milk support prices; and by continuing to import milk from other countries, competing with his herd and driving down prices.

Jackson. How do you feel, Clifford?

Greenwood. Not worth a damn. If you really want to know, I could bawl. Jackson. If you had it to do over again, would you go back into the dairy business?

Greenwood. Never. Not on your life, my life, or anybody else’s. You work your life to buy a herd of cows, then you give them away. What I’d like to see is just everybody just quit farming, then we’ll see what city folks think about high priced food—food—and where they’re gonna get it from.

Jackson. Clifford Greenwood thinks he and other dairymen have been taken for granted. And now—by going out of business and not producing milk—he says he hopes to get even. Mike Jackson, NBC News, Bertha, Minnesota.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, we can thank a number of people for the plight that farmers like Clifford Greenwood find themselves in. We can thank the House of Representatives for refusing by 295 votes to include in the farm bill passed last March 20 the provision increasing dairy support prices to 85 percent. But more important, we can thank Secretary Butz for providing the misleading information about the consumer cost of the dairy section of the bill which many urban Members of Congress mistakenly believed when they voted to strike the dairy section from the bill. And even more importantly, we can thank the Secretary and the President for their opposition to dairy support increases in general and to the insistence on vetoing even the watered down farm bill sent to them by Congress on May 1.

I hope this Government has sense enough to change its mind. The next time we have a farm bill before us, it will not help Clifford Greenwood but it might help a lot of other people and in the process it might also help to keep the United States self-sufficient in dairy products.

SENATE—Saturday, July 26, 1975

(legislative day of Monday, July 21, 1975)

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of the certain measures on the calendar beginning with Calendar No. 295 and concluding with Calendar No. 315.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. HANSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, is the distinguished majority leader asking for approval on everything between Calendar No. 295 and 315?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, we have three "overs."

Mr. HANSEN. I have not even seen them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, but I talked to the assistant Republican leader, and they have been cleared with everyone, all but three. If the Senator has any objection, I will be glad to withdraw consideration of them all.

Mr. HANSEN. I was not trying to object, Mr. President, I am simply trying to find out what the bills are about. I understood that there was a possibility we might be taking up some of the energy bills, and I have not even read through them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, these are out of the Committee on Rules and they have to do with financing committee.

Mr. HANSEN. I have no objection, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICS AND SPACE SCIENCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 37) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences for inquiries and investigations which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

On page 2, in line 18, strike out "committee," and insert "vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate."

The amendments were agreed to:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations, the committee be authorized to:

1. The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations, which had been referred to it, or upon which it might be taking up, the committee be authorized to:

2. The expenses of the committee and of any subcommittee thereof (as authorized by section 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its rules and procedures under rules of the Senate, the committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 28, 1976, in its discretion: (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the salaries of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $35,000, of which amount not to exceed $1,000 shall be available for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202 (1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended).

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1976.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 15) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for inquiries and investigations, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

On page 2, in line 15, strike out "February 28, 1976" and insert "February 28, 1976."

On page 2, in line 18, strike out "committee," and insert "vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate."

The amendments were agreed to:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations, the committee be authorized to:

1. The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations, which had been referred to it, or upon which it might be taking up, the committee be authorized to:

2. The expenses of the committee and of any subcommittee thereof (as authorized by section 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its rules and procedures under rules of the Senate, the committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 28, 1976, in its discretion: (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the salaries of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $35,000, of which amount not to exceed $1,000 shall be available for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202 (1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended).

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1976.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.
On page 2, in line 6, strike out "$250,000" and insert "$335,000".
On page 2, in line 17, strike out "committee" and insert "Senate".

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The Committee on Armed Services is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, to expend not to exceed $428,300 to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to each of the subjects set forth below in succeeding sections of this resolution, said funds to be allocated to the respective specific inquiries in accordance with such succeeding sections of this resolution.

Sec. 3. The Committee on Armed Services, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, to expend not to exceed $493,300, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to each of the subjects set forth below in succeeding sections of this resolution, said funds to be allocated to the respective specific inquiries in accordance with such succeeding sections of this resolution.

Sec. 4. Not to exceed $428,300 shall be available for a general study or investigation of:

(1) the common defense generally;
(2) the Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force generally;
(3) soldiers' and sailors' homes;
(4) pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;
(5) the size and composition of the Army, Navy, and Air Force;
(6) forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards;
(7) ammunition depots;
(8) the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal;
(9) the Federal Reserve System, including the development of weapons systems or military operations.

Sec. 5. Not to exceed $65,000 shall be available for studies and investigations pertaining to military readiness and preparedness for the common defense generally.

Sec. 6. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 87) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Armed Services for inquiries and investigations, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

On page 2, in line 6, strike out "$250,000" and insert "$335,000".
On page 2, in line 17, strike out "committee" and insert "Senate".

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use the services of personnel of any such department or agency, as follows:

Sec. 2. The Committee on Armed Services is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, to expend not to exceed $428,300 to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to each of the subjects set forth below in succeeding sections of this resolution, said funds to be allocated to the respective specific inquiries in accordance with such succeeding sections of this resolution.

Sec. 3. The Committee on Armed Services, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, to expend not to exceed $493,300, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to each of the subjects set forth below in succeeding sections of this resolution, said funds to be allocated to the respective specific inquiries in accordance with such succeeding sections of this resolution.

Sec. 4. Not to exceed $428,300 shall be available for a general study or investigation of:

(1) the common defense generally;
(2) the Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force generally;
(3) soldiers' and sailors' homes;
(4) pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;
(5) the size and composition of the Army, Navy, and Air Force;
(6) forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards;
(7) ammunition depots;
(8) the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal;
ings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable with respect to each study or investigation for which expenditure is authorized by this resolution, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 29, 1976.

Sec. 7. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 80) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on the Budget for inquiries and investigations, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

On page 1, line 11, strike out "$1,989,600" and insert "$1,681,600".

On page 2, line 7, strike out "$133,500" and insert "$186,500".

On page 17, line 3, strike out "committee" and insert "committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate".

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified in rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to conduct a cooperative study of instrumentalities in the Federal and State governments with substantial economic, health, or safety regulatory authority, activities which affect the efficient operation of the economy, or the quality or safety of goods or services, or the health or safety of the general public.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee on Government Operations and the Senate Committee on Commerce are authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with their jurisdiction specified in rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to conduct a cooperative study of instrumentalities in the Federal and State governments with substantial economic, health, or safety regulatory authority, activities which affect the efficient operation of the economy, or the quality or safety of goods or services, or the health or safety of the general public.

Sec. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $1,681,600, of which amount not to exceed $186,500 may be expended for the procurement of the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $1,681,600, of which amount not to exceed $186,500 may be expended for the procurement of the services of personnel of any such department or agency, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 63), authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Commerce for inquiries and investigations, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The Acting President pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

STUDY OF CERTAIN FEDERAL AGENCIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 71) authorizing a study of the purpose and current effectiveness of certain Federal agencies, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

On page 9, line 4, strike out "chairman of the".

On page 9, line 8, strike out "Commerce, acting jointly with the ranking minority members of both committees," and insert "Commerce".

On page 9, line 8, strike out "July 1, 1976, to" and insert "February 29, 1976".

On page 9, line 14, strike out "consent to" and insert "consent to and".

On page 9, line 14, strike out "assignment and insert "transfer".

On page 9, line 17, strike out "committee" and insert "committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate".

On page 10, beginning with line 6, strike out line 8.

Sec. 5. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee on Commerce is authorized to expend, from the contingent fund of the Senate, from March 1, 1975, through September 1, 1976, not to exceed $375,000, upon vouchers signed by the chairman of that committee, with the approval of the ranking minority member. For the purpose of the resolution, the committee on Government Operations shall, from March 1, 1975, through September 1, 1976, not to exceed $375,000, upon vouchers signed by the chairman of that committee with the approval of the ranking minority member.

And insert:

Sec. 5. (a) The expenses of the committee on Government Operations under this resolution shall not exceed $250,000, of which amount not to exceed $186,700 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants or organizations thereof, as authorized by section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended.

(b) The expenses of the committee on Government Operations under this resolution shall not exceed $250,000, of which amount not to exceed $208,000 may be expended for the procure­ment of the services of individual consultants or organizations thereof, as authorized by section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended.

Sec. 6. (a) The expenses of the committee on Commerce under this resolution shall not exceed $216,700, of which amount not to exceed $186,700 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants or organizations thereof, as authorized by section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended.

(b) The expenses of the committee on Commerce under this resolution shall not exceed $216,700, of which amount not to exceed $186,700 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants or organizations thereof, as authorized by section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended. Whereas there are a large number of Federal and State agencies which regulate in significant ways various aspects of the Nation's economy.

Whereas the proliferation of such agencies over a long period of time, and under a variety of circumstances, has resulted in overlapping regulatory jurisdictions, conflicting mandates, and procedures that have made the conduct of Federal Government and the economy.

Whereas to consider certain reforms in Federal and State regulatory functions, procedures, in the operations and organization of the agencies, a Senate committee study is indicated to review the effectiveness of the agencies and consider any necessary legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Government Operations and the Senate Committee on Commerce are authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with their jurisdiction specified in rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to conduct a cooperative study of the Nation's economy, or the quality or safety of goods or services, or the health or safety of the general public.

