

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS FOR  
FISCAL YEAR 1976

---

HEARINGS  
BEFORE A  
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

NINETY-FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

AN ACT MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY CON-  
STRUCTION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR  
THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1976, AND FOR OTHER  
PURPOSES

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

56-018 O

WASHINGTON : 1975

General COOPER. Fiscal year 1977 the Army's program is about \$140 million. The largest projects there are the hospital at Fort Campbell, with \$54 million, and the hospital at Fort Hood, \$48 million.

Fiscal year 1978, if we get 100 percent of our requirements, our program is for \$180 million. We have a large hospital at Fort Carson, Colo. We have for fiscal year 1978 as we discussed earlier \$45 million for a new hospital at Fort Polk.

Senator JOHNSTON. That is \$40 million?

General COOPER. \$45 million.

Senator JOHNSTON. That is in today's dollars?

General COOPER. These are 1976 dollars.

In fiscal year 1979 we have a program for about \$160 million, the largest of which is the major renovation, addition, and modernization of the Army Medical Center in Hawaii, which we have listed as \$80 million. They are still going to look at the situation out there to see what they are going to do in the way of modernizing the hospital or is it better starting from scratch.

For fiscal year 1980 we list a program of \$186 million. The major one there is the Fitzsimmons Army Medical Center in Denver.

Did I give you the details?

#### MAINTENANCE FACILITIES

Senator JOHNSTON. Yes. Finally, what efforts is the Army making to improve maintenance facilities, particularly in division-sized bases?

General COOPER. We have in fiscal year 1976 program about \$44 million including Europe. It is our next highest-priority, after we have finished the barracks. We greatly increased the amount from fiscal year 1974 to 1975. We have only slightly increased from 1976 over 1975. We would expect that to go up. That is a major problem. That is where the men work, where they spend a lot of their time. Some people say they would rather work in good conditions even if they didn't sleep quite so well. It gets to be a matter of judgment. I think we have made enough progress with the barracks.

In fiscal year 1977 I would expect a larger increase in maintenance. As I said, in the next offset program with Germany, that will be our top priority. It also is very useful in connection with pollution. The Germans have made it known that they are very much interested in pollution projects, not having a lot of mud from tanks and trucks and so forth and not having oil that leaks into the system because you don't have adequate facilities in the maintenance areas.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE RECESS

Senator JOHNSTON. Very good. Thank you very much, General Cooper. We appreciate your testimony.

That concludes our testimony for this afternoon.

We will resume at 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

[Whereupon, at 2:45 p.m., Tuesday, May 20, the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Wednesday, May 21.]

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1975

U.S. SENATE,  
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,  
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m. in room 126, the Capitol, Hon.  
Mike Mansfield, chairman, presiding.  
Present: Senator Mansfield.

### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

#### STATEMENT OF REAR ADM. A. R. MARSCHALL, COMMANDER OF THE NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND

#### BUDGET REQUEST

Senator MANSFIELD. The subcommittee will come to order and the first witness will be Admiral Marschall.

Proceed, Admiral Marschall.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Rear Adm. A. R. Marschall, Commander of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command. It is an honor and privilege to present the Navy's fiscal year 1976 military construction appropriations budget.

Maj. Gen. A. G. Schwenk, U.S. Marine Corps, will present the Marine Corps portion of the budget.

#### AMOUNT OF REQUEST

The appropriations request is \$854 million. Of this amount, \$72 million is for the Uniform Services University of the Health Sciences. Subsequent to the submission of the budget to the Congress, the \$72 million for the University has been reduced to \$64.9 million. To offset this \$7.4 million reduction, and other projects withdrawn in the amount of \$1.8 million, the Navy requests that appropriations for planning and design be increased by \$7 million and access roads by \$2.2 million. The increase in planning and design is necessary to prepare estimates and initiate timely execution consistent with new schedules established pursuant to Public Law 93-344, the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974. The increase in access roads funding is required to meet the most pressing needs related to the Trident support site at Bangor, Wash. The appropriations request for fiscal year 1975 was \$644 million, and the amount appropriated

was \$606 million, including \$15 million for the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.

I will depart from my prior method of presenting the program and will address the deficiency in each facilities class, the amount included in this year's program, the projection for the next 4 years, and some of the rationale for our decisions.

#### BRIEF OVERVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT FACTORS

The type of presentation I have outlined would take a great deal of time, so I have developed my statement to provide a brief overview of the most significant factors. A more detailed analysis of each facilities category is provided as a supplement to my statement.

In 1971, we testified that \$870 million was needed annually to correct our identified deficiencies and to satisfy new facilities requirements generated by mission changes and technological improvements that generate facilities requirements for current missions. Our present analysis reconfirms that funding requirements for military construction should be \$800 to \$900 million per year in fiscal year 1976 dollars. With the inflation that has taken place since 1971, the \$800 to \$900 million represents a reduction in our funding requirements that is attributable to the shore establishment realignment and an ongoing intensive effort to eliminate projects that are valid, but not essential under the austere budgets that are likely to be the rule for the future. The total of the Navy and Marine Corps facilities deficiencies is \$8.4 billion. For the next 4 years, we expect to request a minimum of \$600 million annually. This is a significant reduction from our idea rate and one that will require us to search hard for alternate ways of doing some tasks and missions. However, some increase may be necessary as we continue to refine our program objectives.

The facilities categories stressed in this year's request are Trident, operational, medical and health facilities, housing and community facilities, energy conservation, and pollution abatement.

#### TRIDENT PROGRAM

I will leave the detailed discussion of the Trident program to Rear Adm. H. E. Lyon, USN, the Trident Project Manager and Capt. E. R. Stacey, CEC, USN, the officer in charge of construction. I will point out that we have awarded construction contracts on \$48 million of Trident facilities and expect to have awarded \$141 million by July 1, 1975.

