Section 5 provides that if the Commissioners obtain a bond for a notary public whose notarial duties are confined solely to District of Columbia business, then the bond obtained by the Commissioners shall be in lieu of that required by law.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file the conference report on the judges' salary bill.

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

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 920)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 727) to adjust the salaries of the judges of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia Tax Court, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the fourth sentence of the sixth paragraph of section 6 of the Act entitled 'An Act to consolidate the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, to be known as "The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia", to create "The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia", and for other purposes', approved April 1, 1942, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 11-711), is amended by striking out '$14,500' and inserting in lieu thereof '$19,000', and by striking out '$14,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$18,500'.

"SEC. 2. The fourth sentence of section 2 of such Act of April 1, 1942, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 11-753), is amended by striking out '$13,500' and inserting in lieu thereof '$18,000', and by striking out '$13,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$17,500'.

"SEC. 3. The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 2 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 47-2402), is amended by striking out '$13,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$17,500'.

"SEC. 4. The last sentence of section 19 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia (D. C. Code, sec. 11-920) is amended to read as follows: 'The salary of the judge shall be $17,500 per annum.'"

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
OREN HARRIS,
SID SIMPSON,
JOS. P. O'HARA,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WAYNE MORSE,
ALAN BIBLE,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 727) to adjust the salaries of the judges of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia Tax Court, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The first section of the Senate bill increased the salary of the chief judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia from $14,500 to $20,000 per annum, and the salaries of the judges of such court from $14,000 per annum to $19,500 per annum. The corresponding section of the House amendment provided an increase to $17,500 for the chief judge and to $17,000 for the judges of such court. The conference agreement fixes the salary of the chief judge to be $19,000 and the salaries of the judges to be $18,500.

Section 2 of the Senate bill increased the salary of the chief judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia from $13,500 per annum to $19,000 per annum, and the salaries of the judges of the Municipal Court from $13,000 per annum to $18,500 per annum. The corresponding section of the House amendment provided an increase to $16,500 for the chief judge and to $16,000 for the judges of such court. The conference agreement fixes the salary of the chief judge of such court to be $18,000 per annum and the salaries of the judges to be $17,500.

Section 3 of the Senate bill (which corresponds to section 4 of the House amendment and the conference substitute) established the salary of the judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia at $18,500 per annum. Under existing law the salary of such judge is fixed under the Classification Act of 1949, and is at present $11,800 per annum. The House amendment provided that the salary of the judge of the Juvenile Court should be $14,800. The conference agreement fixes the salary of such judge to be $17,500.

Section 4 of the Senate bill (which corresponds to section 3 of the House amendment and the conference substitute) increased the salary of the judge of the District of Columbia Tax Court from $13,000 per annum to $18,500 per annum. The House amendment increased the salary of such judge to $16,000. The conference agreement fixes the salary of such judge to be $17,500.

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
OREN HARRIS,
SID SIMPSON,
JOS. P. O'HARA,
Managers on the Part of the House.

MILITARY, NAVAL, AND AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 286) providing for the consideration of H. R. 6829, a bill to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule as the reading would indicate providing for 3 hours of general debate and then the reading of the bill in Committee of the Whole under the 5-minute rule for amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important piece of legislation. It is very extensive in its scope. I wonder at times whether we really appreciate the full significance of these tremendous authorizations and appropriations. This one bill authorizes the expenditure of more money than possibly the cost of running this entire Government during the first 25 years of its existence.

The bill is divided into five titles and it proposes to provide construction and other related authority for the military departments within and outside the United States and for the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. Speaker, the total authorization in this bill is for the sum of $2,368,998,900.

Breaking this figure down, Mr. Speaker, the Army would be given a total authorization of $551,105,000. This would be further broken down so that $238,778,000 would be allotted for use inside continental United States. The sum of $78,334,000 would be authorized for outside the United States, while $223,993,000 would be authorized for classified use by the Army and $10 million would be authorized for emergencies.

The authorization for the Navy in this bill would be $596,140,900, of which $331,607,200 is proposed to be spent in continental United States while $107,191,300 is to be spent outside the country. The classified allocation for the Navy is $151,342,400 while the sum of $6 million is proposed to be authorized for emergency use by the Navy.

The Air Force has received the largest authorization, for its total in H. R. 6829 is $1,165,453,000. Out of this sum it is proposed that $709,480,000 be allocated for expenditure within continental United States while $450,973,000 would be spent outside of continental United States, and finally $5 million would be set aside for emergency use.

Title IV of the bill would provide the sum of $800,000 to be allocated, if authorized, for the use of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, while title V proposes to authorize the sum of $56 million for the Central Intelligence Agency. This makes the grand total of $2,368,998,900.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the report indicates that the Army authorization this year, if

Document No. _____
Review of this document by CIA has determined that
☑ CIA has no objection to declass
☐ It contains information of CIA interest that must remain classified at TS S C
Authority: HR 70-2
☐ It contains nothing of CIA interest
Date 14-5-81 Reviewer 026199

Approved For Release 2000/08/16 : CIA-RDP80-01370R000500060021-8

Command installation and it will be in the greater Milwaukee area, Wis.

Although the Department of Defense submitted a good program, the committee added certain items which are set out on page 15. No new item was added for the Air Force, but a hospital at Camp Jackson, S. C., was added for the Army, and the Naval Air Facility at the Naval Academy was added for the Navy. This is the same facility I just mentioned.

This air facility was recommended by the Board of Visitors at the Naval Academy, as were the other two items at Annapolis—an addition to Bancroft Hall and some of the fill necessary to provide additional land area.

Another important construction item added by the committee appears in title IV of the bill. This would authorize the construction or rehabilitation of five units of housing, a communications facility and other related items for the chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff and four of his assistants. At the present time all of the Chiefs of Staff are provided with adequate housing. For example, the Commandant of the Marine Corps has some 15,000 square feet in his house, while Admiral Radford's house is something a little over 3,000 square feet.

These buildings are to be erected on land adjacent to the Naval Observatory.

