's approach was essentially the same as other rating systems on behalf of business, or labor, or organized veterans. It was based, sponsors said, on a selected group of 10 votes touching on war policy and military preparedness.

Only difference between this and other vote rating systems was that the American Security Council based its own positions on the results from a mass computerized questionnaire which it sent out in mid-July.

Impartial observers might charge that the council's multiple-choice questions were loaded, or in the main so heavy handed as to be useless in determining foreign policy positions in the world of 1970.

But that would be a matter of opinion. I am more interested at the moment in pointing up a demonstrable fact concerning the American Security Council—for the discovery of which I am indebted to my own slovenly habit of rarely throwing anything away. It is this:

The American Security Council questionnaire which was sent to me—"an opinion leader in Washington"—on July 15 carried a mailing tab unmistakably identical to mailings which have arrived at my home from numerous other organizations—all of them legitimate, but all identified with the far, far right.

One of these groups utilizing the same mail list was the Conservative Victory Fund. In this one our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) was urging me—also by computerized letter—to join in an effort to defeat such good friends as JOHN BRADEMAS, DON EDWARDS, and DICK FULTON—and to help boost the fortunes of Senator MURPHY and Phylis Schlafly, among others.

In another mailed message delivered to my door with the very same address tab, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER asked me to send $15 to Young Americans for Freedom—ostensibly to help counter a million-dollar kitty purportedly collected by the New Mobe for their moratorium rally last October.

Still another appeal came from the National Right To Work Legal Defense and Education Foundation, Inc.—again with the same, easily identified mailing tab. the thrust of this organization's message was that union officials alone had socked $60 million into Hubert Humphrey's campaign, and unless we right-thinking citizens took legal action to halt them, those same union officials would spend even more in this year's congressional elections. The range of suggested contributions: $5 to $500.

On and on runs the identically addressed torrent—appeals from every conceivable new creation of that far-out fringe of the right, usually with the right palm turned upward in a political campaign year.

I commend these organizations on their frugality in combining mail lists. And I suppose if I did not save them all, in desk space that surely could be put to better use, I might be fooled into supposing that each of these peas came from a different pod.

Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to share the fruits of my easily assembled detective work with anyone interested in inspecting it. Meanwhile, any colleagues low rated by the American Security Council should be no more concerned than if their rating came from the liberty lobby.

Which it probably did.

THE UNITED STATES MUST RESPOND PROMPTLY TO NEW SOVIET THREAT IN CUBA

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the White House statement last Friday, September 25, that the United States would view with grave concern any attempt to establish a base in Cuba for the servicing of Soviet nuclear submarines, came none too early.

I fully support the President's statement.

This public warning to the Soviets appears to be based on intelligence developed by the Department of Defense, indicating that such a base is in the process of being established at Cienfuegos in the southern part of Cuba.

I am today calling the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs to meet in an urgent executive session with high Government officials, to review this situation.

I am also requesting the chairman of the Armed Services Committee to give every consideration to the requirements of strengthening our military and naval capability in the Caribbean region.

Nearly 3 months ago, in the course of my subcommittee's hearings reviewing the security situation in the Caribbean, I raised this very issue with high-ranking officials of the administration and the top U.S. military commanders responsible for the Caribbean region.

I had stressed that only a short time earlier, in May of this year, the second group of Soviet naval units visited the Caribbean and first stopped in Cuba at the port of Cienfuegos.

That Soviet naval force included an Echo II type submarine which had nuclear capability, eight firing tubes, and a range of approximately 400 miles.

I had pointed out to executive branch witnesses that the presence of Soviet nuclear naval units was drastically changing the security balance in the Caribbean and required the U.S. Government to take prompt steps to reverse the policy of curtailing our naval and shore facilities at Key West, at Boca Chica, at the Homestead Air Force Base, and at other installations in Southeastern United States.

Adm. E. P. Holmes, commander in chief of our Atlantic Command, agreed that it would be a "folly" to cut down U.S. military and naval capability in the face of this new Soviet threat.

On July 8, and during subsequent hearings, I repeatedly called to the administration's attention the many reports which I received indicating that facilities for servicing Soviet nuclear submarines were being constructed in Cuba.

Information now available to the Department of Defense and the White House seems to confirm those reports.

I believe that it would be a drastic mistake for the administration to invite a repetition of the 1962 Cuba missile crisis by failure to act promptly and decisively to nip this new Soviet challenge in the bud.