#### OPERATIONAL FACILITIES

The operational facilities category has one of the largest deficits of all the categories of the Navy's military construction program; therefore, the Navy has allocated \$66 million to this category, or 8 percent of this year's program, to provide airfield pavements, communications buildings, piers, a mooring for a floating drydock, and dredging.

#### MEDICAL FACILITIES

Fiscal year 1976 is the third year of the accelerated medical construction program approved by the Secretary of Defense. The goal of

the medical facility modernization program is to upgrade or replace Navy health care facilities to recognized standards in order to (1) continue to provide Navy and Marine Corps active duty personnel, their dependents, and other authorized beneficiaries with the highest attainable level of health care, and (2) attract and retain health care professionals by providing modern facilities for the conduct of their profession. The fiscal year 1976 program includes \$132.9 million, or 20 percent of the budget, for the redevelopment and replacement of the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, and the naval hospital, Bremerton, Wash., and the initial phasing of replacement construction at the naval hospital, Orlando.

#### BACHELOR HOUSING AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES

The stress placed on bachelor housing and community facilities the last several years is continued this year with \$72 million, or 11 percent, allocated for these facilities categories. This year's program will provide new spaces for 5,471 bachelor enlisted and 132 bachelor officers. Modernization of existing facilities will provide 325 spaces for bachelor enlisted personnel.

#### ENERGY CONSERVATION AND POLLUTION PROJECTS

In the fiscal year 1976 Milcon budget, energy conservation has been allocated \$29 million, or 4 percent of the program. A significant program is currently planned for fiscal year 1977. The objective of the energy conservation program is a 15-percent reduction in energy consumption through a comprehensive 5-year program.

Forty eight million dollars, or 7 percent of this year's program, has been allocated to the abatement of air and water pollution. The thrust of this program is to comply with evolving Federal and local standards.

The programs and facilities categories that will be stressed in the next 4 years are bachelor housing and community facilities, maintenance and production, utilities, operational, medical, and training.

#### PROBLEMS WITH FISCAL YEAR 1974 AND FISCAL YEAR 1976 PROGRAMS

There are two other topics that I would like to discuss with the committee. These are the significant number of amendments included in this year's budget, and the problem the Navy is having in living within the total fiscal year 1974 military construction authorization. These are separate problems, but the source of each problem is the same.

The Secretary of the Navy, in his posture statement, indicated the impact inflation and changing market conditions are having on the Navy budget.

Last year I addressed briefly the impact inflation was having on the Navy's construction program. Inflation in the construction industry has been a serious problem, with several factors contributing to this problem. These factors were the availability and cost of money, increasing labor costs, increasing fuel costs, the uncertainty of future fuel costs, material shortages and a general uncertainty of the future. In their estimates, contractors applied greater direct costs and ample



contingency amounts for these factors. Improvement has been seen recently in most of these factors. The Navy request includes 21 amendments to prior year authorizations in the amount of \$45 million or 6.1 percent of this year's authorization request. The majority are included because of the energy crisis and resulting inflation. This compares with 11 amendments in the amount of \$28 million in fiscal year 1975; 5 of these 11 fiscal year 1975 amendments in the amount of \$13 million were inflation related and added after the original budget was submitted to Congress.

In fiscal year 1970 and 1971, our amendments averaged 5 percent of the authorized amount for projects. In fiscal years 1972, 1973 and 1974, we ranged from 1 to 1.7 percent. The 5 percent of fiscal year 1975 and the 6 percent request for fiscal year 1976 are departures from the norm and this amendment problem may be with us a couple of years until all contracts have been executed for the fiscal year 1974 and fiscal year 1975 Milcon programs.

For fiscal year 1974, there are 9 amendments totaling \$25 million included in our fiscal year 1976 request. Even with these amendments, the Navy has a need for a "various installations" or general amendment of \$15 million to the fiscal year 1974 Authorization Act. This amendment is needed to provide authority to assure all valid fiscal year 1974 projects are executed and the cost variation provisions of the authorization act may be fully utilized.

In prior years, no particular difficulty has been experienced in executing all valid projects. The authority required for the use of the cost variation provisions has been obtained from cancellation or reduction of the authority of other projects. The limitations of the cost variation section are that the total cost of all construction and acquisition under the Navy title may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated in that title. For fiscal year 1974, this balance of additional costs and savings has been upset due to the fact that inflationary trends have caused an increasing use of the cost variation provisions, and the energy crisis has required the use of the additional cost variation authority provided retroactively in fiscal year 1975.

The problem was aggravated in fiscal year 1974. Unlike former MILCON authorization acts in which the authorization for appropriations for the Navy title equaled the sum of authorized projects, the total amount authorized to be appropriated in fiscal year 1974 was \$7.5 million less than the total authorized by project.

This means that we would have to accrue \$7.5 million in savings to execute all projects as authorized by the Congress. The limitations on the use of the cost variation provisions are based on the act's authorized appropriations rather than its authorization by project and installation. This operates to lower artificially the limitation on the use of cost variation provisions in fiscal year 1974 below that of prior years as well as jeopardize some of the projects intended for construction by the Congress. To overcome this difficulty, the Navy, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, has recommended to the Armed Services Committees the addition of an amendment to provide general authorization at unspecified installations to meet anticipated increases in cost estimates in the amount of \$15 million. This in effect is a restoration of \$7.5 million so that the amount authorized to be appropriated in fiscal year 1974 would equal the sum of individual

installation authorizations; together with an increase of \$7.5 million to allow prudent use of the cost variation authority in these unsettled economic times.

No appropriations to match this authorization are being requested at this time. Funding for the utilization of the cost variation provisions of the authorization act has historically come from available appropriations. If the Navy should reach a point where available appropriations are constraining contract awards, our lower priority projects will be deferred and additional funds will be requested for the deferred projects next year.

The projects requested will provide facilities for new missions, current missions and modernization of the shore establishment. We appreciate the past support of the committee and earnestly seek it for this year's program.

We will be pleased to answer any questions the committee may have. Thank you.