Now, in addition to that, it is recommended here that $56 million be made available to the Central Intelligence Agency to establish a permanent building to house its activities. There are a great number of people employed by the Central Intelligence Agency here in the District of Columbia, and they are being housed in some 33 or more buildings. Mr. Dulles, the head of the Central Intelligence Agency, feels that being housed in many units, as they are, jeopardizes the security that is required. Now, you know what the Central Intelligence Agency is. So, we provide here an authorization of $56 million for land and a building.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Are these buildings for the Central Intelligence Agency, estimated to cost $50 million, to be constructed within 30 or 35 miles of the District of Columbia? Can the gentleman tell me?

Mr. VINSON. During the hearings Mr. Dulles designated certain places. Some were outside the District of Columbia. But, he did feel that it was absolutely essential, in view of the character of the work he does, to be within reasonable distance of the District of Columbia. I would say 35 to 40 miles from the District or probably more, but that was the line of testimony.

There were about 125 amendments to the original bill, which totaled at the time it was submitted, about $2,354,000,000. The bill that you have before you totals almost $2,369,000,000. This is an increase of about $14½ million. In the process of its consideration, the committee eliminated items in the amount of over $33 million and added items in the amount of about $48 million.

You will note at the bottom of page 15 and on page 16 of the report that the committee gave special consideration to several of the controversial items which naturally arise in every public-works bill. One of these is the land acquisition in Okinawa, another was the expansion of Fort Sill; two of the Navy proposals involving New Iberia and Port Chicago were also in the same category.

A number of the members of the Maryland and Ohio delegations were heard with respect to the proposed move of the headquarters of the Research and Development Command from Baltimore to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

A matter of particular interest, as evidenced by the mail which the committee has received, relates to the effect of the Government's construction of family housing on Wherry projects.

I want to draw your attention to the table set out on page 21 of the report, which contains every installation at which there is a Wherry project and at which housing would be constructed under this bill. If you will look at the last column you will see that in every instance, even after taking into consideration every conceivable kind of housing, there still is a large deficit at those installations.

Of course, the second last column indicates only about 4,500 housing units to be constructed at these bases. The whole bill contains about 17,000 units, but these other houses are to be constructed at bases where there is no Wherry housing.

Last year Congress authorized 11,600 family housing units. This bill, as I say, will authorize about 17,000 units. They will vary in cost, with the overall average in the United States being $13,480. Of these 17,000 houses, 3,500 represent replacements of quarters that can no longer be lived in. Five thousand two hundred and seventy-one are for officers, and 11,700 are for enlisted men.

All of this housing will be of permanent construction and located for the most part at permanent installations.

Section 609 of the bill, appearing on page 70, would permit a military department to acquire, upon the application of the project owner, any Wherry housing project at an installation at which housing would be constructed directly by the Government under this bill. I want to draw your particular attention to the fact that the project owner has to want to get rid of his project and make application that it be purchased by a military department before this can be done.

To my mind a project owner would probably want to have the department acquire his project only if it has proved to be an unprofitable business venture. In any event, I want to stress that it is entirely a voluntary act on the part of the private owner.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a good bill and that it represents a sound program. It was unanimously reported by the House Armed Services Committee.

I respectfully urge its passage.

Mr. Chairman, to show you how carefully we considered this bill, I should like to say this. I am proud of what the committee did with this bill. We worked 6 long weeks and read every item, line by line, in order to approve this proposed authorization of $2,369,000,000. It takes a long time to find out how to spend that much money, and we took the time.

We amended the bill in 125 different places and reduced the authorization requested. But when we added these authorizations in Maryland and South Carolina, it increased the total. As I say, there were about 125 amendments to the original bill, the total of which when it was submitted was $2,354,000,000. The bill before you now calls for a total of $2,369,000,000, an increase of about $14,500,000.

In the process of its consideration, the committee eliminated items in the amount of $33 million and added items in the amount of $48 million.

Had it not been for the fact that we felt the circumstances warranted it, such as the hospital at Camp Jackson and the activities at the Naval Academy, as a result of our screening and careful scrutiny of the bill, which we passed on in a line by line consideration, there would have been a reduction of $33 million.

I want to say this further. This is a department measure. It is recommended by the Director of the Budget. It is recommended by Mr. Floete's office, which was created for the purpose of scrutinizing and coordinating these public works.

I ask that the bill be enacted because the facts and circumstances warrant it. It is absolutely essential to carry on this public works construction to keep our military forces in the shape in which they should be kept.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I notice on page 17 of the report mention is made of a suggestion of moving the Fifth Army headquarters from Chicago to Des Moines. Would the gentleman explain that?

Mr. VINSON. A great many suggestions come before the Committee on Armed Services. Oftentimes it seems they are sowed in fertile soil and bear fruit. Sometimes they fall among thorns and thistles. I am afraid that suggestion has fallen among thorns and thistles. I do not think the gentleman need disturb himself about it, because Secretary Stevens said that he was going to examine it, he did examine it, and concluded that the facts at this time did not warrant that proposal.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman will recall that some weeks ago I telephoned him when there was such a report in Chicago, and asked him about it.

Mr. VINSON. I want to compliment the gentleman who represents the city of Chicago for being so alert. I have always known that he was right here on the job and his inquiry substantiates my conclusion.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I am voting "present" on the rollcall on H. R. 6829, authorizing construction for the military departments and the Central Intelligence Agency.

To me, this is the only sound position open because I have not been able to find in the extensive hearings and the report the facts I feel I need in order to pass on this $2.36 billion authorization for the purchase of more real estate by the Department of Defense, which already holds properties costing more than $24.8 billion with some of it being carried at ridiculously low acquisition costs. This holding comprises 61 percent of the acquired real property of the United States Government. In addition, the Department of Defense leases 190 locations including 1,983,686 acres for which it pays an annual rental of $19,697,000.

I cannot say that the armed services do not need every facility provided in the bill before us today—but, after reading the hearings, I do have some reasonable doubts. Neither can I say that the armed services do need these facilities and this land in every case.

In the brief of authorizations, under title I, the Army lists $223,993,000, or 40 percent, of its construction authorizations as "classified." The Navy, under title II, lists $151,342,400, or about 25 percent of its construction funds as "classified." I am pleased that the Air Force seems more detailed and forthright in its justifications throughout and does not hide behind the term "classified" for projects most of which are being built right here in the United States, where all our citizens can observe daily the steam shovels, bulldozers, and steelworkers working on the projects so carefully "classified" from Congress.