Sec. 2. (a) The study shall contain findings, conclusions, and recommendations concerning the Federal regulatory agencies with respect to:

(1) the most serious deficiencies within the regulatory process which tend to contribute to inflation, lessen competition, or which adversely affect the public and regulated companies,

(2) the extent to which certain areas of the national economy are over-regulated or under-regulated, with special emphasis on overlapping regulatory jurisdictions, conflicting mandates, and actual implementation of existing laws and regulations,

(3) the economic costs and benefits of regulation, or the lack thereof, with special emphasis on the inflationary impact of regulation on the cost to the consumer of goods and services, the added costs to manufacturers and suppliers in providing goods and services, the anticompetitive effects of some regulations, the degree of regulatory efficiency, and responsiveness to the public of overlapping or related regulatory jurisdictions, conflicting mandates, and actual implementation of existing laws and regulations,

(4) the continued appropriateness or applicability of original regulatory purposes and activities as currently conducted, and an evaluation of the purposes and objectives which regulation should now serve,

(5) the consequences to the Nation of selective deregulation in specified areas or selective modification of regulatory purposes, operations, and procedures in specific areas,

(6) the need for, and specific recommendations concerning increased or more stringent antitrust enforcement as a higher order national policy, including recommendations for any new legislation which may be needed or for restructuring of the Federal antitrust effort,

(7) specific recommendations and initiatives to improve the effectiveness, efficiency, and responsiveness to the public of overlapping or related regulatory jurisdictions, conflicting mandates, and actual implementation of existing laws and regulations, including but not limited to the following:

(A) selective elimination of specific regulatory functions, procedures, activities, or purposes;

(B) selective elimination, merger, or transfer of overlapping or related regulatory jurisdictions, conflicting mandates, or functions;

(C) revisions in the laws, regulations, structure, operation, procedures, activities, or membership of the agencies involved;

(D) elimination, transfer, or separation

Whereas there are a large number of Federal and State agencies which regulate in significant ways various aspects of the Nation's economy.
out of the subsidy-granting or other forms of indirect regulatory activities or regulatory agencies which adversely affect or interfere with their principal regulatory responsibilities;

(8) an evaluation of other proposals for improving the effectiveness, efficiency, and responsiveness to the public of the regulatory agencies involved, instead of continuing to permit nuclear policies to develop implicitly through a series of regulations with differing facts and circumstances;

(b) making the regulatory responsibilities of selected or all regulatory agencies more independent of the executive branch by requiring simultaneous submission of budget and legislative requests to the President and the Congress, and by permitting each regulatory agency to independently control and supervise its own litigation in the Federal court;

(C) eliminating collegial commissions altogether or selectively, and replacing the commissions with agencies administering regulatory statutes or their applicability to regulatory agencies to independently control and supervise its own litigation by an evaluation of proposals—

(A) encouraging the enumeration of broad policies of regulatory agencies, and not only continuing to permit nuclear policies to develop implicitly through a series of regulations with differing facts and circumstances;

(B) making the regulatory responsibilities of selected or all regulatory agencies more independent of the executive branch by requiring simultaneous submission of budget and legislative requests to the President and the Congress, and by permitting each regulatory agency to independently control and supervise its own litigation in the Federal courts;

(D) revising procedures for selecting commissioners and reviewing their qualifications, including the establishment of a distinguished Board of Regulatory Review to provide its recommendations or guidance as possible appointees for regulatory agency positions;

(E) revamping the conflict-of-interest statutes or their applicability to regulatory agency officials, so as to limit the movement of persons from a regulated industry or a related industry to the industry which regulates that industry, and the movement of persons from the agency back to the regulated industry;

(F) limiting the removal of regulatory agency officials to reason relating to their inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office;

(G) making regulatory agency officials, in their personal capacity, civilly or criminally responsible for intentional misuse or abuse of their office for reasons relating to (1) their disclosure of trade secrets or other confidential or privileged information; (2) their failure to make information available to the public pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act; (3) their failure to hold or attend agency meetings, sessions, and agency advisory committee meetings and sessions to which the chairman or other officer in charge has directed them to carry out the provisions of the laws administered by them;

(H) providing that the payment of reasonable costs and expenses in agency proceedings of intervenors on behalf of the public or consumer interests and an assessment of the manner by which such proposal might be implemented across the board including the anticipated costs therefor;

(I) creating a new Administrative Court of the United States as an expert judicial unit to handle agencies;

(a) amending the Administrative Procedure Act and modifying agency rules to expedite regulatory agency proceedings as a means of facilitating more timely decision-making and preventing wasteful costs attendant to agency delays;

(b) revising the direct subsidies, where appropriate, for complicated and cumbersome regulatory schemes, with hidden taxes and the paperwork burden both within the agencies and within the regulated industries by avoiding needless duplication; and

(M) providing for more effective means of independent evaluation of regulatory activities within the regulatory agencies and their specific or general impact on the public interest in matters of particular importance or impact;

(9) recommendations for assuring an ongoing study, by the Congress, of the economic costs and benefits and the deficiencies of Federal regulatory activities, including proposals for limiting the growth of bureaucracy, regulatory agencies or establishing a time certain within which they would expire unless Congress specifically reviews their mandates by legislative enactment, and

(10) a realistic and detailed assessment of the costs or savings, transitional, interim, and long-term, of Commission proposals and recommendations for regulatory reform.

The study shall also consist of findings, conclusions, and recommendations concerning regulatory activities within State, regional, and local regulatory agencies which tend to contribute to inflation, lessen competition, or which adversely affect the public and the regulated companies. The report shall give special emphasis to regulatory activities which interact with or are affected by the activities of State, regional, or local regulatory agencies.

(b) The study shall also consist of findings, conclusions, and recommendations concerning regulatory activities within State, regional, and local regulatory agencies which tend to contribute to inflation, lessen competition, or which adversely affect the public and the regulated companies. The report shall give special emphasis to regulatory activities which interact with or are affected by the activities of State, regional, or local regulatory agencies.

The amendments were agreed to. The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 184(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its interpretation under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Commerce is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, to employ personnel, and to disburse the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended).

(b) Expenses of the Committee on Commerce under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 30) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on the District of Columbia for investigations and investigations, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

On page 2, in line 5, strike out "$175,000" and insert "$181,700".

On page 2, in line 16, strike out "committee" and insert "committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 184(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its interpretation under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Commerce is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, to employ personnel, and to disburse the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended).

(b) Expenses of the Committee on Commerce under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 184(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its interpretation under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Commerce is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, to employ personnel, and to disburse the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended).

(b) Expenses of the Committee on Commerce under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 30) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on the District of Columbia for investigations and investigations, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

On page 2, in line 5, strike out "$175,000" and insert "$181,700".

On page 2, in line 16, strike out "committee" and insert "committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 184(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its interpretation under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Commerce is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, to employ personnel, and to disburse the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended).

(b) Expenses of the Committee on Commerce under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 30) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on the District of Columbia for investigations and investigations, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

On page 2, in line 5, strike out "$175,000" and insert "$181,700".

On page 2, in line 16, strike out "committee" and insert "committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 184(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its interpretation under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Commerce is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, to employ personnel, and to disburse the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended).

(b) Expenses of the Committee on Commerce under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.
ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 51) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Finance for hearings and investigations, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

Page 2, in line 7, strike out "$990,000" and insert "$1,810,000", of which amount not to exceed $10,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended)."

Page 3, in line 18, strike out "committee" and insert "committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate".

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Finance, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 49) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, for hearings and investigations, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

Page 2, in line 11, strike out "$2,408,362" and insert "$2,308,000".

Page 2, in line 21, strike out "$239,300" and insert "$388,544".

Page 9, in line 16, strike out "$88,544" and insert "$388,144".

Page 10, in line 7, strike out "$238,518" and insert "$238,468".

Page 11, in line 9, strike out "$292,000" and insert "$222,950".

Page 12, in line 4, strike out "$115,000" and insert "$113,938".

Page 13, in line 15, strike out "$2,408,362" and insert "$2,308,000".

Page 13, in line 18, strike out "committee" and insert "committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate".

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, to February 29, 1976, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 49) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, for hearings and investigations, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

Page 2, in line 21, strike out "$239,300" and insert "$388,544".

Page 10, in line 7, strike out "$238,518" and insert "$238,468".

Page 11, in line 9, strike out "$292,000" and insert "$222,950".

Page 12, in line 4, strike out "$115,000" and insert "$113,938".

Page 13, in line 15, strike out "$2,408,362" and insert "$2,308,000".

Page 13, in line 18, strike out "committee" and insert "committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate".