DIEGO GARCIA

Senator MANSFIELD. Thank you, Admiral. I note in your worksheet that you have allocated for the Naval Station at Diego Garcia 277 new bachelor housing, numbering 277 for the bachelor housing program under "installations" and now under "bachelor officers quarters" you have for Diego Garcia 32. What is the justification for that? Do you have authority to proceed in that manner?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir. All of us are fully aware of what took place in last year's program with respect to Diego Garcia. We have come in again in this year's program with the follow-on, which was originally part of the fiscal year 1975 package. This is the remainder of the Diego Garcia program which was partially authorized with caveats last year and it is consistent with what we brought to the Congress in our total package in attempting to get the supplemental authorization and appropriation prior to the 1975 program.

Senator MANSFIELD. What is the justification for our being on Diego Garcia, which I understand is a British possession?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir. Fundamentally, the Congress of the United States approved the construction and operation of a communications station on this island.

Senator MANSFIELD. I understand that, but do we have a formal agreement with the Government of the United Kingdom?

Admiral MARSCHALL. It is my understanding, sir, that we have.

Senator MANSFIELD. Is that agreement in writing?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I think it is in writing, but may I provide it for the record as I am hazy on this particular subject, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MANSFIELD. And also whether or not the hearings have been held before the Foreign Relations Committee vis-a-vis acquisition of that island by this country for the purpose of installing the naval installation there?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir, I will also provide that for the record.

Senator MANSFIELD. And any written agreements we may have of any nature I would like to have furnished for the record in this particular aspect.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

#### AGREEMENTS BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND UNITED KINGDOM PERTAINING TO DIEGO GARCIA

Two agreements between the United States and the United Kingdom pertain to United States use of Diego Garcia.

The first, "Availability of Certain Indian Ocean Islands for Defense Purposes," was executed by an exchange of notes on 30 December 1966 (Treaties and Other International Acts Series 6196) and is an agreement upon terms which govern the availability of the British Indian Ocean Territory, which consists of Diego Garcia, the remainder of Chagos Archipelago and the islands of Aldabra, Farquhar, and Desroches, for defense purposes of both governments as they may arise.

The second agreement, of 24 October 1972 (Treaties and Other International Acts Series 7481), provides in principle for the United States to construct, maintain, and operate a limited naval communications station on Diego Garcia.

The two agreements and other available documents containing classified information have been provided the committee staff.

There is no record of hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee relative to acquisition of Diego Garcia for the purpose of installing a naval installation.

#### CONSTRUCTION OBLIGATIONS

Senator MANSFIELD. Admiral, what are the actual construction obligations through December 1974, and what are your projected obligations through October 1975?

Admiral MARSHALL. The unobligated balance as of June 30, 1974, was \$490.8 million. On October 1, 1975, we project an unobligated balance of \$321.2 million.

Senator MANSFIELD. Unobligated?

Admiral MARSHALL. Unobligated balance, yes, sir.

Senator MANSFIELD. Please supply any further details you can incorporate in the record.

[The information follows:]

*Summary of projected unobligated balances at the end of fiscal year 1975*

Planning and design-----	\$100,000
Access roads-----	50,000
Urgent minor construction-----	1,000,000

Overall military construction appropriation account----- 483,200,000

#### INFORMATION ON SHIPYARD AND AIR FACILITIES

Senator MANSFIELD. Would you provide for the record the naval shipyards, naval air rework facilities, and their primary mission in terms of types of ships or aircraft and engine overhaul.

Admiral MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

#### NARF WORKLOAD PROJECTIONS

The workload history and projection for the NARF's is presented below by activity for the years 1974 through 1980. Values for FY 1976 and beyond are subject to changes from budget and program revision.

##### DIRECT PRODUCTIVE MAN-HOURS (IN THOUSANDS)

	FY 1974 - FY 1980						
	ALAMEDA	CHERRY POINT	JACKSONVILLE	NORFOLK	NORTH ISLAND	PENSACOLA	QUONSET PT.
FY 1974	5046	2542	2852	4495	7522	3727	509
FY 1975	4690	2617	2741	4473	7353	3406	-
FY 1976	4610	2441	2595	4355	7295	3318	-
FY 1977	5184	2934	2775	5042	7368	3368	-
FY 1978	5047	2718	2602	5715	7648	3306	-
FY 1979	5331	2948	2592	5631	7812	3450	-
FY 1980	5466	2964	2547	6051	7679	3369	-
							TOTAL
							26693
							25280
							24814
							26691
							27036
							27764
							26096

While out-year projections are distributed into shop categories for planning purposes, historical labor expenditure records are maintained according to funding program. A complete shop category breakdown is provided for FY 1977, the mid-year of the period. Total values for shop categories are proportionally representative for the total period.

##### FY-1977 DIRECT PRODUCTIVE WORKLOAD BY SHOP CATEGORY (MAN-HOURS IN THOUSANDS)

SHOP CATEGORY	ACTIVITY						
	ALAMEDA	CHERRY POINT	JACKSONVILLE	NORFOLK	NORTH ISLAND	PENSACOLA	TOTAL
Airframe	1,000	782	562	1,040	1,620	1,052	6,056
Engine	569	417	402	539	728	-	2,655
Accessories & Comp.	1,229	794	485	1,029	1,435	930	5,902
Electronics, Communications	640	270	344	594	651	410	2,909
Armament	248	-	40	176	-	5	469
Support Equip.	642	167	227	862	504	305	2,707
Manufacture & Rep.	556	347	330	372	1,405	239	3,249
Test & Calibration	147	38	50	211	192	93	731
Other	153	119	335	219	853	334	2,013
TOTAL	5,184	2,934	2,775	5,042	7,388	3,368	26,691



I would like to show the total picture using Chart VI. When we started in 1970, in the National Capital Region, except for Indian Head, Maryland, which has been excluded, we had 60,228 personnel. Last year in January we had about 53,268. In June of 1974, a number 46,700 was mentioned, during hearings. Not mentioned at that time were the Marine Corps, students, and some miscellaneous activities that actually made the number appropriate for comparison purposes for the total Navy Department, 51,150. By the end of the year, we reduced down to 49,168, so that is the base I would like to work from.