I have been unable to discover just what is the construction included in title IV for the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Evidently this $300,000 did not appear in the original H. R. 5700 as introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], at least not in title IV where it is now. Is this a house for Admiral Radford? Is it an elite housing project to provide for his personal staff, too? How many facilities can you provide for an admiral for $300,000. I am not saying that this is necessarily either an unwise or an unjustified expenditure; I would just like to know what it is for and what we get for the money. Such items as "Chairman, JCS, $300,000," do not explain to me what use is to be made of the taxpayers' money any more than I can be completely satisfied with general phrases such as "Operational and maintenance facilities," "Community facilities," and "Storage facilities," as justifications for the expenditure of billions of dollars.

I do not know whether the CIA needs a $6 million building site and a $50 million building, or not. I do not know or have any idea of how many employees CIA now has. I do not know what they do or to whom they are really accountable. Perhaps if I knew these things I would want to increase the CIA construction authorization, but I guess I will never know. Perhaps those of us in Congress will, someday, create a Joint Committee on Intelligence to provide congressional guidance to CIA modeled on that which the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has developed in its field. Certainly we exercise no controls over this super secret agency through a check on the purse strings.

The Committee on Armed Services deserves due credit for their application and diligent work on this piece of legislation. The hearings total 4,091 pages, accumulated in approximately 50 hours and 25 minutes of on-the-record hearings spread over 21 days. Rapidly calculating, I estimate that the committee considered this authorization at about the rate of $789,666 per minute of open hearing time, an evidence of unusual efficiency especially when you consider that their considerations ranged from Alaska to the Midway Islands including the British West Indies, the Canal Zone, Cuba, French Morocco, Hawaii, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Johnson Island, Mariana Islands, and the Marshall Islands in between. Without being able to tell what went on in the off-the-record hearings, one can wish the Army and Navy had justified their requests as forthrightly as the Air Force.

The Army will be authorized $551,105,000 in this bill as contrasted with $236 million granted in fiscal 1955—an increase of over 100 percent. The Navy will be authorized $596,140,900 in this bill to accomplish public works as compared with about $202 million for fiscal 1955, an increase of well over 100 percent. The Air Force will be authorized $1,165,456,000 in this bill, an increase of more than 300 percent over last year's authorization of $398,954,000.

Is this too much, or is it too little? Can we use this real estate instead of weapons against an enemy? I just do not know. On the basis of the information furnished me I have no way of reaching a sensible conclusion. So, I voted "Present."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. METCALF, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 283, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on final passage I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 316, nays 2, answering "present" 2, not voting 114, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—316

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addonizio
Alger
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Bass, N. H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Baumhart
Beamer
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bow
Bowler
Boyle
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill
Buchanan
Budge
Burleson
Burnside
Bush
Byrd
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carrigg
Cederberg
Celler
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Christopher
Chudoff
Church
Clark
Clevenger
Cole
Colmer
Cooley
Coon
Cooper
Corbett
Coudert
Cramer
Cretella
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Derounian
Devereux
Dies
Dixon
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Durham
Edmondson
Elliott
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandes
Fine
Fisher
Fjare
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Friedel
Gary
Gavin
Gentry
George
Gordon
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Gregory
Griffiths
Gross
Gwinn
Haley
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hayworth
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Holmes
Hope
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hyde
Jarman
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karsten
Keating
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krueger
Landrum
Lane
Lanham
Lankford
Latham
LeCompte
Lipscomb
Long
McCarthy
McCormack
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McMillan
McVey
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Mahon
Marshall
Martin
Mason
Matthews
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Minshall
Mollohan
Morano
Moss
Multer
Murray, Ill.
Murray, Tenn.
Natcher
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Phillips
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Preston
Price
Priest
Prouty
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Ray
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riley
Roberts
Robeson, Va.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Rutherford
Sadlack
Saylor
Schenck
Scott
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Shelley
Short
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Taber
Talle
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, Mich.
Thompson, N. J.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tumulty
Udall
Van Zandt
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Walter
Watts
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.

Mr. MANSFIELD. True 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 Maida; 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 acquisiton. 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 avigation 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

Approved For Release 2000/08/16 : CIA-RDP80-01370R000500060021-8

or 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 [illegible] 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 Philip 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 Probt);

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 Reichinger;

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 Stijepo Bulich;

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 Arnes 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 Eufronio 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. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of con-

school system, will do much to save our youth.

Then, thirdly, religion. The church and the synagogue—when correctly understood and used by the parents—can and do play a major role in the prevention of delinquency. The house of God and the religious school must, however, not be regarded by parents as good places to which to send their children, but in which they have no personal interest. How naive can parents become when they say: "I sent them to church, didn't I? I sent them to Sunday school, didn't I? What kind of a church are you running? You must have a pretty bad Sunday school if my children are turning out this way."

Now, religious institutions, although they can be exceedingly effective and are effective in the training of character, cannot perform miracles. Such institutions can imbue the child with the highest concepts of morality and unselfishness only when his parents participate with him. Only then will the child consider these institutions important.

Fourthly, the influence of the community upon the child's growth and development. Good housing, it has been shown time and again, prevents delinquency. And recreational facilities, playgrounds and social centers, operated by trained personnel, are all unquestioned deterrents to delinquency. The work of youth organizations like the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, YMCA's, YWCA's, etc., all should be widely expanded so that more and more of our youth will come under their influence. The policy of the infiltration of street gangs by trained youth leaders that is being pursued by our own New York Youth Board is, to my mind, an excellent method of dealing with this problem. Yes, when the community influences are favorable, the child has a better chance to be the kind of citizen that his parents and that the community at large would want him to be.

Finally, it is well known that the moral climate of a community has its effect upon the youth. Stories of corruption involving important Government officials, shady business practices, stories of easy money and of gangsters who are glorified and become heroes, the effect of unwholesome movies, comic books, TV programs are not without their influence upon the young. Dr. Fine tells of a young thief who remarked to him: "Yes, I stole $150 from a gas station. So what? How much did Governor Hoffman steal from the people of New Jersey?" It is this attitude that is very easily developed in the minds of impressionable youth. "If they can do it, if they can get away with it, why can't I?"