The track record of Soviet policy has demonstrated that once they embark upon the course of trying to change the military balance in a given region, they will continue ahead until they are stopped.

This has almost happened once in Cuba. It has happened since in the Mediterranean, in the Indian Ocean and in other areas.

Approved For Release 2003/03/25 : CIA-RDP72-00337R000200260010-8

Approved For Release 2003/03/25 : CIA-RDP72-00337R000200260010-8

As the first step, I believe it is imperative that the United States move promptly to beef up our military capability in the Caribbean region. This means that our facilities at Key West, Boca Chica, and Homestead should be immediately restored to full strength.

The stakes involved in any potential conflict in the Caribbean, and particularly in any United States-Soviet confrontation in that region, are going up each day.

I warned about this months ago, and I am today repeating that warning.

I believe that to wait any further is to court disaster.

The United States should and must respond promptly and forcefully to this new Soviet challenge.

I am gratified that the White House is turning its attention to this urgent problem. I hope that this will result in actions along the lines I have suggested.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will my distinguished colleague yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I wish to commend my distinguished colleague from Florida upon his statement. I endorse what he has said and join in his concern. I feel that the United States must move, and move vigorously, and that the committees of Congress should fully explore the threat to our security and to the hemisphere, which appears to be developing, in the area to which the gentleman referred.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman. I assure him that we have known about the proposed base for some time, and I have been preparing to release some remarks on the subject. For 4 months I have been preparing remarks, which I intend to deliver today. In a conference report, consideration of which we concluded on Thursday, we have included $435 million for the Navy as a beginning effort to beef up our Navy to be able to meet the threat we know the Soviets are creating. The item is in the conference report which will be up tomorrow. But this afternoon I intend to speak on the subject.

I want to thank the gentleman. The time is now to do something about this.

Mr. FASCELL. I agree with the gentleman from South Carolina.

MRS. JESSIE BALL DU PONT PASSES

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Jessie Ball du Pont, of Jacksonville, Fla., and Wilmington, Del., passed away at Nemours, her estate near Wilmington, on this past Saturday, and will be buried there today. She was one of the most beautiful characters I have ever known, full of love for humanity and with a zest for life, and wholesomely dedicated to making life better for others. Yet, she never claimed credit for the vast amount of good she did; and most of it was done anonymously.

Since she was the widow of an extremely able and wealthy man, Mr. Alfred I. du Pont, and the sister of another outstanding business leader, Mr. Edward Ball, some who knew her only slightly assumed that her tremendous accumulation of wealth was the result solely of the work of these able men; but those who know anything of the actual facts know that she has been an extremely successful businesswoman in her own right for a half a century.

She established the Alfred I. du Pont Foundation for Crippled Children, a dream of her late husband; and she otherwise carried on the philanthropic objectives of this sensitive and strong man, whom I also had the pleasure to know before his death 35 years ago. And she had a strong conviction of the need to keep vital the independent colleges of the country, particularly those which were church oriented. Her philanthropies in this field have been little published but they were tremendous.

Several weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, my family and I went to Nemours to pay our respects during a congressional recess, as she had repeatedly asked us to do. We learned sadly from her doctors that she would not be with us long. But regardless of how certain is the closing of life, it is always a shock and a personal tragedy to those who are left behind.

Few persons ever had the outstanding talents and opportunities of this great lady; and none ever used them better for mankind, I am sure. All thoughtful Americans join me in deepest sympathy to her brother, Ed Ball, her sisters and her daughter, Mrs. Carl Zapfee, and her other relatives and close friends.

Mr. Speaker, Ralph Waldo Emerson once observed that most of us fret ourselves into nameless graves while here and there some noble soul forgets himself into immortality. Such a person was my beloved friend, Jessie Ball du Pont.

This morning's edition of the Washington Post carried the following announcement of her death:

JESSIE BALL DU PONT

WILMINGTON, DEL., September 27.—Mrs. Jessie D. Ball du Pont, 86, third wife of industrialist Alfred I. du Pont, died Saturday at her family estate near here.

Her husband, who died in 1935, organized E. I. du Pont De Nemours and Co., and was one of the world's richest men. He was a grandson of the founder of the Du Pont industrial empire.

It was reported in 1964 that Mrs. du Pont received from the Alfred I. du Pont estate a total of $58.8 million from 1951 to 1962, $6.6 million in 1962 alone.