Eliminations due to the actions that I mentioned in the first list, from the initial population of 60,000 were those shown on Chart VI as 11,060 personnel reductions, then the additional 2,668 approved reductions make it 13,728, and the new ones under study listed on Chart V, involve a reduction of 1,900, for a grand total of 15,628. That brings the total population from 60,228 down to 44,600, or about a 25 percent reduction in this period, both in the past and that projected.

Pertinent to that is the total reduction in space of 1.8 million total square feet; approximately twice what the Secretary of Defense asked us to do.

## EXCERPT FROM CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Senator MANSFIELD. The fact I raised questions about Diego Garcia and introduced a resolution of disapproval, I will insert in the record at this time the statement and material which I included with the statement in the Congressional Record on May 19, 1975.

[The document follows:]



# SENATE RESOLUTION 160—RESOLUTION DISAPPROVING CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS ON THE ISLAND OF DIEGO GARCIA

(Referred to the Committee on Armed Services.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on May 12, 1975, the President of the United States, by letter, certified to the Congress that the construction of naval facilities on the island of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean is vital to the national interests of the Government of the United States. The text of the President's letter to the Congress reads as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 613(a)(1)(A) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1975 (Public Law 93-552), I have evaluated all the military and foreign policy implications regarding the need for United States facilities at Diego Garcia. On the basis of this evaluation and in accordance with section 613(a)(1)(B), I hereby certify that the construction of such facilities is essential to the national interest of the United States.

GERALD R. FORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 12, 1975.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, may we have order? I cannot hear the Senator's remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senate may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Under the provisions of Public Law 93-552, 93d Congress, 2d session, section 613, I am laying before the Senate a resolution of disapproval in accordance with the provisions of section 613. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks section 613 from the public law be printed in order that Senators may have an opportunity to read this section of law and know exactly how this resolution of disapproval will be handled in the Committee of the Armed Services and on the floor of the Senate.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was very surprised that the President of the United States would send this resolution to the Congress at this time in view that we have been told by the administration that the President is in the midst of a reappraisal of our foreign policy because of the debacle of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Southeast Asia.

I think in the debate of this resolution, when it is returned from the Armed Services Committee, a number of very important questions should be examined during the debate.

Why, in the face of the fact that all the nations bordering on the Indian Ocean have asked the United States and the Soviet Union not to escalate the arms race in the Indian Ocean area, has the administration forwarded this letter of certification? At a meeting in New Delhi on November 17, 1974, 30 nations issued a policy statement opposing the United States building a naval facility on the island of Diego Garcia.

Why does this administration persist in the face of a staggering deficit in our budget insist on building a naval facility that will cost approximately \$175 million? I contend that the money that the administration is requesting to start building naval facilities on Diego Garcia, amounting to \$14 million for the Navy and \$3.3 million for the Air Force, is only a downpayment. Already in the fiscal year 1976 budget, the Navy is asking for an additional \$13 million for operational facilities on Diego Garcia.

Mr. President, are we going to engage in an adventure of Southeast Asia and Vietnam all over again? Is there an extension of a policy of the United States trying to be policeman for the world in the face of our bitter experience in Vietnam?

Are we not scattered throughout the world enough by having military personnel on all five continents—perhaps, if Antarctica is considered a continent, on all six continents—and naval ships on all the oceans of the world and on a good many seas?

In voting the naval base on the island of Diego Garcia, are we going to vote a three-ocean Navy? The Navy contends that they will be able to operate carriers in the Indian Ocean with only a 12-airplane carrier force. However, will it really have to be 15 carriers to fulfill our commitment in the Atlantic, Pacific, and the Indian Ocean?

I believe that the role of the carrier in sea warfare should be a part of the debate on the island of Diego Garcia. I submit that the aircraft carrier is now obsolete with the technical advancement of the new cruise missiles. I submit that in the Mediterranean Sea, the Soviets always know exactly within a few hundred yards where our carriers are operating. Can a carrier task force adequately protect itself in its operations in the Indian Ocean?

What are our so-called vital interests in the Indian Ocean? Certainly, having a task force in the Indian Ocean

had no effect on the oil situation during the Yom Kippur war in October 1973. In fact, our naval vessels were completely cut off from Arab oil and the United States could do nothing about the Arab action.

Incidentally, I understand that there is an interesting article in this week's U.S. News & World Report, which once again raises the specter of war in case of another oil embargo. I hope that that does not come to pass.

Mr. President, the question of Diego Garcia and allowing the Navy to build a naval operating facility on this island some 1,200 miles south of the tip of India is a vital policy question. I urge upon my colleagues to take due notice of this action and to study all of the facts that are available. I urge my colleagues to give serious consideration as to whether this Nation should support a naval base thousands of miles from our shores which will amount to nothing more than "showing the flag" in an area of the world where the nations have requested that we not have our Navy there in force.

For the information of my colleagues, on December 5, 1974, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, S20742, I delivered a speech setting forth reasons for my opposition to the building of naval operating facilities on the island of Diego Garcia.

I ask unanimous consent that that speech be printed in the RECORD at an appropriate point.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Finally, I point out that the Senate has 60 legislative days to act upon this resolution and the Armed Services Committee should report it back to the floor of the Senate within 20 days with its recommendation. I urge the Armed Services Committee to report this resolution of disapproval favorably in order that the United States will not embark upon another adventure in the southern part of Asia.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the resolution of disapproval and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

S. Res. 160

Resolved, That the Senate does not approve the proposed construction project on the island of Diego Garcia, the need for which was certified to by the President and the certification with respect to which was received by the Senate on May 12, 1975.