I shall not go into the improvements that must be made in the various agencies dealing with our youth after they have become delinquent—the juvenile police officers, the juvenile courts, improved foster homes, detention homes, training schools, etc.—but desire merely to emphasize the need for improving those media which will prevent juvenile delinquency, namely, the home, the school, the church and synagogue, the community, the morale climate. To achieve this purpose, we must stop thinking in terms of delinquent youth, but rather in terms of our delinquent society. We know the causes. We also know the cure. Our problem is not that we demand that something be done by someone else, but that we express our willingness to accept whatever responsibility devolves upon us as members of society and to make whatever financial sacrifices that may be necessary in order to build a finer, healthier, and more worthy community life for the young people of our country. No task confronting us is more important, none more essential to the well-being of our society.

During the war a new expression, crash program, came into frequent use. It means that if something of the utmost importance, something involving the very life and death of our country had to be accomplished, then the question of financial cost was not to be considered at all. Thus, when it was decided to create an atomic bomb—even though no one was certain that it could be achieved—we did not hesitate to spend what was then, and still is, the astronomical sum of $2 billion. We said then, and we say now, that whatever the cost, it was worth it.

Something of the same spirit animated the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis when it embarked upon its dramatic program to stamp out this horrible disease. Untold millions of dollars were spent and will continue to be spent until this scourge is completely eliminated from the world. Who will say that its wasn't—and isn't—worth it?

Some such crash program, it seems to me, is required if we are to win the war against juvenile delinquency, a disease which is even mode dreadful and more destructive than polio or any other physical ailment. Let us have more family counselors than we think we need. Let us build more and better schools and playgrounds than we think are necessary. Let us hire better teachers, more teachers and provide them with a wage to which they are entitled. Let us engage more youth directors than we believe we are going to need. The cost will go up into the hundreds of millions and billions of dollars, but who will say that it isn't worth it?

At the present time juvenile delinquency is problem number one in America. It is infinitely more serious than any other problem which we are confronted. The very existence of our civilization depends upon its solution. It must be solved and it can be solved and it will be solved, when the citizens of our Nation become aware of the responsibilities devolving upon them. Yes, punishment is necessary when crimes are committed, whether by juveniles or by adults. But that doesn't solve the problem. It is the delinquent society which creates delinquency that requires our attention.

In the 21st chapter of the Book of Deuteronomy a very strange procedure is described in connection with what is to take place when a slain person is found in a field and his murderer is unknown. The elders and the judges of the city nearest the spot where the body has been found are required to offer a sacrifice, wash their hands over it and then say, "Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it. Forgive, O Lord Thy people Israel, whom Thou had redeemed, and suffer not innocent blood to remain in the midst of Thy people Israel." In commenting on this unusual proceeding, one of the ancient rabbis asked: "Why is it that the good people, the respectable people, the elders and the judges are called upon to swear that their hands were guiltless of this crime? Why were not the cutthroats, the thieves, and the known criminals of the community made to swear that they did not perpetrate this crime?" To these rhetorical questions he provided the answer: "In order that we might always realize that not the bad people, but the good people are responsible for the evils of a community; the evils of life will disappear when the good folk assume the responsibilities which belong to them." Amen.

LOSS OF UNITED STATES TRADE IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, to those of us who recognize the importance of the Latin American countries to the economic well-being of our Nation, the article which appeared in the July 1 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald is indeed frightening. This article is entitled "United States Is Losing Trade in Latin America." It goes on to state that Japan and Europe, including the Soviet bloc countries, are cutting into the trade of Latin America by offering lower prices and longer credit terms.

This assertation was contained in a United Nation's report which reviewed the economy of the Latin America countries for the year 1954.

Mr. President, the Department of Commerce reveals that our trade with Latin America has dropped by almost $250 million in the past 2 years, and there is every indication that with our little attention to the affairs of the countries to the south of us, and increased attention on the part of the countries of Europe and the Soviet bloc countries that trade between Latin America and the United States will unfortunately continue to fall off.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the above-described article.

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

UNITED STATES IS LOSING TRADE IN LATIN AMERICA

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., June 30.—Japan and Europe, including Soviet bloc countries, are cutting into United States trade with Latin America by offering cheaper prices and easier credit terms, a U. N. report disclosed today. Soviet bloc trading was sharply on the upgrade, it said.

A review of Latin American economies for 1954 was made public here in advance of the meeting of the U. N. Economic Commission for Latin America starting August 29 in Bogota, Colombia.

Agriculture increases in Latin America as a whole kept up with a population increase and industry spurted 8.4 percent over 1953, but there were gloomy notes in the review. Investment in Latin America showed a declining trend. Balance of payments surplus was reduced by more than $700 million.

During 1951 and 1953 imports of European rolling stock almost equaled those from the United States, the review noted. The United States also was losing ground in commercial vehicles, not only to Europe but also to Japan.

European exports to Latin America of machinery for the pulp, paper, and timber industries have more than doubled in 2 years, while those of the United States and Canada have fallen by 45 percent, the review said.

Japan was described as extremely active in textile-machinery sales.

Eastern Europe and Japan have provided strong competition in agricultural machinery, cutting considerably imports of United States tractors.

The United States still holds an edge in the sale of private automobiles and was showing recovery in agricultural machinery, oil drilling machinery and machine tools, the review said.

MULTIPLE USE OF SURFACE OF SAME TRACTS OF PUBLIC LANDS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681) and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other

purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681) and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with a further amendment as follows: On page 5, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendment, after the words "United States" insert the words "subsequent to the location of the claim", and the Senate agree to the same.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WALTER ROGERS
LEE METCALF,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN MILITARY, NAVAL, AND AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 7, 1955, pp. 8661–8669, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

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

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter which I received from residents of Langley, Va. The subcommittee did not know of the objection of the people of Langley, Va., to the possible location of the new CIA headquarters in that community.

I am not sure whether it has been finally decided that the headquarters will go to Langley, Va. I think, however, that certainly the people of that community should have an opportunity to be heard before the Appropriations Committee before any final decision is reached. The committee was unaware of the protest at the time the matter was being considered.

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

JULY 8, 1955.