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, to expend not to exceed "$2,308,000 to examine, investigate, and make a comprehensive study of any and all matters pertaining to each of the subjects set forth in the resolution, as amended, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.
their
the
at
flict of interest, and the improper expendi­
ture of such corporations, companies, or individ­
uals engaged in criminal or organized criminal ac­
tivities; (a) to study the adequacy of Federal and State legal and administrative pol­ices and procedures in the detection, prevention, and punishment of crimes and organized criminal activity, and to study the adequacy of Federal and State legal and administrative pol­ices and procedures in the detection, prevention, and punishment of organized crime in interstate commerce or international commerce; and to determine whether any changes in such laws and regulations are necessary or desirable for the protection of the public against the occurrences of such crimes, activities, or practices; (4) all other aspects of crime and lawless­ness within the United States which have an impact upon or affect the national health, welfare, or safety; (5) riots, violent disturbances of the peace, vandalism, civil and criminal disorder, in­ternational, the commission of crimes in con­nection therewith, the immediate and long­standing causes, the extent and effects of such occurrences and crimes, and measure necessary to control and prevent them and to reduce the future occurrence and spread thereof; (6) the efficiency and economy of opera­tions of all branches and functions of the Government; (a) to study or investigate the extent to which Federal, State, or local governments and the manner and efficiency with which the services of individual consultants or organizations there­of are utilized, (b) Nothing contained in this section shall be­come applicable to the study or investigation of any matter within the jurisdiction of any Federal or State legislative body, or to the study of any matter which is the subject of any pending litigation; (c) for the purpose of this section the committee, or any duly authorized subcom­mittee thereof, or its chairman, or any other member of the committee or subcommittee designated by the Senate, or any duly authorized sub­committee thereof, or its chairman, or any other member of the committee or subcommittee designated by the Senate, may be ex­amined by the Advisory Commission on Federal Regulatory Agencies at any time there­after, provided that the amount of such examination shall not exceed $222,000. (D) coordination of energy programs with the pricing of energy in United States, foreign, and international markets; (2) policies, procedures, and activities of the Federal and State governments, including the fiscal interrela­tion­ship between the Federal Government and State and local governments; (3) the development and effectiveness of fiscal, budgetary, and program information systems and controls; and (D) legislative and other proposals to im­prove these methods, processes, and rela­tionships; (7) the efficiency, economy, and effective­ness of all agencies and departments of the Government involved in the control and management of national resources or in the maintenance of the independent sec­tion of the petroleum industry as a strong competitive force; (H) the allocation of energy supplies owned or controlled by the Government; (I) the management of energy supplies owned or controlled by the Government; (J) relations with other oil producing and consuming countries; (K) the monitoring of compliance by gov­ernments, corporations, or individuals with the laws and regulations governing the allo­cation, conservation, and pricing of energy supplies; and (L) research into the discover and de­velopment of alternative energy sources.
Provided, That, in carrying out the duties therein set forth, the inquiries of this commit­tee or any subcommittee thereof shall not be limited to the record, functions, and opera­tions of the particular branch of the Government under inquiry, and may extend to the records and activities of persons, corporations, or other enti­ties dealing with or affecting that particular branch of the Government; of such amount not to exceed $222,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants or organiza­tions thereof.
(b) Nothing contained in this section shall affect or impair the exercise by any other standing committee of the Senate of any power, granted by the discharges by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended.
(c) For the purpose of this section the committee, or any duly authorized subcom­mittee thereof, or its chairman, or any other member of the committee or subcommittee designated by the Senate, or any duly authorized sub­committee thereof, or its chairman, or any other member of the committee or subcommittee designated by the Senate, may be examined by the Advisory Commission on Federal Regulatory Agencies at any time there­after, provided that the amount of such examination shall not exceed $222,000.
ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 66) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for inquiries and investigations, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

On page 2, in line 11, strike out "$817,000" and insert "$824,900."

On page 2, in line 12, strike out "(1)".

On page 2, beginning with line 16, insert:

Sec. 5. (a) The committee shall continue the study of national fuels and energy policy authorized pursuant to S. Res. 45, agreed to on March 2, 1971, and the committee, as amended by S. Res. 45, the committee shall make—

(i) a full and complete investigation and study (including the holding of public hearings in appropriate parts of the Nation) of the current and prospective fuel and energy problems, policies, and programs of the United States and the present and probable future alternative procedures and methods for meeting these needs, consisting of achieving other national goals, including the high priorities—national security and energy; and

(ii) a full and complete investigation and study of the existing and prospective governmental policies and laws affecting the fuels and energy industries with the view of determining what, if any, changes and implementation of these policies and laws may be advisable in order to simplify, coordinate, and provide effective and reasonable national policy to assure reliable and efficient energy supply and energy adequate for a balanced economy and for the security of the United States, taking into account: the Nation's environmental concerns, the national interest in maintaining an adequate and dependable source of energy, and the need for maintenance of an adequate force of skilled workers.

(b) In carrying out the investigations set forth in S. Res. 45, agreed to on May 3, 1971, the committee shall, in addition to such other matters as it may deem necessary, give consideration to—

(i) the proved and predicted availabilities of our national fuel and energy resources in connection with their forecast future use, as well as to worldwide trends in consumption and supply;

(ii) projected national requirements for the utilization of these resources for energy production and other purposes, both to meet short-range needs and to provide for future demand for the years 2000 and 2020;

(iii) the interests of the consuming public, including the availability in all regions of the country of the adequate supply of energy and fuel at reasonable prices and including the maintenance of a sound competitive, efficient, and dependable structure; and

(iv) the effect of energy and fuel production, transportation, and/or transmission, in progress and contemplated, and the present and future needs for the development of new sources and areas for further exploration and technological research, development, and demonstration;

(v) the effect that energy producing, transportation, upgrading, and utilization has upon conservation, environmental, and ecological factors, and vice versa;

(vi) the effect upon the public and private sectors of the economy of any recom- mendations made pursuant to this study on economic concentrations in industry, particularly as they may affect small business enterprises engaged in the production, processing, and distribution of energy and fuel;

(vii) governmental programs and policies now in operation, including not only their effect upon segments of the fuels and energy industries, but also their impact upon related and competing sources of energy and the fuels and their interaction with other governmental and private sectors, objects, and programs; and

(ix) the need, if any, for legislation designed to effectuate recommendations in accordance with the above and other relevant amendments to existing laws as necessary to integrate existing laws into an effective long-term fuels and energy policy.

(c) In furtherance of the purposes of S. Res. 45, agreed to on March 3, 1971, the chairman and ranking minority member of each committee, as appropriate, and the United States Science and Space Committee, on Commerce, on Finance, on Foreign Relations, on Government Operations, on Health, Education, and Welfare, and on Public Works, or members of such committees designated by such chairmen and ranking minority members, and all of the ranking majority and minority Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, or Senate members of such committee designated by such ranking majority and minority members to serve in their places, shall have the right to serve as ex officio members of the committee for the purpose of conducting the Senate's National Fuels and Energy Policy Study.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 134(a) and 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rules XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 28, 1976, in its discretion—

(i) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, (3) with the prior consent of the Senate, to use services of any executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis services of such department or agency, and (4) to consent to the assignment of personnel of other committees of the Senate to assist in carrying out the purposes of this resolution. Travel and other expenses, other than salary, of any person from other committees assigned to the committee pursuant to this paragraph for the purposes of section 3 of this resolution may be paid under this resolution.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $824,900, of which amount not exceed $500,000 shall be available for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizational personnel (as defined in 202 (1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended).
on with achieving other national goals, including the high priorities—national security and environment—and

(i) a full and complete investigation and study of the existing and prospective governmental policies and programs affecting energy industries with the view of determining what, if any, changes and implications of these policies and programs, if any, should be advanced. The findings, report, and recommendations should be sufficiently professional, coordinate, and provide effective and reasonable national policy to assure reliable and efficient sources of energy and fuel and energy industries related to a balanced economy and for the security of the United States, taking into account: the Nation's energy and economic relationships and the involvements by public and private enterprise for the maintenance of reliable, efficient, and adequate sources of energy and fuel and energy industries, but also their impact upon the short-range needs and to provide for future demand for the years 2000 and 2020; (iii) the interests of the consuming public, including the availability in all regions of the country of an adequate supply of energy and fuel at reasonable prices and including the maintenance of a sound competitive structure in the supply and distribution of energy and fuel to both industry and the public; (iv) technological developments affecting energy production and other purposes, both to meet short-range needs and to provide for future demand; (v) the effect of energy production, transportation, and utilization on conservation, environmental, and ecological factors, and vice versa; (vi) the need of the public and private sectors of the economy for any recommendations made under this study, and of existing governmental programs and policies now in effect; (vii) the effect of any recommendations made pursuant to this study on economic concentrations in industry, particularly as these recommendations may affect small business enterprises engaged in the production, processing, and distribution of energy and fuel; (viii) governmental programs and policies now in operation, including not only their effect upon segments of the fuel and energy industries, but also their impact upon related and competing sources of energy and fuel and energy industries, with other governmental objectives, goals, and programs; and (ix) the need, if any, for legislation designed to effectuate recommendations in accordance with the above and other relevant considerations, including such proposed amendments to existing laws as necessary to integrate existing laws into an effective long-term fuels and energy program.

In accordance with the purposes of S. Res. 45, agreed to on May 3, 1971, the chairman and ranking minority member of each of the Committees on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, on Commerce, on Finance, on Foreign Relations, on Government Operations, on Labor and Public Welfare, and on Public Works, or a majority of any committee designated by such chairman and ranking minority member to serve in their places, and the ranking minority and majority Senate Members of the Committee on Atomic Energy, or Senate members of such committee designated by such ranking majority and minority Senate Members, shall participate, and shall serve as ex officio members of the committee for the purpose of conducting the Senate National Fuels and Energy Policy Study.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 29, 1976.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 72), authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary for inquiries and investigations was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 40) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for inquiries and investigations, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

On page 2, in line 13, strike out “$750,000” and (vi) the public and private sectors of the economy for any recommendations made under this study, and of existing governmental programs and policies now in effect; (vii) the effect of any recommendations made pursuant to this study on economic concentrations in industry, particularly as these recommendations may affect small business enterprises engaged in the production, processing, and distribution of energy and fuel; (viii) governmental programs and policies now in operation, including not only their effect upon segments of the fuel and energy industries, but also their impact upon related and competing sources of energy and fuel and energy industries, with other governmental objectives, goals, and programs; and (ix) the need, if any, for legislation designed to effectuate recommendations in accordance with the above and other relevant considerations, including such proposed amendments to existing laws as necessary to integrate existing laws into an effective long-term fuels and energy program.

In accordance with the purposes of S. Res. 45, agreed to on May 3, 1971, the chairman and ranking minority member of each of the Committees on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, on Commerce, on Finance, on Foreign Relations, on Government Operations, on Labor and Public Welfare, and on Public Works, or a majority of any committee designated by such chairman and ranking minority member to serve in their places, and the ranking majority and minority Senate Members of the Committee on Atomic Energy, or Senate members of such committee designated by such ranking majority and minority Senate Members, shall participate, and shall serve as ex officio members of the committee for the purpose of conducting the Senate National Fuels and Energy Policy Study.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 29, 1976.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $250,000. The committee may expend funds for inquiries and investigations, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 29, 1976.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 52) authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, in line 13, strike out “committee” and insert “committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate”. The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $250,000. The committee may expend funds for inquiries and investigations, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 29, 1976.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 44) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Public Works for inquiries and investigations which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

On page 2, line 7, strike out “$875,000” and insert “$849,000”.