## EXHIBIT 1

SEC. 613. (a) None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act with respect to any construction project at Diego Garcia may be obligated unless—

(1) the President has (A) advised the Congress in writing that all military and foreign policy implications regarding the need for United States facilities at Diego Garcia have been evaluated by him, and (B) certified to the Congress in writing that the construction of any such project is essential to the national interest of the United States;

(2) 60 days of continuous session of the Congress have expired following the date on which certification with respect to such project is received by the Congress, and

(3) neither House of Congress has adopted, within such 60-day period, a resolution disapproving such project.

(b) (1) For purposes of this section, the continuity of a session of Congress is broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die, and the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of such 60-day period.

(2) For purposes of this section, "resolution" means a resolution of either House of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the Senate does not approve the proposed construction project on the island of Diego Garcia, the need for which was certified to by the President and the certification with respect to which was received by the Senate on May 12." The first and second blanks being filled with the name of the resolving House and the third blank being filled with the appropriate date.

(c) Subsections (d), (e), and (f) of this section are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and as such they are deemed a part of the rules of the Senate, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in the Senate in the case of resolutions described by subsection (b) (2) of this section; and they supersede other rules of the Senate only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change such rules at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the Senate.

(d) A resolution with respect to a proposed construction project of the island of Diego Garcia shall be referred to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

(e) (1) If the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate to which a resolution with respect to a proposed construction project on the island of Diego Garcia has been referred has not reported such resolution at the end of 20 calendar days after its introduction, not counting any day which is excluded under subsection (b) (1) of this section, it is in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution or to discharge the committee



from further consideration of any other resolution introduced with respect to the same proposed construction project which has been referred to the committee, except that no motion to discharge shall be in order after the committee has reported a resolution of disapproval with respect to the same proposed construction project.

(2) A motion to discharge under paragraph (1) of this subsection may be made only by a Senator favoring the resolution, is privileged, and debate thereon shall be limited to not more than 1 hour, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution, the time to be divided in the Senate equally between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees. An amendment to the motion is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(f) (1) A motion in the Senate, to proceed to the consideration of a resolution shall be privileged. An amendment to the motion shall not be in order, nor shall it be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(2) Debate in the Senate on a resolution, and all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(3) Debate in the Senate on any debatable motion or appeal in connection with a resolution shall be limited to not more than 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the mover and the manager of the resolution, except that in the event the manager of the resolution is in favor of any such motion or appeal, the time in opposition thereto, shall be controlled by the minority leader or his designee. Such leaders, or either of them, may, from time under their control on the passage of a resolution, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any debatable motion or appeal.

(4) A motion in the Senate to further limit debate on a resolution, debatable motion, or appeal is not debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, a resolution is in order in the Senate.

#### EXHIBIT 2

##### STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

Mr. President, I feel compelled to speak out on the issue of Diego Garcia, the projected naval operating facility in the Indian Ocean. As we move toward the final days of this second session of the 93rd Congress, Senators are receiving a great deal of pressure from both the Department of Defense and the Department of the Navy to approve \$14,802,000 as a down payment on naval facilities that will enable the Navy to operate carrier task forces from the Island of Diego Garcia. In addition, the Air Force is requesting Air Force facilities on Diego Garcia that will enable KC135 tankers to refuel

B52's operating out of Thailand over the Indian Ocean. First of all, I would like to briefly give you some background, both historical and legislative, which bear directly upon the Navy's efforts to make the Island of Diego Garcia an operating base.

Diego Garcia is an atoll located within the Chagos Archipelago in the middle of the Indian Ocean approximately 1,000 miles due south of the tip of India. The heavily vegetated island consists of 6,700 acres with average elevations of three to seven feet. It is horseshoe shaped with a 40-mile perimeter. The enclosed lagoon is 5½ miles wide by 13 miles long with average depths of 30 to 100 feet. The annual rainfall is approximately 100 inches. The United States Government became interested in Diego Garcia in the early Sixties, particularly when the British Government announced that it was withdrawing its naval forces from Singapore and indications were made public that Her Majesty's Government intended to greatly reduce its Indian Ocean naval squadron. At about the same time, the Russian navy began operations in the Indian Ocean and making port calls to nations bordering on the Indian Ocean. It must be pointed out that for years the United States Navy has been traversing the Indian Ocean with carriers and other auxiliary combatants when the transfer of aircraft carriers was made to the Pacific fleet.

Beginning in the early Sixties, as aforementioned, with the announcement that the British were greatly reducing their naval activity in the Indian Ocean, the United States has in a more frequent manner stepped up its operations in the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf, which is a part of the Indian Ocean. At the present time, naval presence is maintained at Bahrain consisting of a supply ship and two destroyers. The Russians have not matched this naval strength. However, since 1968, the Russians have greatly increased their presence in the Indian Ocean, sometimes having as many as 30 combatant ships, which include a large number of mine sweepers.

The United States sometime in calendar year 1966 began negotiating with the British Government for a lease to establish a communications station and an operational base on Diego Garcia. This base was to be an austere logistic support activity which was mainly a refueling stop for naval units operating in the Indian Ocean. In 1965, the British formed the British Indian Ocean Territory which comprises the Chagos Archipelago which, of course, includes Diego Garcia. The United States Navy stated that the selection of these islands was predicated in unquestioned UK sovereignty in the absence of a population. A bilateral agreement was signed in December 1966 between the British Government and the United States which granted base rights for a period of 50 years to the United States Government to the Indian Ocean territory.