The Honorable HENRY M. JACKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: We are residents and property owners of the Langley-Great Falls area of Fairfax County, Va., who are concerned over the possible construction of the Central Intelligence Agency headquarters in the neighborhood. On April 7 of this year CIA announced publicly that it was giving up any plan to locate in Langley. Then last week, without notice, language was written into a military construction bill which indicated that CIA was still very much interested in Langley as a possible site. We believe there are serious considerations against locating CIA in Langley that should be brought to the attention of the Congress.

Langley is a unique residential area of one-family homes on large lots, country places, and farms. There are no apartment buildings and virtually no commercial development. A large Government office building will bring great pressure for mass housing, commercial construction, used-car lots, and other changes which will destroy the character of the area.

Fairfax County is already hard-pressed to provide water, sewerage, schools, roads, police, and other facilities for a rapidly growing population. Water and sewerage may be arranged for an office building itself, but the great population increase which will follow will throw an intolerable burden on the community. For example, the water table is already falling in the county, and new mass housing in an area of individual wells will lower the table disastrously and dry up many existing wells.

To erect a large office building on this river front property and to build a super highway to it in the name of the George Washington Memorial Parkway is directly contrary to the purposes of the Capper-Crampton Act. The Congress in 1930 authorized the acquisition of the river front property, including the entire Virginia shore of the Potomac from below Chain Bridge to a point above Great Falls, for a memorial to George Washington and for "the protection and preservation of the natural scenery of the Gorge and the Great Falls of the Potomac" (46 Stat. 482).

The Public Roads tract at Langley with 1½ miles of riverfront is the only substantial piece of United States property on the Virginia shore above Chain Bridge available for park purposes. Other such property is increasingly difficult to acquire. As with the more highly publicized Maryland shore of the Potomac, the interest of protecting the wilderness of the river and carrying out the statutory purposes of the Capper-Crampton Act must be balanced against the interest of providing access for the motorist. Neither consideration, however, suggests that large Government office buildings should be located on potential park land.

The McLean Citizens Association, drawing its members from the entire area, considered the problem at a special meeting and voted to opppose location of a CIA building in Langley. At a subsequent meeting the association recommended that park and recreation areas be designated for the area, including if possible the bulk of the Public Roads property at Langley. Of several sites now being considered by CIA, Langley is the only one in which the local citizens association has objected. In fact, other areas have pleaded with CIA to locate there and have offered free land and facilities.

No affirmative reason has been offered for location of a huge Government office building on potential park land, in the midst of an entirely residential area, against the wishes of the community and in the face of strongly pressed invitations to locate elsewhere. CIA has no need to have its employees work in rural residential surroundings. To locate in Langley would damage a unique community with no offsetting gain to CIA.

We are presenting our views in this letter to make clear that residents of the Langley area have not changed their opposition to a CIA building here. After the April 7 statement we assumed that the mattter was closed. If Langley is again to be considered by CIA, we wish to be heard. Surely such a controversial proposal, with its serious effects on long-established Federal park policy and on the orderly development of a community, should receive full and careful study including an opportunity for all viewpoints to be presented.

Respectfully yours,

BENJAMIN LEE BIRD.
G. BOWDOIN CRAIGHILL, Jr.
ROGER FISHER.
MANNING GASCH.
ANTHONY LEWIS.
SAMUEL E. NEEL.
CYNTHIA ZIMMERMAN.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have a short statement which is a summary of the conference report, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STENNIS ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 6829, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL

A tabulation showing a comparison of the authorization contained in this bill as it passed the House, as it passed the Senate, and as has been agreed to in conference is as follows:

Comparative summary of military construction authorization bill (H. R. 6829)

	House	Senate	Conference
Army	$551,105,000	$527,027,000	$533,904,000
Navy	596,140,900	571,620,300	564,224,300
Air Force	1,165,453,000	1,205,170,000	1,207,902,000
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff	300,000		
CIA	56,000,000	53,500,000	54,500,000
Total	2,368,998,900	2,357,317,300	2,360,530,300

The total authorization agreed to in conference is $3,213,000 more than had been approved by the Senate and $8,468,600 less than had been approved by the House.

Under the conference agreement the Army would receive $533,904,000 or $6,877,000 more than had been contained in the bill as it passed the Senate. This difference represents Senate agreement to add $5 million for hospital facilities at Fort Jackson, S. C. and to add $1,877,000 for cold storage facilities at Schofield Barracks in Hawaii.

The Navy would receive authorization in the amount of $564,224,300, which figure is $7,396,000 less than the Senate had approved. This net reduction derives from the Senate's agreeing to the addition of $81,000 for providing Navy family quarters in the District of Columbia and to the addition of $432,000 for a dispensary at Quantico, Va., with these additions being more than offset by reductions of $6,098,000 at Camp Pendleton in California; $123,000 at the Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Md.; and $1,688,000 for land acquisition at Port Chicago, Calif. The decision to reduce the authorization at Camp Pendleton results from a reluctance to provide additional facilities there until an adequate water supply for the base is assured. The land acquisition at Port Chicago was deleted, pending an on-the-site study by a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee to determine whether this land requirement can be coordinatd with a similar requirement of the Army in the same area. The relatively small reduction at the Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Md. was made after the Department of the Navy advised that it no longer required this small item.

The Air Force portion of the authorization is $1,207,902,000, an increase of $2,732,000 over the authorization contained in the bill as it passed the Senate. The addition of $2,732,000 is to provide additional facilities at the Charleston Air Force Base, S. C. These facilities were originally scheduled for authorization next year, but were included in this bill in order to enhance the effectiveness of this important base at an early date.

The Senate had provided authorization for the headquarters installation for the Central Intelligence Agency in a maximum amount of $53,500,000; $45 million of this sum as intended for the construction of buildings. If the headquarters installation were placed at Langley, Va., $8,500,000 would have been available for the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway. If a site other than Langley were chosen, $1 million would have been available for the purchase of the necessary land. The House had provided $50 million for the building, and the Conferres agreed to add $1 million to the Senate allowance of $45 million for this purpose. Thus, the CIA is provided a maximum authorization of $54,500,000, of which $46 million is earmarked for the construction of a headquarters installation. If the Langley site is finally selected, an additional $8,500,000 is available for extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway. If the Langley site is not selected, this $8,500,000 is not available for authorization, but $1 million would be available for the purchase of land.