On page 3, in line 16, strike out “commit-
The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Public Works, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, in its discretion, (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $84,860, of which amount not to exceed $12,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof, (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended).

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 29, 1976.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 54) authorizing additional expenditures by the Select Committee on Small Business, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

On page 2, in line 21, strike out "$365,000" and insert "$312,700".

On page 3, in line 7, strike out "committee" and insert "committees" except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate".

Desc. resolutions, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by S. Res. 55, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, as amended and supplemented, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

Sec. 2. For purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency, and (4) to do any other thing necessary or proper to carry out the provisions of the resolution. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee, and such committee shall not have power to report any such legislation.

(1) A majority of the members of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

Sec. 3. (a) For purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to hold
hearings, (3) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate, (4) to require the attendance of witnesses and the attendance of such government employees as may be necessary to the proper conduct of business of the committee, and the Senate is authorized to create a special committee empowered to make expenditures by the Senate.
have a leader in the person of Premier Karamanlis, whose words can look up, a man of great integrity and ability, a man Greece needs at this time, but a man who must be given some support in helping to bring about a settlement of the situation to the end that Cyprus' future will not hang like an albatross around his neck.

I hope, Mr. President, that Congress, in its wisdom, will not give up on a leader of his party but is also a very effective leader of his party and is also a very effective leader of our country.

I trust and hope that his words will be heard not only in the Senate but on the floor of the House, and that some degree of stability can be maintained in the Aegean and in Southeast Europe, and so that these possibilities which I mentioned will not come to pass.

Mr. GRIFFFIN. Mr. President, I wish to commend our distinguished majority leader for his very wise and considered remarks. He is one of those very rare and, I think, helpful people in life who can see precisely the important elements in this situation to the end that that alienation we severed all ties, but which is now being pursued.

But I recall so well what the majority leader said several months ago when he observed that at that time those people in Turkey—and not only Premier Karamanlis but others as well—understood that if America were by its actions to alienate Turkey, and as a consequence of that alienation we severed all ties, then what clout we may have had previously and what influence we might have had in Western and in helping to bring about a settlement of the tough, knotty, thorny problem of Cyprus would indeed have been lessened very materially.

I thought that what the majority leader said needed to be heard and needed to be understood by all people.

We cannot, as we have learned time after time, not only in this body but in real life experience as well, undo all the wrongs or the errors of the past. There is no way we can go back and change the moving finger of time. So it is not or should not be a question of pretending over the show of a span of history and say that here is a wrong that was committed so we are going to react another way and try to undo that or penalize somebody for an action that has displeased someone or that, indeed, has offended someone.

I just want to say that I agree completely with the distinguished minority whip in applauding our majority leader for his statesmanship in the future by his ability to help us put things in perspective.

I hope that the other body will do it, too, because far more is at stake than the issue of the affront, the affront and the affront and the affront and the affront between Greece and Turkey.

Mr. HATFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, this morning we had, again, one of those very rare and, I think, helpful experiences of listening to a reumed by the distinguished majority leader (Mr. MANSFIELD) concerning the problems of the Mediterranean, involving the countries of Greece and Turkey.

I think we are all committed of the fact that the majority leader has a very distinguished record and career as an academician, a man who has been trained and schooled in history, and has had the responsibility to teach young people in a university.

With such an outstanding background of academic experience, we come to think, after reading the foreign policy speeches made by the distinguished majority leader, and do agree that are proud moments of that point. He not only is a man skilled in understanding the background and history of peoples, but also has the ability to apply that knowledge to current events.

I hope the other body, where I had the privilege of serving for 10 years, will respond affirmatively to the President's request and to the implicit suggestion of the message of the distinguished majority leader that it reconsider its action, not only for the sake of the country but for the sake of Congress, which seeks, and should have, a more important and effective role in foreign policy.

Mr. HANSSEN. Mr. President, I, too, would like to commend the distinguished majority leader for his very wise and considered and tempered remarks this morning.

I have heard from a number of my very fine and admired constituents in Wyoming on this issue. A majority are proud of their Greek heritage and I find many of them on which they and I, can, and do agree that are proud moments in the long history of the Greek people. I think it is extremely unfortunate that on this issue, we do oftentimes reflect the feelings of the majority of our constituents, or those we know particularly well, rather than to try to view an issue of this kind in the context of the majority leader's voice for the diplomatic and legislative action requested by the President.

In recent months and years the legislative branch of the Government has been seeking to assert a more active role in the formulation of the foreign policy of our country. If we are to have a responsible role in that field, then it is important for Members of Congress to realize that foreign policy cannot be based on day-to-day domestic political considerations; that foreign policy must follow a steady and responsible course based on the long-term best interests of the Nation.

Perhaps, we do not have a great deal to beat our chests about in the morning. I have heard from a number of my very fine and admired constituents in Wyoming on this issue. A majority are proud of their Greek heritage and I find many of them.

I have heard from a number of my very fine and admired constituents in Wyoming on this issue. A majority are proud of their Greek heritage and I find many of them.

I have heard from a number of my very fine and admired constituents in Wyoming on this issue. A majority are proud of their Greek heritage and I find many of them.

I have heard from a number of my very fine and admired constituents in Wyoming on this issue. A majority are proud of their Greek heritage and I find many of them.
The majority of the new deferrals I am reporting—14 of 23—defer the obliga-
tions that would have been paid under the continu-
ing resolution for 1976 (Public Law 94-41). I have proposed that several ongoing programs be reduced, termi-
nated, or transferred to other agencies beginning in fiscal year 1976. The Congress has not yet completed action on the 1976 regular appropriation bills or on my proposed modifications of certain programs. In the meantime, it has generally
provided for all programs to receive temporary appropriations at ongoing rates. I am deferring obligations above the levels I have proposed, pending completion of Congressional action on my proposals.
The remaining new deferrals are routine in nature and have little or no effect on program levels.
The details of each deferral and proposed rescission are contained in the attached reports.

This special message increases to eight the number of rescissions now pending before the Congress. I urge prompt, positive action on each of them.

GERALD R. FORD
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 26, 1975.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO CONTINUE THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-
pore (Mr. Strove) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States requesting an additional $3 billion to continue the Food Stamp program, the cost of the program has nearly doubled in the past 6 months. The unemployment rate has also been a factor in the increase. To con-
tinue the Food Stamp program for the remainder of this fiscal year, I am forced to ask the Congress for an additional $3 billion over the $3.8 billion which I re-
quested in my budget submitted in February.

Accordingly, I am today transmitting to the Congress a budget amendment request-
ing these additional funds.

The flaws in the existing law easily can be seen. Only 10 years ago, there were fewer than 500,000 people participat-
ing in the program at a cost of $36 million. Today, the number of partici-
pants has expanded to 20 million and the cost to $8.8 billion. Furthermore, if all those presently eligible under current law suddenly signed up for the program, esti-
mates are that between 40 and 60 mil-

lion persons would be receiving food stamps.

In short, what has evolved in just 10 years is another massive, multibillion dollar program, almost uncontrolled and fully supported by Federal taxpayers.

Some believe that the Food Stamp pro-
cannot be controlled and that even-
creasing costs are inevitable. I refuse to accept that proposition. Every public pro-
gram is controllable. The Food Stamp Act was placed on the Statute books by
the Congress which has the power and authority to amend the law.

Earlier this year, I submitted a pro-
posal which would have required all partic-

JULY 26, 1975

Gerald R. Ford
The White House, July 26, 1975.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL ON WAGE AND PRICE STABILITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-
pore (Mr. Brown) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the Council on Wage and Price Stability, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Bank-

ing, House and Urban Affairs. The message is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 5 of the
Council on Wage and Price Stability Act, as amended, I hereby transmit to the Congress the third quarterly report of the Council on Wage and Price Sta-
bility. This report contains a description of the Council’s activities during the past
few months in monitoring wages and prices in the private sector and review-
ing various Federal Government activities that lead to higher costs and prices
without creating commensurate benefits. It discusses in some detail the Council’s studies of slower cost increases, the rising cost of living, and the impact of higher prices and wages during the first quarter of 1975 and the outlook for the rest of the year. It also includes a summary chapter prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the cost of medical care.

Although it requires continued atten-
tion, the Council has been made less necessary by the existing law. Wage increases now decelerating, moderation in wage settlements becomes very important. Wage increases that substantially raise unit labor costs could create new inflationary pressures. Moreover, the recovery of the economy should not be used as an occasion for business to raise prices in anticipation of stronger demand. The Council on Wage and Price Sta-
bility also will continue to monitor closely actions taken by the Government and will call to public attention unjustified activities that could have an adverse impact on price levels.