The Navy came to the Congress in the Fiscal Year 1970 Military Construction Program with a submission for the first con-

struction increment of a proposed logistic facility on the Island of Diego Garcia. The logistic facility was approved by the House and Senate Armed Services Committees and the House Appropriations Military Construction Subcommittee. When presented to the Senate, there was strong opposition from within the Senate Appropriations Committee to the United States becoming committed to another naval operations base within the Indian Ocean. Senator Richard Russell, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee at that time, was very much opposed to the United States committing the Navy to sustained operations within the Indian Ocean and so stated in Committee meetings on a number of occasions. The Military Construction Subcommittee also strenuously opposed the appropriation of money to construct the operating facility and the Military Construction FY 1970 conference committee debated this matter through a number of meetings lasting over a two-week period. Finally, an oral agreement was reached wherein the Navy was to be instructed to come back in FY 1971 for a new appropriation which would support only a communications station, and all of the logistic support facilities were to be deleted from the FY 1971 program. The rationale at that time for the communications station was that, in time, the United States would have to withdraw from the main continent of Africa the large communications facility that the United States Government had at Asmara, Ethiopia. (Kagnew Station Communications Center, Asmara, Ethiopia, is now being phased out and the Navy will centralize its African communications facilities at Diego Garcia).

In support of the FY 1971 appropriations for the communications facilities on Diego Garcia, the Navy stated the following:

"The requirement to close the gap in reliable communication coverage which exists today in the central Indian Ocean/Bay of Bengal area was a major consideration in developing the initial concept for a support facility on Diego Garcia. Establishment of a communications support capability in this area is an immediate requirement and is a requirement which exists independent of the modest logistics support facility which was rejected by the Congress. The purely passive role and image of a communications facility should not raise the same concern of active commitment which had apparently been associated with the logistics support aspects of the original concept."

As previously mentioned, the Navy was instructed to come back in the 1971 military construction program with a communications package only and to all intents and purposes the logistic support facility was not to be a part of the package. In fact, it was specifically agreed that there would be no items which could in any way support a carrier task force.

In all of the communications and oral conversations that the subcommittee had with the Navy, it was indicated that the Navy would not use Diego Garcia as an operational base. Members of the subcommittee were re-

assured, when the FY 1971 construction budget for Diego Garcia was approved, that the Navy did not intend to operate fleet surface units from Diego Garcia.

To bring you up to date concerning the FY 1975 Military Construction Authorization Bill, H.R. 16136, which is still in conference, I will explain Section 612 in the Bill. This section precluded the obligation of any funds until the President of the United States has advised the Congress in writing that he had evaluated all military and foreign policy implications regarding the need for these facilities and has certified that this construction essential to the national interest. Such certification must be submitted to the Congress and approved by both Houses of Congress. This will assure the opportunity for full debate on the policy question of Diego Garcia.

I might say, parenthetically, that I consider this most prudent and realistic action for the Congress to take. I wish to further point out that Section 612 of the Authorization Bill was adopted by a record vote of 83-0 in the Senate.

The position of the House Armed Services Committee is that the Administration should be given the authority to build the facilities in Diego Garcia but that prior to the exercise of that authority the President shall notify Congress of his intention and that Congress shall have 60 days to reject the blanket authority it had previously given to him. This procedure has heretofore been used too often by the Executive and acquiesced in by the Congress. The negative power of the Congress—the power to deny a change in the status quo—is turned on the Congress itself. The burden of persuasion shifts away from those who desire action to prove the rightness of their cause. The Congress must insist that the justification for policy must be made prior to the grant of authority. It is exactly that insistence that was included in the Military Construction Authorization.

It is my contention, as stated earlier, that the Senate position in the Authorization Bill is realistic and prudent and Diego Garcia, as a policy question, should first of all be thoroughly investigated by the Foreign Relations Committee, then the question should be taken to the floor and the two Houses of the Congress should be allowed to work their will.

On November 17, at a meeting in New Delhi of the 30 nations surrounding the Indian Ocean, a policy statement was issued unanimously that America and the Soviet Union should not escalate the arms race in the Indian Ocean and the area should be left in peace; particularly, all 30 nations opposed the United States' building a facility on Diego Garcia. The cost of this naval base for both construction and equipment will amount to approximately \$175 million; thus, as you can see, this \$14 million plus \$3.3 million is only a down-payment.

Within the Department of Defense we do have a difference of opinion as to how important the building of this base is to our national interest. The Navy says that it is



imperative for the defense of the United States, particularly in keeping the oil routes open in the Indian Ocean. The CIA has stated that the buildup of the Russians, particularly in Somaliland, is certainly not as extensive as outlined by Admirals testifying for this project.

Mr. President, is this Southeast Asia and Vietnam all over again? It appears to me that our Government must have learned something about trying to be policemen for the World during our experience in Vietnam: 45,000 dead and 300,000 wounded men must certainly mean something to us. I respectfully submit that the United States cannot go on attempting to be a policeman for the World. And most certainly in my humble opinion, the construction of this operating base in the Indian Ocean is only a further effort by the Department of Defense to play the role of policeman in the Indian Ocean and to actively involve our military forces in the politics of an area that now wants to be left at peace. Yet in the face of all the nations in the littoral area requesting that we not build up Diego Garcia as a naval base, there are those individuals in high places that contend we should go ahead in our own national interest with the building of this naval base, I ask the question—what really are our vital interests in the Indian Ocean besides gunboat diplomacy and "showing the flag"? Our presence in the Indian Ocean had no effect on the oil situation during the Yom Kippur War in October 1973, in fact, our naval vessels were completely cut off from Arab oil and the United States could do nothing about the Arab action.

In closing, there are a few points that I would like to make that I think have a direct bearing in my opinion upon whether or not Diego Garcia funding should be approved to build a naval base on Diego Garcia. In allowing this naval base to be built, I think Senators should be aware that they are actually voting for a 3-ocean Navy. It is my contention that this base on Diego Garcia could cost hundreds of millions of dollars. We already have an admission from the Navy of a cost of \$173 million. Oh yes, the Navy will contend that the base will only cost \$35 million but they are not telling the American people of the cost for salaries of the Seabees that are building the base, nor are they advising the Congress of the complete costs for the communications equipment and other machinery that will go into the making of this base.

I submit that all of the information I have in hand shows that the aircraft carrier is now obsolete with the technical advancement of the new cruise missiles and I might say, by way of explanation, that in the Mediterranean Sea, the Soviets always know exactly where our carriers are.