The House had provided an authorization of $300,000 for the construction of quarters and related communication facilities for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and his assistants. The conferees recognized the desirability of providing suitable quarters for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, but no detailed justification for this construction had been ppresented in the Senate, and it was agreed that an authorization of this type should be separately considered. Only this morning a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services took testimony on an authorization for this purpose, and it is possible that a separate bill to authorize housing for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will be reported in time for consideration and action at this session of the Congress.

There were two changes from the Senate version of the general provisions contained in title V. The Senate conferees agreed to accept a House provision authorizing the secretaries of the military departments to acquire housing units insured by the Federal Housing Commissioner pursuant to title VI or title IX of the National Housing Act, in those cases where the housing units are adequate and suitable for housing military personnel and their dependents. This provision, as it was originally inserted by the House, was intended to be complementary to a somewhat similar provision authorizing the secretaries of the military departments to assume, on application by the sponsor, mortgage obligations on the so-called Wherry housing units that had been insured under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act. The Senate bill did not contain the provision affecting the Wherry housing units. The House receded from its language authorizing the acquisition of Wherry housing units and the Senate accepted the House language authorizing the acquisition of title VI and title IX units.

The second change in the general provisions as they had passed the Senate relates to the provision requiring the secretaries of the military departments to come into agreement with the Armed Services Committees on the utilization of certain classified and overseas construction authorization. This section represented a continuation of committee policy adopted originally in 1952. However, the construction requirements, cost estimates, and base agreements are much more firm and definite today than was true in 1952, and the Senate agreed to eliminate this provision.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the conference report substantially follows the bill as passed by the Senate.

With reference to the matter at Langley, Va., we did not locate the CIA building at Langley. There was no testimony taken on that point.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the county executive of the county of Fairfax, Va., be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
COUNTY OF FAIRFAX,
Fairfax, Va., July 7, 1955.

Hon. JOHN C. STENNIS,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR STENNIS: It occurs to me that it would be appropriate to advise you of the position taken by the Board of County Supervisors of Fairfax County, Va., relative to possible location of the Central Intelligence Agency's Office building near Langley in Fairfax County.

Our board has consistently welcomed the CIA to this location and has expressed a willingness to cooperate in every way possible in providing the facilties which this installation would require in order to make it possible for the Langley site to be chosen.

The board has officially agreed to provide sewage disposal for the installation and has cooperated with the city of Falls Church and the Virginia Department of Highways relative to supplying water and providing adequate highway facilities for same.

It is my understanding that a decision in connection with this location will soon be forthcoming and I am pleased to advise you of the position taken by the Fairfax County Board of County Supervisors.

With best wishes,
Sincerely yours,
CARLTON C. MASSEY,
County Executive.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to congratulate the members of the conference committee upon the action on the bill which the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi has presented. The able and distinguished Senator from Mississippi and his committee composed of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], performed a very fine service, and I wish to commend them for the excellent manner in which they handled the bill.

On behalf of the people of South Carolina I should like to say that we are very appreciative of the consideration given to the hospital at Fort Jackson. Fort Jackson is one of the finest installations for training troops, and the hospital will provide facilities which are very badly needed there. We are very grateful to the conference committee for their action in the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina subsequently said:

Mr. President, I should like to commend the three Senate conferees on the military construction bill for their success in retaining certain items in the bill. I wish to say something in behalf of the Charleston transportation depot; and I notice that there is $5 million allowed for Camp Jackson, S. C., for medical facilities. I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that it is not Camp Jackson. It is Fort Jackson. It was made a fort several years ago.

Also, I notice that $427,000 has been included for the naval industrial reserve shipyard, Charleston, S. C.; $1,650,000 for the Marine Corps record depot, Parris Island, S. C.; $4,649,000 for the Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, S. C.; and $553,000 for community facilities at the Naval Receiving Station, Charleston, S. C.

There are several other items pertaining to South Carolina, but I shall not go into them in detail now.

I thank the committee of conference for having included these items for South Carolina. I think they are much needed and can well be used in the defense of our Nation at this time.

MRS. LORENZA O'MALLEY (DE AMUSATEGUI) ET AL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1003) for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui), Jose Maria de Amusategui O'Malley, and the legal guardian of Ramon de Amusategui O'Malley, and re-

questing a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. KILGORE, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. BUTLER conferees on the part of the Senate.

THOMAS F. HARNEY

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2907) for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as the Harney Engineering Co., and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. KILGORE, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. BUTLER conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORRIN J. BISHOP

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4249) for the relief of Orrin J. Bishop and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. KILGORE, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. BUTLER conferees on the part of the Senate.

ESTATE OF VICTOR HELFENBEIN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5078) for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. KILGORE, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. BUTLER conferees on the part of the Senate.

DONALD HECTOR TAYLOR

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 26) for the relief of Donald Hector Taylor, which was, in line 7, after "fee" insert "*Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act."

Mr. KILGORE. The bill has been amended by the House to provide for the posting of a bond, as a guaranty that the beneficiary will not become a public charge.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

LUPE M. GONZALEZ

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 36) for the relief of Lupe M. Gonzalez, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceeding and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, any warrant of arrest and bond which may have been issued in the case of Lupe M. Gozalez, and the said Lupe M. Gonzalez shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which any such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants of arrest have issued.

Mr. KILGORE. The amendment of the House is to merely cancel outstanding deportation proceedings rather than granting the status of permanent residence to the beneficiary.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ANNA C. GIESE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 244) for the relief of Anna C. Giese, which was in line 7, after "fee" insert "under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose."

Mr. KILGORE. The House amendment provides that the Surgeon General may impose such conditions as he may deem necessary, inasmuch as the beneficiary has been afflicted with tuberculosis.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIEN SHEEPHERDERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 633) for the relief of certain alien sheepherders, which was, on page 1, line 5, strike out "Panagiatis Demitreos Zeras,".

Mr. KILGORE. The bill has been amended by the House to delete the name of one of the beneficiaries inasmuch as he has departed from the United States.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MARION S. QUIRK

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 758) for the relief of Marion S. Quirk, which was, on page 1, line 7, after "fee" insert ", under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose."