GERALD R. FORD
The White House, July 26, 1975.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

A report on the Rail Passenger Service Act (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rail-

ing, Housing and Urban Affairs.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of receipts and disbursements pertaining to the disposal of surplus military sup-
plies and equipment (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Approp-
riations.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense transmitting a draft of proposed legislation concerning the ap-
pointment, promotion, separation, and re-
tirement of members of the armed forces, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Serv-
ces.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

A letter from the Secretary of Transpor-
tation transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on fare-free mass transportation (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Transpor-
tation, Housing and Urban Affairs.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Educa-
tion, and Welfare transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the health consequences of smoking (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commer-
ce.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce trans-
mitting, pursuant to law, a report on the National Marine Fisheries Service for the

PROPOSED ACT OF THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Chairman of the Coun-
cil of the District of Columbia transmitting,
pursuant to law, a copy of an act adopted by the Council regarding the District of Columbia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
A letter from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an act adopted by the Council to establish a District Council Boxing and Wrestling Commission (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION BY THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY
A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL
Two letters from the Comptroller General of the United States each transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed amendment to the petroleum price and allocation regulations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED DECORTIE OF PEACE OF OIL
A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed amendment to the petroleum price and allocation regulations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

STRIPPER WELL LEASE EXEMPTION AMENDMENT
A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, an extension of the stripper well lease exemption amendment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

APPLICATION FOR LOAN TO A RECLAMATION DISTRICT
A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior reporting, pursuant to law, on an application for a loan of $200,000 from the Wenatchee Reclamation District, Chelan County, Wash.; referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE
A letter from the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the period May 1 through May 15, 1978, concerning visa petitions approved by the Service (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED REGULATION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
A letter from the Executive Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare transmitting, pursuant to law, proposed regulations and guidelines governing section 102(b)(6) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED ALTERATION OF A PUBLIC BUILDING
A letter from the Administrator of General Services transmitting, pursuant to law, a prospectus for alterations at the Woodlawn Operations Building (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION BY THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION
A letter from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION
A letter from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting, pursuant to law, the first annual report on Administrative Adjudication of Traffic Infractions (with an accompanying report; to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS
Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:
By ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. Scott):
A petition seeking a redress of grievances from several citizens of the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1976—CONFERENCE REPORT—(REPT. NO. 94-334)
Mr. STENNIS submitted a report from the committee of conference on the dis-agreeing votes of the two Houses on the first amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6674) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1976, and the period of July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and for the civilian and military personnel of the Department of Defense, and to authorize the military training student loads, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES
As in executive session, the following executive reports of committees were submitted:
By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Commerce:
The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for the terms indicated:
For the remainder of a term expiring March 26, 1976:
Robert F. Conklin, of New York, vice Irving Kristol, resigned.
Virginia Bauer Duncan, of Virginia, vice Thomas J. Buckley, resigned.
For the remainder of a term expiring March 26, 1978:
Amon R. Hostetter, Jr., of Massachusetts, vice Theodore W. Braun, resigned.
For a term expiring March 26, 1980:
Getus Perry Gregg, Jr., of Illinois, vice James R. Kiliri, resigned.
Little E. Herndon, of South Carolina, vice Frank Pace, Jr., term expired.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS
The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as indicated:
By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. BUCKLEY):
S. 2184. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to participate in the organization for, planning, design and construction of facilities in connection with the 1980 Olympic Winter Games at Lake Placid, N.Y. Referred to the Committee on Commerce.
By Mr. MONTOYA:
S. 2185. A bill to amend the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 to provide for the gradual decontrol of domestic crude petroleum prices and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
By Mr. FONG (by request):
S. 2186. A bill to ban the importation, manufacture, sale, and transfer of Saturday Night Specials, to improve the effectiveness of the Gun Control Act of 1968, to ban possession, shipment, transportation, and receipt of all firearms by felons, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS
By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. BUCKLEY):
S. 2184. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to participate in the organization for, planning, design and construction of facilities in connection with the 1980 Olympic Winter Games at Lake Placid, N.Y. Referred to the Committee on Commerce.
Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I today introduce, along with Senator Buckley, a bill to authorize the construction of the necessary winter sports and supporting facilities at Lake Placid, N.Y., the designated site for the 1980 Winter Olympic games.

Last year, the Congress passed, in Senate Resolution 72, a resolution of support and assistance for Lake Placid’s application to the International Olympic Committee to host the 1980 Winter Olympics. I am honored that the International Committee saw fit to choose the United States as the host country for the games, and I am especially pleased that the games are returning to Lake Placid, where they were successfully conducted in 1932.

Lake Placid is an ideal setting for the Winter Olympic games. Its combination of pristine beauty, existing facilities and accessibility make it perfectly suited for the Olympic games. It is a destination for tourists from around the world and are viewed by many millions more.

The organizers of the Lake Placid games have a keen insight in the need to ensure the best representation of the athletes—to provide the finest in competition at the highest international level. Moreover, their commitment to the eco-
logical protection of the Lake Placid area is total and without question. The games are truly being run by the people of the area, who have voted by referendum to welcome and support the town's bid to host the 1980 games.

An example of this commitment can be seen in the following document, which is the organizing committee's view of the need to return the Winter Olympics to a small town, with only moderate expenditures and no environmental degradation. I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the environmental problems that played a leading role in forcing Denver, Colo., to withdraw in 1976 Winter Olympics and that plague other possible sites for the games in the United States, do not exist in Lake Placid's designation as the 1980 site. A combination of circumstances, unique to this community and the Adirondacks, and to the New York State constitution has provided a permanent safeguard against environmental exploitation of the park.

State legislation has created the Adirondack Park Agency with broad authority to establish a master plan for the park and to exercise its comprehensive authority to establish a State land master plan and Adirondack Park private land use and development plan with rigid land use controls. Both the town of North Elba and the village of Lake Placid have a long history of professional community planning. Each community has detailed zoning ordinances, active planning boards and boards of zoning appeals. Strict sign ordinances and trailer ordinances already exist in the village of Lake Placid and are nearing reality in the town of North Elba. Lake Placid provides an almost unlimited source of present and future water requirements for the area. Municipal facilities have been designed to serve a community of 20,000 to 25,000 persons, far in excess of foreseeable requirements for the next 25 years.

Without question, the hosting of a 1980 Winter Olympic Games would involve the expansion and improvement of present facilities and the construction of some new facilities. It is here that Lake Placid can point with pride to its almost unexcelled existing winter sports facilities. Almost every sports facility already exists to host the 1980 Winter Olympics now exists and is in annual use. The following are the principal facilities and the necessary improvements to be made.

**Bobsledding**

The Olympic bobsrun, owned by the State of New York, has been in operation for over 25 years considered to be one of the finest in the world. The bobsrun area includes all necessary parking, a new lodge, refrigerated finish curve and complete water, sewer, and power requirements. The run has been approved by the FIBT for international competitions and is repeatedly the site of world bobsled championships, including those of 1973. The only suggested improvements for 1980 would be refrigeration of the entire run.

**Cross Country and Biathlon**

Cross country facilities necessary to conduct the Olympic cross country and biathlon events already exist at the Mount Van Hoevenberg Recreation Area owned and operated by the State of New York. These facilities were used for the 1967 and 1972 world university games, and they were the site of the 1973 world's biathlon championships. The only additions required for 1980 would be limited trail improvements, a biathlon range, and lodge expansion.

**Alpine Skiing**

Whiteface Mountain ski area, also owned and operated by the State of New York, can properly be called one of the major ski mountains in the East. There now exist four ski shelters or lodges, six ski lifts, several miles of ski trails, over 2,000,000 visitors, and 1980 that would be required for the Olympics. The existing 150 or more hotels, motels, and guest houses are capable of catering to the needs of over 10,000 visitors, and housing far in excess of 25,000 additional persons is already available at present tourist facilities within an hour's drive from Lake Placid. While it can be anticipated that the 1980 Olympics will create a demand for additional housing in the area, the existing and new municipal facilities previously outlined are more than adequate to handle any expansion.

**Skicross**

The town of North Elba park district owned Intervale Olympic ski jump complex already contains a 70-meter and a 40-meter ski jump. There are facilities to provide all required housing for the Olympics. No new development of private or State-owned lands would be involved for any possible ski jump improvements that might be made.

**Speed Skating**

The required 400-meter speed skating track constructed for the 1960 Olympics is located on the campus in front of Lake Placid Central School and adjacent to the Olympic arena. Each year since 1932 a 400-meter speed skating track has been constructed on this site at one of several available locations in the area. This would involve the construction of dormitory facilities, cafeteria, and field house stadium that could be used as an Olympic Village and for college purposes following the Olympic Winter Games.

**Ice Skating, Hockey**

There are two ice sheets in the present Olympic arena that are technically adequate for both figure skating and hockey competitions. Expanded seating capacity for spectators should be provided at the present arena within the present structure. The scope of the present figure skating programs and hockey activities is now far beyond the capacity of the present arena, and additional ice space is required. For the 1980 Olympics, an additional arena or ice sheet with substantially increased spectator capacity will have to be constructed. This facility could be provided adjacent to the present Olympic arena without damage to the area, change in the character of the community or adverse ecological impact. The Olympic area is located within easy walking distance from most of the housing in the community.

**Accommodations for Visitors**

Lake Placid is a resort community whose economy is based upon the accommodation of visitors. The community has years of experience in handling large conventions and peak crowds of visitors. The existing 150 or more hotels, motels, and guest houses are capable of catering to the needs of over 10,000 visitors, and housing far in excess of 25,000 additional persons is already available at present tourist facilities within an hour's drive from Lake Placid. While it can be anticipated that the 1980 Olympics will create a demand for additional housing in the area, the existing and new municipal facilities previously outlined are more than adequate to handle any expansion.

**Access Highways**

An adequate network of modern access roads presently serves the area. Lake Placid's 1980 Olympic proposals neither seek nor desire any additional or expanded highways. During the summer months, the present highway system presently handles in excess of 100,000 daily visitors to the area.

**Olympic Village**

For the Olympic Winter Games there are a maximum of approximately 1,200 competitors and 600 officials that will need housing. Lake Placid is fortunate in having a number of practical alternatives to the housing problem. In the first instance, it would be possible, with very little additional construction, to provide all result in a new housing from existing privately owned commercial establishments. A second alternative would be to expand existing small college dormitories to provide all result in a new housing from existing privately owned commercial establishments.

A second alternative would be to expand existing small college dormitories to provide all result in a new housing from existing privately owned commercial establishments.
A third alternative would be a proposal that has already been submitted to the organizing committee by Health Planning Associates, Inc., the establishment of a four-county—Clinton, Franklin, Hamilton, and St. Lawrence—health service and mental health center at the site of the present Ray Brook Hospital to be used as an Olympic village and immediately thereafter converted to use for other purposes.