Mrs. du Pont was a native of Virginia and was married to the industrial magnate in Los Angeles in 1921. She was then 36. She was a descendant of Mary Ball Washington, mother of George Washington.

Mr. du Pont was divorced from his first wife, the former Bess Gardner of Philadelphia, in 1906. His second wife, Mrs. Alicia Bradford Maddox, of New York City, died in 1908.

Mrs. du Pont had lived in seclusion at Nemours, the family estate, for a number of years. Her secretary said she died of pneumonia.

Mrs. du Pont was a major benefactor of such institutions as Hollins College, Washington and Lee University, the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Mary Washington College of the University of Virginia, the University of the South and the Alfred I. du Pont Institute for crippled children.

In 1957, for example, Mrs. du Pont gave Hollins College a gift of $271,000, half of it to go toward a chapel and the other half for versity of the South and the Alfred I. du Pont arship fund.

She made two gifts in 1947 totaling $112,000 toward Washington and Lee University's bicentennial fund.

In 1956, Mrs. du Pont was selected by the Virginia Chamber of Commerce for a special award for "her service to Viginia and to education in the Old Dominion." She was the first woman to receive such an award.

Mrs. du Pont broke a 210-year tradition in 1959 when she became the first woman on the Board of Trustees of Washington and Lee University. She was appointed to succeed Sen. Harry F. Byrd (D-Va.) who had resigned.

Funeral arrangements were incomplete. However, burial was expected to be next to her husband at the estate.

She is survived by a daughter, Mrs. Carl Zapfee, of Baltimore, three stepchildren, eight grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

RUSSIAN SUBMARINE BASE IN CUBA

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I think all the Members of the House are greatly concerned by the evidence of the showing that Russia is trying to build a submarine base in Cuba.

I have by wire contacted the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee as well as the Foreign Affairs Committee urging that the committees call the Defense and State Departments before them and investigate this matter.

It is a serious development, and the people of this Nation are vitally concerned. I am sure, as he has in the past, that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee will respond by looking into this matter which can vitally affect the defense of this Nation.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman understands I will approach this in a little different manner than the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, but I will look into it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina, and I would urge his close investigation into this matter.

NATION'S HOUSING CRISIS

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the other day, one of my colleagues made a speech blaming the Nixon administration for the Nation's housing crisis. While I must

Approved For Release 2003/03/25 : CIA-RDP72-00337R000200260010-8

Approved For Release 2003/03/25 : CIA-RDP72-00337R000200260010-8

admit that we are indeed in the midst of a housing crisis as severe as any this Nation has ever faced, I should point out several things:

First. President Nixon's administration did not cause the housing crisis. It was inherited from the Democrats. The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, the product of a Democrat administration and a Democrat-controlled Congress, documented the housing need at 26 million housing units over the next 10 years—1968–78. This goal was reaffirmed by President Johnson's National Commission on Urban Problems in its report to him in 1968.

Second. The reason why the housing crisis persists is because of inflation. And inflation is the unfortunate result of unwise guns-and-butter overspending of the Johnson administration. This inflation has hit the housing problem from several directions all at the same time. It has caused the cost of homebuilding, including land, labor, materials, management, and financing to increase 10 percent since 1968. It has made financing home purchase more difficult and costly. And it has increased the price of existing housing, often pricing it out of the market for which it was intended.

Third. Although the Nixon administration inherited a severe housing problem together with a war-induced inflation which has exacerbated the housing problem, a number of specific steps have been taken which are beginning to bring results.

The most important step to take in curing the housing crisis is to curb inflation. As Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns said on February 7, 1970:

> There can be no doubt whatever that the single most important contribution toward improving housing market conditions would be success in the present struggle to check inflationary trends and expectations. Nonetheless, it must be recognized that it takes time to overcome an inflationary momentum that has gathered headway over a span of years dating all the way back to 1964.

The Nixon administration has instituted a number of fiscal and monetary changes designed to bring inflation under control. Just last week we heard the heartening news that the prime interest rate had dropped from 8 to 7½ percent and that the cost of living rose less in August than in any month since December 1968. Nixon's anti-inflationary policy, it appears, is paying off. This success should be reflected in an easing of the housing finance situation in the near future. The lower prime rate especially should mean that very soon home mortgages will be down to the point where the average family can begin to afford to buy a home. Unfortunately, the Democrat-controlled Congress did not see fit to adhere to Nixon's fiscal policy which called for a $1.3 billion surplus in fiscal year 1971. Such a surplus would also have had the effect of making more money available for investment and thereby forcing down interest rates. Rather than a surplus, however, the Democrats have passed legislation which so far has added $2.7 billions to the President's fiscal year 1971 budget.