Mr. KILGORE. The bill has been amended by the House to provide that the Surgeon General may impose such conditions as he may deem necessary, inasmuch as the beneficiary has been afflicted with tuberculosis.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ELISEU JOAQUIM BOA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1654) for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Boa, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eliseu Joaquim Boa may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

Mr. KILGORE. The bill has been amended by the House to grant a waiver to the beneficiary of the bill, rather than granting the status of permanent residence. This waiver will enable the beneficiary to qualify for a visa as the husband of a lawfully resident alien.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

DR. LUCIANO A. LEGIARDI-LAURA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 467) for the relief of Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appro-

purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with a further amendment as follows: On page 5, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendment, after the words "United States" insert the words "subsequent to the location of the claim", and the Senate agree to the same.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WALTER ROGERS
LEE METCALF,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
WILLIAM A. DAWSON.
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN MILITARY, NAVAL, AND AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 7, 1955, pp. 8661–8669, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

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

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter which I received from residents of Langley, Va. The subcommittee did not know of the objection of the people of Langley, Va., to the possible location of the new CIA headquarters in that community.

I am not sure whether it has been finally decided that the headquarters will go to Langley, Va. I think, however, that certainly the people of that community should have an opportunity to be heard before the Appropriations Committee before any final decision is reached. The committee was unaware of the protest at the time the matter was being considered.

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

JULY 8, 1955.

The Honorable HENRY M. JACKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: We are residents and property owners of the Langley-Great Falls area of Fairfax County, Va., who are concerned over the possible construction of the Central Intelligence Agency headquarters in the neighborhood. On April 7 of this year CIA announced publicly that it was giving up any plan to locate in Langley. Then last week, without notice, language was written into a military construction bill which indicated that CIA was still very much interested in Langley as a possible site. We believe there are serious considerations against locating CIA in Langley that should be brought to the attention of the Congress.

Langley is a unique residential area of one-family homes on large lots, country places, and farms. There are no apartment buildings and virtually no commercial development. A large Government office building will bring great pressure for mass housing, commercial construction, used-car lots, and other changes which will destroy the character of the area.

Fairfax County is already hard-pressed to provide water, sewerage, schools, roads, police, and other facilities for a rapidly growing population. Water and sewerage may be arranged for an office building itself, but the great population increase which will follow will throw an intolerable burden on the community. For example, the water table is already falling in the county, and new mass housing in an area of individual wells will lower the table disastrously and dry up many existing wells.

To erect a large office building on this river front property and to build a super highway to it in the name of the George Washington Memorial Parkway is directly contrary to the purposes of the Capper-Crampton Act. The Congress in 1930 authorized the acquisition of the river front property, including the entire Virginia shore of the Potomac from below Chain Bridge to a point above Great Falls, for a memorial to George Washington and for "the protection and preservation of the natural scenery of the Gorge and the Great Falls of the Potomac" (46 Stat. 482).

The Public Roads tract at Langley with 1½ miles of riverfront is the only substantial piece of United States property on the Virginia shore above Chain Bridge available for park purposes. Other such property is increasingly difficult to acquire. As with the more highly publicized Maryland shore of the Potomac, the interest of protecting the wilderness of the river and carrying out the statutory purposes of the Capper-Crampton Act must be balanced against the interest of providing access for the motorist. Neither consideration, however, suggests that large Government office buildings should be located on potential park land.

The McLean Citizens Association, drawing its members from the entire area, considered the problem at a special meeting and voted to oppose location of a CIA building in Langley. At a subsequent meeting the association recommended that park and recreation areas be designated for the area, including if possible the bulk of the Public Roads property at Langley. Of several sites now being considered by CIA, Langley is the only one in which the local citizens association has objected. In fact, other areas have pleaded with CIA to locate there and have offered free land and facilities.

No affirmative reason has been offered for location of a huge Government office building on potential park land, in the midst of an entirely residential area, against the wishes of the community and in the face of strongly pressed invitations to locate elsewhere. CIA has no need to have its employees work in rural residential surroundings. To locate in Langley would damage a unique community with no offsetting gain to CIA.

We are presenting our views in this letter to make clear that residents of the Langley area have not changed their opposition to a CIA building here. After the April 7 statement we assumed that the mattter was closed. If Langley is again to be considered by CIA, we wish to be heard. Surely such a controversial proposal, with its serious effects on long-established Federal park policy and on the orderly development of a community, should receive full and careful study including an opportunity for all viewpoints to be presented.

Respectfully yours,

BENJAMIN LEE BIRD,
G. BOWDOIN CRAIGHILL, Jr.
ROGER FISHER.
MANNING GASCH.
ANTHONY LEWIS.
SAMUEL E. NEEL.
CYNTHIA ZIMMERMAN.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have a short statement which is a summary of the conference report, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STENNIS ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 6829, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL

A tabulation showing a comparison of the authorization contained in this bill as it passed the House, as it passed the Senate, and as has been agreed to in conference is as follows:

Comparative summary of military construction authorization bill (H. R. 6829)

	House	Senate	Conference
Army	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible] 904,000
Navy	596,140,000	571,620,000	[illegible] 224,300
Air Force	[illegible] 83,000	[illegible] 200	1,207,902,000
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff	300,000		
CIA	50,000,000	53,500,000	54,500,000
Total	2,368,908,000	2,357,317,300	2,360,530,300

Document No. _____
This document by CIA has determined that
☑ CIA has no objection to declass
☐ It contains information of CIA interest that must remain classified at TS S C
Authority: HR 70-2
☐ It contains nothing of CIA interest
Date 14-5-87 Reviewer 00 6199

Approved For Release 2000/08/16 : CIA-RDP80-01370R000500060021-8

The total authorization agreed to in conference is $3,213,000 more than had been approved by the Senate and $8,468,600 less than had been approved by the House.

Under the conference agreement the Army would receive $533,904,000 or $6,877,000 more than had been contained in the bill as it passed the Senate. This difference represents Senate agreement to add $5 million for hospital facilities at Fort Jackson, S. C. and to add $1,877,000 for cold storage facilities at Schofield Barracks in Hawaii.