I state that for just this one time cannot the United States Government wait and really find out what the intentions of the Soviet Union are in regard to the Indian Ocean. All the reports I have indicate that the Soviet Union's naval activity is of a low order.

In summary, I would like to say that it appears to me that our Department of De-

sailors 10,500 miles from home and putting obsolete carriers in the Indian Ocean, which are vulnerable and practically defenseless against new weaponry.

Are we building a naval base, a new Wake Island, that is completely, in time of crisis, undefendable?

Mr. President, in closing I am reminded of a very important incident that occurred on the floor of the Senate. Some years back when the Defense Appropriation Bill was on the floor and the Senate was considering appropriating money for the Navy for naval landing craft (FDL's) the late great chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator Richard Brevard Russell, said and I quote: "If we make it easy for the Navy to go places and to do things, we will find ourselves always going places and doing things." I remind the Senate in approving the building of a naval base on Diego Garcia that we will be making it easy for the United States to go to the Indian Ocean and more than likely that we will do things.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a parliamentary inquiry or does he yield the floor?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed. I will yield the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. As I understand, the resolution will be referred to the Armed Services Committee; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I want to assure the Senate we will consider this resolution and do it well within the time that was agreed on last fall when this matter was, in effect, taken over, and we will hear testimony on it and get back with a report in time for us to consider that agreement.

I do not care to go into a discussion of the merits of the matter now, but it is a matter where the money was in the bill last year and was approved at a certain level, \$14 million, I believe it was, but carried over under special consideration here for this resolution.

I just observed that \$13 million now requested in the 1976 budget is the same \$13 million that was deducted last year by agreement more or less and made two installments out of it. So, after all, it is just that part of the 1975 budget that was before us until this year.

I thank the President.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate what the Senator said, I expected nothing less. The Senator has been most cooperative and considerate in this matter in and out of committee.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

# FISCAL YEAR-1976 NAVAL PROJECTS

Senator MANSFIELD. Admiral Marschall, would you please detail for the subcommittee the entire list of projects for the Navy for fiscal year 1976.

THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT, NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE, NEW LONDON, CONN.

Admiral MARSCHALL. For the Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn., we are requesting \$17,880,000 for five projects. The base maintains and operates shore facilities to support two attack submarine squadrons, a submarine development group, and two deployed Poseidon submarine squadrons.

The berthing pier project will provide five berths to accommodate all classes of nuclear attack submarines (SSN) including the new high speed 688 class. The project includes construction of two new berths and dredging and demolition of two unusable timber piers to make three existing berths adequate.

A floating drydock mooring facility project will provide a facility for mooring a floating drydock which has the required capacity to dock the 637 long hull and 688 nuclear submarines.

The project to dredge the river channel complements a dredging project approved in fiscal year 1973. When completed, 7.5 miles of river channel will be deepened from 32 feet to 36 feet between Long Island Sound and the submarine base. This project will enable the SSN 688 class ships to be homeported at the sub base by 1977.

The bachelor-enlisted quarters project will provide adequate living spaces for 300 E2-E4 personnel and 80 E5-E6 personnel.

The utilities improvement project will enable power to be fully distributed on base and at the State pier site. Consumption has increased 161 percent since 1961.

## NAVAL WEAPONS STATION, EARLE, N.J.

We are requesting \$879,000 for the Naval Weapons Station, Earle, N.J., which receives, renovates, maintains, stores, and issues ammunition, explosives, expendable items, and/or weapons and technical ordnance material, a berthing utilities project is requested. The project will provide permanent utility (cold iron) services for two ammunition ships (AE) to be homeported at the station and berthed on pier 2.

## NAVAL UNDERWATER SYSTEMS CENTER, NEW LONDON, CONN.

For the Naval Underwater Systems Center, New London, Conn., which performs a variety of functions ranging from exploratory research through in-service engineering assistance to the fleet, we are requesting \$238,000. These functions are performed throughout the life cycle of underwater warfare systems and components, under sea surveillance systems, and submarine communications systems. At Lake Seneca, Dresden, N.Y., the laboratory has an annex that performs transducer calibration in support of the laboratory's mission.

The Dresden, N.Y., land acquisition project will permit acquisition of land and improvements currently under lease at Lake Seneca for logistic support of two deepwater moored development, test, and evaluation platforms with a value of \$5 million.



security of two installations by the construction of new production and maintenance buildings within a secure area, thereby eliminating transportation and the requirement for additional security at both locations. At the other installation, the improvements are needed to meet new criteria.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES, ATLANTIC FLEET WEAPONS RANGE, ROOSEVELT ROADS, PUERTO RICO

We are requesting \$2,128,000 for a single project for the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico. The Range operates, maintains and develops weapons range facilities and services in support of the training of fleet forces and other activities.

The air surveillance radar project supports the replacement of the existing obsolete (rotating) NA/FPS-67A radar with a phased array, stationary radar, which provides major improvements in the detection, tracking, and data collection capability. Although not shown, the project estimate includes 160 tons of air-conditioning.

ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA, NAVAL AIR STATION, BERMUDA

We are requesting \$78,000 for a fuel storage tanks project for the Naval Air Station, Bermuda. The project will purchase three 80,000 barrel jet fuel storage tanks including ancillary facilities, as a cost effective alternative over continuing to lease these tanks.

At present, facilities for fuel storage are leased from Exxon. The lease contract at the Exxon St. George Fuel Terminal contains an option for the U.S. Government to purchase those tanks built in 1960. This option must be exercised by the expiration of the lease agreement in June 1976.

NAVAL AIR STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA

We are requesting \$3,264,000 for a bachelor enlisted quarters modernization project to be located at the Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The project will be designed to accommodate 325 E2-E4 enlisted men.

NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA

We are requesting a telephone system project in the amount of \$450,000, for the Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, provides facilities services, communications, training and material support for operation and maintenance of naval weapons, aircraft, and ships at sea for the activities and units of the operating forces. The telephone system project will replace worn cable systems plus add emergency power plants and extend the main telephone exchange building.