The administration has also increased the flow of funds into mortgages by extending the Fannie Mae commitment and by adjusting interest rate ceilings on FHA and VA mortgages.

Attacking the housing problem from another direction, the President also took steps to stabilize the cost of building materials. The Department of Agriculture was directed to use a supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1969 and an increased appropriation for 1970 to provide additional timber from national forests. The Department of Interior was directed to make available increased timber for sale. And the Interstate Commerce Commission issued orders to relieve the shortage of boxcars used to move lumber and plywood from the Northwest. As a result of these measures, the sharp increase in prices which had seriously affected the building costs for single family homes and small apartments was reversed. Lumber and plywood prices have declined from their high levels of a year ago.

Working to relieve the labor shortages that have helped push housing costs up, the Nixon administration has initiated special job training programs to make entrance into the labor market easier. At present, 250,000 students are enrolled in construction training; the Department of Labor is encouraging local surveys and reports on specific manpower needs; and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is helping States develop plans for vocational education in secondary schools, postsecondary schools, and cooperative education programs which emphasize preparation for the construction industry.

In addition to attacking inflation, materials costs, and labor shortages, the Nixon administration has launched an imaginative program, Operation Breakthrough, which aims at developing entirely new ways to go about meeting our housing needs. Operation Breakthrough seeks to apply the principles of mass production to homebuilding so that the discoveries of industrial research and technology can be used to move homebuilding out of the Middle Ages. As this succeeds, volume production and economy of scale will become possible, permitting greater efficiency in the design, production, transfer, financing, and management of our national housing effort. This will mean attractive, well-built homes at prices families can afford.

Because of these efforts by the Nixon administration, the housing outlook is a lot brighter than it was when Nixon took office in January 1969. His efforts to control the inflation which the Democrats bequeathed to the Nation in the 1960's, means that soon the housing problems that accompanied the inflation will begin to respond. The additional administration efforts to control materials costs and labor shortages and to develop new housing construction approaches will help us beat this housing shortage in the 1970's.

According to a Wall Street Journal article, appearing on September 24, there are already tangible signs that the housing situation is improving. The article follows:

Home builders begin to sound a bit more optimistic.

There's still plenty of gloom in the industry, which has been hit hard by tight money. But signs of improvement are easier to come by now. The Council of Housing Producers, whose 13 members are among the major home builders in the U.S., says members expect to build about 33% more units in 1970 than a year ago. Houston's Westchester Corp., which had anticipated selling 225 homes this year, now expects to build about 300. In Pittsburgh, Ryan Homes, a big builder of single-family units, says business is "up substantially."

"We think it's quite obvious that the tight money situation is easing," says Eli Broad, chairman of Kaufman & Broad, a Los Angeles builder that expects housing starts in the last half to be up "at least 30%" from a year abo. This week's cut in the prime lending rate by major banks has added to optimism that more money will be available for housing.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

THE SOVIET THREAT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, never before in the 30 years of my membership in this body have I stepped into the well of this House with greater concern for the future of this Nation.

The fears that I have are those that must be shared by every American regardless of his political or social philosophy or his economic status.

All Americans have been given the blessed and priceless heritage of freedom—a freedom which I am convinced is in terrible jeopardy.

My critics, who are legion, will attempt to dismiss what I say today by categorizing them as the shrill cries of a hawk who is suffering the agonies of reduced defense expenditures.

If this occurs, I will have failed my purpose since I believe that these critics, who love America no less than I, will, if they assess my words carefully, find that we not only have a common concern, but a common and frightening peril.

The Congress is now engaged in a great and protracted debate over foreign policy and the defense budget.

Unfortunately, the debate in the other body has again distinguished itself by its indecisiveness and, regrettably, its apparent sense of hopelessness. Thank God that this body, despite its uninhibited free swinging debate, continues to be capable of making clear-cut and courageous decisions when our Nation's security is at stake.

My words today are, therefore, intended as much for the Members of the

Approved For Release 2003/03/25 : CIA-RDP72-00337R000200260010-8