The Navy would receive authorization in the amount of $564,224,300, which figure is $7,396,000 less than the Senate had approved. This net reduction derives from the Senate's agreeing to the addition of $81,000 for providing Navy family quarters in the District of Columbia and to the addition of $432,000 for a dispensary at Quantico, Va., with these additions being more than offset by reductions of $6,098,000 at Camp Pendleton in California; $123,000 at the Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Md.; and $1,683,000 for land acquisition at Port Chicago, Calif. The decision to reduce the authorization at Camp Pendleton results from a reluctance to provide additional facilities there until an adequate water supply for the base is assured. The land acquisition at Port Chicago was deleted, pending an on-the-site study by a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee to determine whether this land requirement can be coordinated with a similar requirement of the Army in the same area. The relatively small reduction at the Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Md. was made after the Department of the Navy advised that it no longer required this small item.

The Air Force portion of the authorization is $1,207,902,000, an increase of $2,732,000 over the authorization contained in the bill as it passed the Senate. The addition of $2,732,000 is to provide additional facilities at the Charleston Air Force Base, S. C. These facilities were originally scheduled for authorization next year, but were included in this bill in order to enhance the effectiveness of this important base at an early date.

The Senate had provided authorization for the headquarters installation for the Central Intelligence Agency in a maximum amount of $53,500,000; $45 million of this sum as intended for the construction of buildings. If the headquarters installation were placed at Langley, Va., $8,500,000 would have been available for the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway. If a site other than Langley were chosen, $1 million would have been available for the purchase of the necessary land. The House had provided $50 million for the building, and the Conferres agreed to add $1 million to the Senate allowance of $45 million for this purpose. Thus, the CIA is provided a maximum authorization of $54,500,000, of which $46 million is earmarked for the construction of a headquarters installation. If the Langley site is finally selected, an additional $8,500,000 is available for extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway. If the Langley site is not selected, this $8,500,000 is not available for authorization, but $1 million would be available for the purchase of land.

The House had provided an authorization of $300,000 for the construction of quarters and related communication facilities for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and his assistants. The conferees recognized the desirability of providing suitable quarters for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, but no detailed justification for this construction had been ppresented in the Senate, and it was agreed that an authorization of this type should be separately considered. Only this morning a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services took testimony on an authorization for this purpose, and it is possible that a separate bill to authorize housing for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will be reported in time for consideration and action at this session of the Congress.

There were two changes from the Senate version of the general provisions contained in title V. The Senate conferees agreed to accept a House provision authorizing the secretaries of the military departments to acquire housing units insured by the Federal Housing Commissioner pursuant to title VI or title IX of the National Housing Act, in those cases where the housing units are adequate and suitable for housing military personnel and their dependents. This provision, as it was originally inserted by the House, was intended to be complementary to a somewhat similar provision authorizing the secretaries of the military departments to assume, on application by the sponsor, mortgage obligations on the so-called Wherry housing units that had been insured under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act. The Senate bill did not contain the provision affecting the Wherry housing units. The House receded from its language authorizing the acquisition of Wherry housing units and the Senate accepted the House language authorizing the acquisition of title VI and title IX units.

The second change in the general provisions as they had passed the Senate relates to the provision requiring the secretaries of the military departments to come into agreement with the Armed Services Committees on the utilization of certain classified and overseas construction authorization. This section represented a continuation of committee policy adopted originally in 1952. However, the construction requirements, cost estimates, and base agreements are much more firm and definite today than was true in 1952, and the Senate agreed to eliminate this provision.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the conference report substantially follows the bill as passed by the Senate.

With reference to the matter at Langley, Va., we did not locate the CIA building at Langley. There was no testimony taken on that point.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the county executive of the county of Fairfax, Va., be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
COUNTY OF FAIRFAX,
Fairfax, Va., July 7, 1955.

Hon. JOHN C. STENNIS,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR STENNIS: It occurs to me that it would be appropriate to advise you of the position taken by the Board of County Supervisors of Fairfax County, Va., relative to possible location of the Central Intelligence Agency's Office building near Langley in Fairfax County.

Our board has consistently welcomed the CIA to this location and has expressed a willingness to cooperate in every way possible in providing the facilities which this installation would require in order to make it possible for the Langley site to be chosen.

The board has officially agreed to provide sewage disposal for the installation and has cooperated with the city of Falls Church and the Virginia Department of Highways relative to supplying water and providing adequate highway facilities for same.

It is my understanding that a decision in connection with this location will soon be forthcoming and I am pleased to advise you of the position taken by the Fairfax County Board of County Supervisors.

With best wishes,
Sincerely yours,
CARLTON C. MASSEY,
County Executive.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to congratulate the members of the conference committee upon the action on the bill which the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi has presented. The able and distinguished Senator from Mississippi and his committee composed of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], performed a very fine service, and I wish to commend them for the excellent manner in which they handled the bill.

On behalf of the people of South Carolina I should like to say that we are very appreciative of the consideration given to the hospital at Fort Jackson. Fort Jackson is one of the finest installations for training troops, and the hospital will provide facilities which are very badly needed there. We are very grateful to the conference committee for their action in the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina subsequently said:

Mr. President, I should like to commend the three Senate conferees on the military construction bill for their success in retaining certain items in the bill. I wish to say something in behalf of the Charleston transportation depot; and I notice that there is $5 million allowed for Camp Jackson, S. C., for medical facilities. I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that it is not Camp Jackson. It is Fort Jackson. It was made a fort several years ago.

Also, I notice that $427,000 has been included for the naval industrial reserve shipyard, Charleston, S. C.; $1,650,000 for the Marine Corps record depot, Parris Island, S. C.; $4,649,000 for the Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, S. C.; and $553,000 for community facilities at the Naval Receiving Station, Charleston, S. C.

There are several other items pertaining to South Carolina, but I shall not go into them in detail now.

I thank the committee of conference for having included these items for South Carolina. I think they are much needed and can well be used in the defense of our Nation at this time.

MRS. LORENZA O'MALLEY (DE AMUSATEGUI) ET AL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1003) for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui), Jose Maria de Amusategui O'Malley, and the legal guardian of Ramon de Amusategui O'Malley, and re-