Mr. President, the financing of the 1980 Winter Olympic Games must be a combined effort of local, State and Federal Governments, as well as private contributions. The local and New York State governments have already begun to provide their share.

The State of New York will provide the funding for all improvements to facilities owned or operated by the State. These include the cross country trails, the biathlon range, the bobsled and luge runs, and the Alpine ski area at Whiteface Mountain.

Lake Placid and the town of North Elba are taking full responsibility for all organization and administrative expenses, functional and operational facilities and special equipment.

We at the Federal level have a similar responsibility, particularly since the congressional resolution of support and assistance was handled in the International Olympic Committee's selection of Lake Placid as the 1980 site.

The commitment must not be delayed. It is modest in extent and essential to the success of the Games, but the cost of the necessary improvements is considerable.

The time has come—now is the proper time—because of the urgency of the situation.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that this legislation will not be delayed. Construction must begin this year if we are to avoid serious problems in meeting the unalterable date of the games themselves. I believe each of my colleagues can endorse this bill and take pride from the success of the Games and the growth of the Olympic movement in the United States in 1980.

EXHIBIT 1
KEEPING THE "WINTER OLYMPICS" IN PERSPECTIVE

In terms of an international athletic competition, the "Winter Olympics"—as they are known to the world—are very similar to those that were first held in Chamonix, France in 1924. With the exception of the post-war emergence of alpine skiing as a major sport, the only other significant change is the addition of new sports since Innsbruck in 1964.

At St. Moritz, Switzerland in 1948 the 28 participating countries sent a total of 878 competitors, and the Luge, added at Innsbruck in 1964, with approximately 80 competitors. At St. Moritz, Switzerland in 1948 the 28 participating countries sent a total of 878 competitors, and the Luge, added at Innsbruck in 1964, with approximately 80 competitors. In 1968, the 1972, and 1976 Winter Olympics, the number of participating countries increased to 35, 39, and 40, respectively.

Only a small percentage of the local residents of a city actually have (or take) the opportunity to attend more than one event and, far out of proportion in relation to the events themselves.

The financing of a modern Winter Olympic Games should be based on the economic feasibility of the Games themselves.

The Olympic Games are the major interdenominational and international tournaments for the benefit of cities and nations, and it is not only a matter of the economic feasibility of the Games themselves, but a matter of the economic viability of the Olympic movement in general.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that this legislation will not be delayed. Construction must begin this year if we are to avoid serious problems in meeting the unalterable date of the games themselves. I believe each of my colleagues can endorse this bill and take pride from the success of the Games and the growth of the Olympic movement in the United States in 1980.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 2185. A bill to amend the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 to provide for the gradual decontrol of domestic crude petroleum prices and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. President, the time has come for a compromise on the question of oil prices. It is clear that if the President does not retreat from his position of complete decontrol and the congressional majorities do not retreat from their position of price stability or rollback, this impasse will not be broken.

If we had intentionally set out to disrupt economic recovery, we would create even greater uncertainty about the future of the oil industry and to give the OPEC cabal a hammer with which to beat on the price of oil whenever they wish, we could not do it better than by doing nothing now.

Surely there is a middle ground between the position of the President and that of the majorities. Only a few countries which all can agree upon and which will meet the principal goals of both sides. I define those goals as follows: First, to assist the economic recovery which is now in its early stage, to provide the resources which the oil industry needs to increase domestic production; and, third, to put control of our economy, our foreign policy, and our destiny back into our own hands.

I believe that the bill I am introducing meets those goals by following a middle path between the Presidential and the congressional majorities. The bill provides a moderate increase in the price of old oil, freezes the price of new oil, and makes adjustments in the definition of new oil to insure that the Federal Energy Administration is not forced to set prices for old oil.

Old oil. My bill authorizes an immediate increase in price to $7.50 per barrel. Thereafter, the price would increase as the economy improves. For each 1-per-cent decline in unemployment, old oil prices will increase by 30 cents until a ceiling price of $9 per barrel is reached. Further increases above $9 will be permitted based on increases in a special cost of living index measuring increases in the cost of material used in the extraction, refining, and production of domestic oil.

New oil. Prices will be frozen at $12.75 per barrel, plus periodic cost of living increases as discussed above.

Definition of new oil. New oil would be defined as any oil produced from a new well, whether in an existing field or in a new field, except that if the oil comes from an existing field and from the same horizon as existing old oil, there would be a rebuttable presumption that it is old oil; and as any oil from properties unitized for the purposes of price main-
tenance, on which secondary or tertiary recovery processes are used.

An increase in the cost of old oil is justified by the importance of increasing our domestic supply of oil and by the steep increases in the costs of drilling which have occurred during the last 2 years. To refuse to provide any increase in old oil prices is to ignore reality.

The cost of drilling a well has increased three to four times over the one year before the embargo, yet the average price of old oil has been frozen at an artificially low price for nearly 2 years. It is appropriate, therefore, that we provide an immediate increase of $2 in the old oil price to reflect 2 years of inflation. Moreover, it is the proceeds from producing wells which provide the capital needed to explore and bring new wells into production. By providing additional revenues for the oil companies, we are providing an economic incentive for increased domestic production.

A $1.50 increase in the price of old oil would immediately increase the oil production of old oil. In this sense it is a compromise. In the sense that it is a moderate increase which will induce additional production, it is a workable compromise. The price freeze on new oil is essentially a freeze on our national oil supplies. There is no justification for allowing the basic price of new oil to rise above $12.75 per barrel. To do so is to tie American prices to the whims of OPEC.

The fear of $16 per barrel oil is well founded. It is expected that OPEC will increase its basic oil prices by another $2 this September, and the President has threatened to impose an additional $1 per barrel tariff on imported oil. Thus, we are looking at a price of $16 per barrel for imported oil. At the very least, $3 of that price is completely artificial and can be accounted for by the free market terms. Yet due to our need of OPEC's oil and our importing of that oil we must pay the $16 per barrel price. Without this price freeze domestically produced oil would naturally rise to meet the ceiling of $16. Figure. However, with this price freeze we can assure the Nation that any increase in the price of OPEC's oil will not be followed by an increase in the domestically produced new oil. Through this price freeze we can reduce OPEC's influence and once again direct our own economic destiny.

It is clear that some type of control is necessary. Our past experience with the 1973 oil embargo, reports from the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and testimony from people from the Brooking Institution and other institutions all clearly show that total decontrol would have disastrous effects. The importation of new and old oil can avoid many of the dangers of total decontrol while at the same time increasing domestic production and limiting OPEC's ability to affect our economy.

The principal reason I am introducing this bill is that I feel that the bill I am presenting today is the long sought at compromise on the troublesome problem of oil prices. It is not the President's total decontrol plan. It is not an incremental approach, the OPEC priority, price stability or rollback plan. It is rather a workable compromise. It is one which will prevent further economic disruptions caused by OPEC on the price of new oil and on the economy in general. It is one which will increase our domestic production of oil. It is not everything that everyone wanted but it does accomplish the basic needs of the country.

By Mr. FONG (by request):

S. 2186. A bill to ban the importation, manufacture, sale, and transfer of certain firearms and ammunition, to provide for the effective enforcement of the Gun Control Act of 1968, to ban possession, shipment, transportation, and receipt of all firearms by felons, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, at the request of the administration, I am today introducing a bill "to ban the importation, manufacture, sale, and transfer of firearms and ammunition, to provide for the effective enforcement of the Gun Control Act of 1968, to ban possession, shipment, transportation, and receipt of all firearms by felons, and for other purposes." The question of Federal control of guns and especially the so-called Saturday night specials has been an issue of much debate and emotional reaction throughout the United States.

Saturday night specials, as my colleagues well know, are cheap, low-quality, easily concealed handguns. These Saturday night specials have no legitimate sporting use or any valid defense purposes.

This type of shoddy gun is of no value to sportsmen. Sportsmen use rifles, shotguns, and well-constructed handguns, but not of Saturday night specials.

No one, and I specifically include myself in that group, wants to prevent sportsmen from pursuing their hobbies. Moreover, as my colleagues and I pointed out in his crime message to Congress on June 10 of this year:

Since 1960, although billions of dollars have been spent on law enforcement programs the crime rate has more than doubled.

More significantly, the number of crimes involving threats of violence or actual violence has increased. And the number of violent crimes in which the perpetrator and the victim are related has increased. A recent study indicates that approximately 85 percent of all violent crimes are committed against strangers.

The personal and social toll that crime exacts from our citizens is enormous. In addition to the direct damage to victims of crime,
violent crimes in our streets and in our homes make fear pervasive.

Something must be done to control the weapons and especially the cheap handguns used to perpetrate these violent crimes.

I have, as far back as 1968, voted for a finding that destructive devices—such as bazookas and mortars—machineguns and short-barreled guns and rifles were violent crimes in our streets.

Purchase or receipt of more than two guns within a 30-day period is prohibited, unless with the prior approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. This is good as it would prevent multiple sales to persons who then redistribute the handguns unreported to the FBI.

Additionally, the Secretary of the Treasury is given additional authority to deny a license unless he finds the person meets the age and criminal record requirements and had premises from which he conducts or intends to conduct the business and that the applicant is not prohibited by State or local law from conducting the business. If the license would apply and that he is likely to conduct the business in conformity with applicable law. The Secretary would have 90 days instead of 45 days to act on this application. This is a good tightening up provision.

Prosecution for commission of a felony where a firearm was carried or used could be had in a court of the United States, and a penalty of 1 to 10 years for a first offense and 2 to 25 years for subsequent offenses to run consecutively after the term of imprisonment for other offenses is also provided. Strict enforcement of such legislation hopefully would deter criminal action and if not, it would certainly protect society by removing the criminal from society for a longer and more certain term, since a suspended or probationary sentence is prohibited.