EUROPEAN AREA

NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY (CLASSIFIED LOCATION)

We are requesting \$1,527,000 for a naval communications facility at a classified location. This facility will provide improved efficiency of communications functions.

The accomplishment of this project will permit more efficient and effective use of limited available resources, people, operations, funds, and equipment, in providing requisite communications to the Fleet in the North Atlantic.

NAVAL STATION, ROTA, SPAIN

We are requesting \$2,205,000 for two projects at the Naval Station, Rota, Spain. The Naval Station supports patrol, transport, carrier and other fleet aircraft, a naval communications station, and serves as a ballistic missile submarine replenishment site and a Military Airlift Command Terminal.

A building addition project for the Naval Station, Rota, Spain, needed to house new net control equipment and carry out missions obtained by the deactivation of Naval Security Group Detachment Morocco, and the closure of the communications activity at Bremerhaven.

An air passenger terminal expansion project will accommodate passenger traffic which has increased in recent years, coupled with the implementation of new procedures for security searches, isolation and customs.

INDIAN OCEAN AREA

In the Indian Ocean area, we are requesting \$13,800,000 for an expansion of facilities project for the Naval Support Activity, Diego Garcia, Chagos Archipelago.

The Naval Communication Station provides Fleet broadcasts, tactical ship-to-shore and point-to-point communications, and is a critical link in the Defense Communications System. A new mission has been assigned this activity to support the periodic presence of an Indian Ocean Task Group. This project seeks authority for facilities to logistically support a Task Group operating in the Indian Ocean on an occasional basis and covers that portion of the facilities deferred by the Congress from the fiscal year 1975 request.

PACIFIC OCEAN AREA

NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS STATION, GUAM

We are requesting \$1,200,000 for a satellite communication terminal addition project for the Naval Communication Station, Guam. This station provides communications support to the Navy shore establishment and the Naval Operating Forces in the western Pacific Ocean area. This project will expand an existing building to permit the installation of a high capacity satellite communications terminal and a broadcast terminal.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP ACTIVITY, HANZA, OKINAWA

We are requesting \$697,000 for an emergency generator improvements project for the Naval Security Group Activity, Hanza, Okinawa. This facility provides direct communications support for the operating units of the Fleet and CINCPACFLT in this critical area



of the Pacific. This project will replace three 200 kW generators with three 400 kW generators.

#### NAVAL AIR STATION, CUBI POINT, REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

We are requesting \$14,116,000 at the Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Republic of the Philippines.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point provides aircraft maintenance and repair services to antisubmarine warfare patrol squadrons, tactical support squadrons, reconnaissance and composite squadron detachments, Fleet and Marine air wings, helicopter combat support and antisubmarine squadrons, and carrier air group detachments.

The aircraft parking apron project is the first of three increments to provide parking space for over 200 aircraft.

The maintenance hangar project which will provide additional maintenance spaces for land based and carrier aircraft.

A bachelor enlisted quarters project which will provide space for 192 E2-E4, 168 E5-E6, and 40 E7-E9 enlisted men.

A bachelor officer quarters project will accommodate 70 officers, warrant through lieutenant, junior grade, and 30 lieutenants and above.

#### NAVAL STATION, SUBIC BAY, REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

We are requesting \$1,264,000 for a bachelor enlisted quarters project at the Naval Station, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, which provides port services for a major portion of the ships operating in the western Pacific. The project will accommodate 144 enlisted men in the grades E2-E4.

#### VARIOUS LOCATIONS

The request for \$1,100,000 for two operational training building projects was withdrawn during hearings before the Armed Services Committees.

#### POLLUTION ABATEMENT, OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

We are requesting \$250,000 for a water pollution abatement item which will eliminate improper effluent discharges by extending the sewer outfall line beyond the low tidal area at Camp Garcia, Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico.

Senator MANSFIELD. Thank you, Admiral. We will now hear from General Schwenk and the Marine Corps.

#### U.S. MARINE CORPS

#### BUDGET REQUEST

Senator MANSFIELD. General Schwenk, will you please proceed?

General SCHWENK. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to have the opportunity to present the Marine Corps military construction program. This year's appropriation request of \$59,001,000 again emphasizes our continuing major effort to provide new and improved personnel support facilities. In addition, construction dollars for training, operational, maintenance and utility facilities are requested. This total will be complemented by a Navy request for \$4,865,000 in support of energy conservation and pollution abatement projects for our Marine Corps installations.

#### PROGRAM SUMMARY

One-half of our \$59 million request will be utilized to construct bachelor enlisted quarters in our continuing effort to satisfy deficiencies in personnel support facilities. The Marine Corps has dedicated a major portion of its construction efforts to bachelor housing facilities for the past 7 fiscal years. We are convinced that the provision of modern and reasonably comfortable living accommodations for our bachelor marines is in the best interest of both the marine and the Corps. Accordingly, we will continue to place personnel support projects to the forefront of our program until a sound functional physical plant exists to meet the living needs of our men and women.

The fiscal year 1977 through fiscal year 1980 programs will be very similar to the program before you in this respect. The remaining portion of our request will be invested as follows: \$6,561,000 for aviation training support and operational facilities; \$5,619,000 for aviation and ground equipment maintenance facilities; \$4,799,000 for existing utility system improvements. In addition, \$13,384,000 in amendments is requested to provide funding for four projects authorized within the fiscal year 1974 program, and one unfunded project in the fiscal year 1975 program. Three of the fiscal year 1974 projects were victims of inflation. The other projects will provide for a coal-burning capability for a steamplant at Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N.C.

Gentlemen, that summarizes the Marine Corps military construction appropriation request.

I will be happy to attempt to answer any questions you may have.

Senator MANSFIELD. Thank you, General. Your proposal seems modest. On behalf of the subcommittee, please accept my appreciation for your appearance today. That will conclude the testimony of the Navy and Marine Corps and if counsel will call in the Air Force, we will proceed with them.

Thank you very much.