So, as my colleagues can see just from the points outlined, the Administration bill is indeed a step in the right direction to making America a safer place in which to live.

At the request of the Administration, I am today introducing a bill. Section 201 of the Criminal Justice Reform Act of 1975. This amendment would strengthen the penalties for criminal convictions involving the use of firearms.

Every effort must be made to discourage the use of firearms by criminals.

Severe additional penalties in our Criminal Justice Reform Act where firearms are used would, in my opinion, hopefully deter the use of such firearms.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, the section-by-section analysis thereof and the amendment to S. 1 be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill and the amendment to S. 1 be printed in the Record, as follows:

SEC. 201. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds and declares:

(a) that the low-quality, and easily concealable handguns, which are commonly known as "Saturday Night Specials," have been used in violent crimes throughout the Nation; and to the integrity of State and local firearms control laws;
(a) by deleting "forty-five" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "ninety"; and

(b) by amending subsections (d) and (e) to read as follows:

(1) The Secretary may revoke a license or permit issued under section 5, if the person holding the license or permit is ineligible to acquire explosive materials under section 5.

(2) The Secretary may revoke a license or permit issued under section 5, if the person holding the license or permit is engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(3) The term "gunsmith" means any person who is not otherwise a dealer who is engaged in the business of repairing or making or fitting special barrels, stocks, or trigger mechanisms to firearms.

(4) The term "ammunition retailer" means any person who is not otherwise a dealer who is engaged in the business of selling or transferring ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(5) The term "ammunition dealer" means any person who is not otherwise a dealer who is engaged in the business of selling or transferring ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(6) The term "ammunition manufacturer" means any person who is not otherwise a dealer who is engaged in the business of selling or transferring ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(7) The term "ammunition importer" means any person who is not otherwise a dealer who is engaged in the business of selling or transferring ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(8) The term "ammunition wholesaler" means any person who is not otherwise a dealer who is engaged in the business of selling or transferring ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(9) The term "ammunition retailer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(10) The term "ammunition manufacturer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(11) The term "ammunition importer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(12) The term "ammunition wholesaler" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(13) The term "ammunition retailer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(14) The term "ammunition importer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(15) The term "ammunition manufacturer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(16) The term "ammunition wholesaler" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(17) The term "ammunition retailer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(18) The term "ammunition importer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(19) The term "ammunition manufacturer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(20) The term "ammunition wholesaler" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(21) The term "ammunition retailer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(22) The term "ammunition importer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(23) The term "ammunition manufacturer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(24) The term "ammunition wholesaler" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(25) The term "ammunition retailer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(26) The term "ammunition importer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(27) The term "ammunition manufacturer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(28) The term "ammunition wholesaler" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(29) The term "ammunition retailer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(30) The term "ammunition importer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(31) The term "ammunition manufacturer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(32) The term "ammunition wholesaler" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(33) The term "ammunition retailer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(34) The term "ammunition importer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(35) The term "ammunition manufacturer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(36) The term "ammunition wholesaler" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(37) The term "ammunition retailer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(38) The term "ammunition importer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(39) The term "ammunition manufacturer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(40) The term "ammunition wholesaler" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(41) The term "ammunition retailer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(42) The term "ammunition importer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(43) The term "ammunition manufacturer" means any person who is not otherwise engaged in the business of selling or transferring firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.
transferee would be a violation of a State law, or any regulation or enforceable part of the records required to be kept by the transferee's residence or the place where the handgun will be kept; and
(5) the transferor has delayed delivery of the handgun for a period of thirty days or less, unless the transferee has provided the Secretary with a copy of the sworn statement and reports do not indicate that the transferee has delayed delivery of the handgun for a period of thirty days or less, unless the person has obtained prior approval of the purchase from the Secretary pursuant to regulations promulgated by the Secretary. It shall be unlawful for any person, other than a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector to ship or transport any firearm or ammunition to which the license is applied within thirty days or less from a person or persons other than a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector from or from such a licensee and from a person or persons who are not such licensees, unless the person has obtained prior approval of the purchase from the Secretary pursuant to regulations promulgated by the Secretary. It shall be unlawful for any person, other than a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector, to ship or transport any firearm or ammunition to which the license is applied within thirty days or less from a person or persons other than a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector unless the person notifies the Secretary of such purchase or receipt within thirty days after the purchase or receipt.

(a) by deleting subsection (a) (2) (A); (b) by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) It shall be unlawful for any person, other than a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector, to ship or transport any firearm or ammunition to which the license is applied within thirty days or less from a person or persons other than a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector unless the person notifies the Secretary of such purchase or receipt within thirty days after the purchase or receipt.

(b) by amending subsection (c) (2) (A) to read as follows:

"(A) The Secretary may, after notice and opportunity for hearing, suspend or revoke any license issued under this section, or may subject the licensee to a civil penalty of up to $10,000 per violation, if the holder of such license has violated any provision of this chapter or any rule or regulation prescribed by the Secretary under this chapter. The Secretary may at any time, for cause shown, and on written notice, suspend or revoke any license issued under this section, or may subject the licensee to a civil penalty of up to $10,000 per violation, if the holder of such license has violated any provision of this chapter or any rule or regulation prescribed by the Secretary under this chapter. The Secretary may at any time, for cause shown, and on written notice, suspend or revoke any license issued under this section, or may subject the licensee to a civil penalty of up to $10,000 per violation, if the holder of such license has violated any provision of this chapter or any rule or regulation prescribed by the Secretary under this chapter.

(c) by amending subsection (c) (2) (B) to read as follows:

"(B) The Secretary may, after notice and opportunity for hearing, suspend or revoke any license issued under this section, or may subject the licensee to a civil penalty of up to $10,000 per violation, if the holder of such license has violated any provision of this chapter or any rule or regulation prescribed by the Secretary under this chapter. The Secretary may at any time, for cause shown, and on written notice, suspend or revoke any license issued under this section, or may subject the licensee to a civil penalty of up to $10,000 per violation, if the holder of such license has violated any provision of this chapter or any rule or regulation prescribed by the Secretary under this chapter. The Secretary may at any time, for cause shown, and on written notice, suspend or revoke any license issued under this section, or may subject the licensee to a civil penalty of up to $10,000 per violation, if the holder of such license has violated any provision of this chapter or any rule or regulation prescribed by the Secretary under this chapter.

(d) by amending subsection (c) (2) (C) to read as follows:

"(C) The Secretary may, after notice and opportunity for hearing, suspend or revoke any license issued under this section, or may subject the licensee to a civil penalty of up to $10,000 per violation, if the holder of such license has violated any provision of this chapter or any rule or regulation prescribed by the Secretary under this chapter. The Secretary may at any time, for cause shown, and on written notice, suspend or revoke any license issued under this section, or may subject the licensee to a civil penalty of up to $10,000 per violation, if the holder of such license has violated any provision of this chapter or any rule or regulation prescribed by the Secretary under this chapter. The Secretary may at any time, for cause shown, and on written notice, suspend or revoke any license issued under this section, or may subject the licensee to a civil penalty of up to $10,000 per violation, if the holder of such license has violated any provision of this chapter or any rule or regulation prescribed by the Secretary under this chapter.

(e) by amending subsection (c) (2) (D) to read as follows:

"(D) The Secretary may, after notice and opportunity for hearing, suspend or revoke any license issued under this section, or may subject the licensee to a civil penalty of up to $10,000 per violation, if the holder of such license has violated any provision of this chapter or any rule or regulation prescribed by the Secretary under this chapter. The Secretary may at any time, for cause shown, and on written notice, suspend or revoke any license issued under this section, or may subject the licensee to a civil penalty of up to $10,000 per violation, if the holder of such license has violated any provision of this chapter or any rule or regulation prescribed by the Secretary under this chapter. The Secretary may at any time, for cause shown, and on written notice, suspend or revoke any license issued under this section, or may subject the licensee to a civil penalty of up to $10,000 per violation, if the holder of such license has violated any provision of this chapter or any rule or regulation prescribed by the Secretary under this chapter. The Secretary may at any time, for cause shown, and on written notice, suspend or revoke any license issued under this section, or may subject the licensee to a civil penalty of up to $10,000 per violation, if the holder of such license has violated any provision of this chapter or any rule or regulation prescribed by the Secretary under this chapter.
his decision to the aggrieved party. The aggrieved party may at any time within 60 days after the date notice was given under this paragraph, petition the United States district court for the district in which he resides or has his principal place of business for a review of the decision, and request a de novo hearing after a review of the record. In a proceeding conducted under this subsection, the court may consider any evidence submitted by the parties to the proceeding. If the court decides that the Secretary was not authorized to impose the proposed suspension, or revoke the license or to assess the civil penalty, the court shall order the Secretary to take such action as may be necessary to comply with the judgment of the court.

(i) By adding the following new subsections after subsection (j):

"(k) The Secretary shall approve for manufacture, assembly, importation, sale, or transfer any handgun model if he has caused to be evaluated and tested representative samples of the handgun model and has found that such handgun model is particularly suitable for sporting or valid defensive purposes and that:

"(1) In the case of a pistol, the handgun model:

"(A) has a positive manually operated safety device; and

"(B) has a combined length and height of not less than 9 inches (measured from the top of the weapon, excluding sights, at a right-angle measurement to the plane of the top and bottom of the frame, excluding magazine extensions or releases) being at least 4 inches and the length (measured from the front sight to the rear of the barrel, at the barrel to the bottom of the part of the weapon that is furthest to the rear of the weapon) being at least 6 inches; and

"(C) attains a total of at least 80 points under the following criteria:

"(i) Overall length: one point for each one-fourth inch over 6 inches;

"(ii) Frame Construction: (a) 25 points if investment cast steel or forged steel, (b) 20 points if investment cast, high tensile strength alloy or forged high tensile strength alloy;

"(iii) Weight: one point for each ounce, with the revolver unloaded and the magazine in place;

"(iv) Caliber: (a) zero points if the revolver has a double action firing mechanism, (b) 3 points if the revolver accepts a .22 caliber ammunition, (b) three points of the revolver accepts either .22 caliber long rifle ammunition or ammunition within the range delimited by 7.65 millimeter and .380 caliber automatic, (c) 10 points if the revolver accepts 9 millimeter parabellum ammunition or ammunition equivalent or greater projectile size or power;

"(v) Safety features: (a) five points if the pistol has a locked breech mechanism, (b) five points if the pistol has a loaded chamber indicator, (c) five points if the pistol has a cocked position indicator, (d) five points if the pistol has a grip safety, (e) five points if the pistol has a magazine safety, (f) 10 points if the pistol has a firing pin block device;

"(vi) Other features: (a) one point if the pistol has a contoured magazine extension, (b) three points if the pistol has a double action firing mechanism, (c) five points if the pistol has a adjustable windage and elevation sight, (d) five points if the pistol has an adjustable windage and elevation sight, (e) 10 points if the pistol has a hammer safety or trigger guard;

"(vii) Miscellaneous equipment: (a) three points if the revolver has a drift adjustable sight, (b) 10 points if the pistol has a double action firing mechanism, (c) five points if the pistol has a spinal woundage and elevation sight, (d) five points if the pistol has a magazine safety, (e) 10 points if the pistol has a double action firing mechanism, (f) two points if the revolver has a target trigger, (g) two points if the revolver has a target trigger, (h) two points if the revolver has a target trigger, (i) two points if the revolver has a target trigger, (j) two points if the revolver has a target trigger, (k) two points if the revolver has a target trigger, (l) two points if the revolver has a target trigger, (m) two points if the revolver has a target trigger, (n) two points if the revolver has a target trigger, (o) two points if the revolver has a target trigger, (p) two points if the revolver has a target trigger, (q) two points if the revolver has a target trigger, (r) two points if the revolver has a target trigger, (s) two points if the revolver has a target trigger, (t) two points if the revolver has a target trigger, (u) two points if the revolver has a target trigger, (v) two points if the revolver has a target trigger, (w) two points if the revolver has a target trigger, (x) two points if the revolver has a target trigger, (y) two points if the revolver has a target trigger, (z) two points if the revolver has a target trigger.

(ii) Frame Construction: (a) 25 points if investment cast steel or forged steel, (b) 20 points if investment cast, high tensile strength alloy or forged high tensile strength alloy;

"(iii) Weight: one point for each ounce, with the revolver unloaded;

"(iv) Caliber: (a) zero points if the revolver has a double action firing mechanism, (b) 3 points if the revolver accepts a .22 caliber ammunition, (b) three points if the revolver accepts either .22 caliber long rifle ammunition or ammunition within the range delimited by 7.65 millimeter and .380 caliber automatic, (c) 10 points if the revolver accepts 9 millimeter parabellum ammunition or ammunition equivalent or greater projectile size or power;

"(vi) Safety features: (a) five points if the revolver has a locked breech mechanism, (b) five points if the pistol has a loaded chamber indicator, (c) five points if the pistol has a cocked position indicator, (d) five points if the pistol has a grip safety, (e) five points if the pistol has a magazine safety, (f) 10 points if the pistol has a firing pin block device;

"(vii) Miscellaneous equipment: (a) three points if the revolver has a drift adjustable sight, (b) 10 points if the pistol has a double action firing mechanism, (c) five points if the pistol has an adjustable windage and elevation sight, (d) five points if the pistol has an adjustable windage and elevation sight, (e) 10 points if the pistol has a hammer safety or trigger guard;

"(ix) Weight: one point for each ounce, with the revolver unloaded;

"(xi) Caliber: (a) zero points if the revolver has a double action firing mechanism, (b) 3 points if the revolver accepts a .22 caliber ammunition, (b) three points of the revolver accepts either .22 caliber long rifle ammunition or ammunition within the range delimited by 7.65 millimeter and .380 caliber automatic, (c) 10 points if the pistol accepts 9 millimeter parabellum ammunition or ammunition equivalent or greater projectile size or power;

"(x) Safety features: (a) five points if the pistol has a locked breech mechanism, (b) five points if the pistol has a loaded chamber indicator, (c) five points if the pistol has a cocked position indicator, (d) five points if the pistol has a grip safety, (e) five points if the pistol has a magazine safety, (f) 10 points if the pistol has a firing pin block device;

"(vi) Other features: (a) one point if the pistol has a contoured magazine extension, (b) three points if the pistol has a double action firing mechanism, (c) five points if the pistol has a adjustable windage and elevation sight, (d) five points if the pistol has a spinal woundage and elevation sight, (e) five points if the pistol has an adjustable windage and elevation sight, (f) 10 points if the pistol has a hammer safety or trigger guard;

"(vii) Miscellaneous equipment: (a) three points if the revolver has a drift adjustable sight, (b) 10 points if the pistol has a double action firing mechanism, (c) five points if the pistol has an adjustable windage and elevation sight, (d) five points if the pistol has a spinal woundage and elevation sight, (e) 10 points if the pistol has a hammer safety or trigger guard;
words, other than a handgun of a model which has not been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 923 (k) (1); and
(b) by adding, after the words "of any firearm," the words "other than a handgun of a model which has not been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 923 (k) (1); and
(c) by adding, after the words "of any firearm," the words "other than a handgun of a model which has not been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 923 (k) of this chapter;"

(d) by designating existing subsection ("c") as subsection ("c") (1) and adding a new paragraph to subsection (c) as follows:

The draft bill would accomplish several major objectives. First, it would ban the importation, manufacture, assembly, sale, or transfer, for profit, of imported firearms or making or fitting special barrels, stocks, or trigger mechanisms to firearms; (1) those engaged in business as "ammunition retailers," defined in proposed section 921 (a) (12) as persons who are not otherwise dealers; (2) those engaged in the business of selling ammunition, other than ammunition for destructive devices, at retail; the draft bill would not ban the importation, manufacture, assembly, sale, or transfer, for profit, of imported firearms or making or fitting special barrels, stocks, or trigger mechanisms to firearms; (2) those engaged in business as "gunsmiths," defined in proposed section 921 (a) (13) as persons who are not otherwise dealers who are not in the business of selling firearms or making or fitting special barrels, stocks, or trigger mechanisms to firearms; the draft bill would ban the importation, manufacture, assembly, sale, or transfer, for profit, of imported firearms or making or fitting special barrels, stocks, or trigger mechanisms to firearms; (3) those engaged in business as "firearms dealers," defined in proposed section 921 (a) (14) as persons engaged in the business of selling firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail; (3) those engaged in business as "firearms dealers," defined in proposed section 921 (a) (14) as persons engaged in the business of selling firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail; (4) those who are pawnbrokers. Section 5 (b) would redesignate existing paragraphs (12) through (30) of 18 U.S.C. 921 (a) as paragraphs (19) through (27) to accommodate the new paragraphs added by sections 5 (c) and (d) of the draft bill.

In addition to adding to section 921 (a) the definitions of "ammunition retailers," "gunsmiths," and "firearms dealer" discussed in connection with the proposed amendment to section 921 (a) (1), the draft bill would make similar changes in the section relating to the definition of "firearm." The term "handgun," defined in proposed section 921 (a) (17) of title 18 as a "particular design and specification of a handgun."

The term "pistol" is defined in proposed section 921 (a) (17) of title 18 as a "handgun having a chamber or chambers as an integral part or parts of, or permanently aligned with, the bore or bores."

Proposed section 921 (a) (18) defines a "re­volver" as a handgun with a breechloading chambered cylinder designed so that the trigger rotates the cylinder to bring the next cartridge in line with the barrel for firing. Section 6 of the draft bill would amend section 922 (d) of title 18 to establish various firearms offenses, in several respects.
Section 922(a) (2) (A) of title 18 presently provides as exceptions to the bar against lice-
nees' shipment or transportation in interstate commerce of firearms and ammunition, the return of a firearm or re-
placement firearm to a person from whom it was mailed by the indi-
vidual of a firearm to a licensee for re-
pair or customizing. Sections 6(a) and (b) of the draft bill would make the exceptions inapplicable to the easily concealable weapons whose manufacture, assembly, sale and trans-
portation under proposed section 922(d) (1) of title 18. However, sec-
tion 18(a) of the draft bill would permit the return of a firearm to a licensee who had re-
cived the gun prior to the effective date of the Act.
Under existing U.S.C. 922(a) (5), the transfer of a firearm to a person other than a licensee who the transferor knows or has rea-
son to believe lives in another State is made unlawful, except in the case of cer-
tain interstate succession or in the case of loan or rental of a firearm to a person for temporary use for lawful sporting purposes. Section 6(c) of the draft bill would change the refer-
ces to persons living in another State to persons residing outside the State. Under section 922(d) of title 18.
Section 922(c) of title 18, relating to sale of firearms to persons who do not appear at the licensee's place of business would be amended by section 6(f) of the bill to apply to firearms other than handguns. Under pro-
posed section 922(g), it would be unlawful to sell a handgun to a person who did not appear at the licensee's business premises for purposes of clearly establishing his identity.
Section 6(g) of the bill would conform the sworn statement required to be sub-
mittied by a mail-order purchaser under section 922(e) with the amendment making the provi-
sion inapplicable to handguns.
Section 6(h) of the bill would repeal sub-
sections (d) and (h) of section 922(f), substan-
tially as amended by proposed sub-
sections (h), (1), and (j).
Section 6(i) of the draft bill redesignates ex-
sting subsection (f) as subsections (m) and (n), respectively, and redesign-
ates subsections (1) through (m) as sub-
sections (1) through (1) respectively in order to permit the addition of proposed sub-
sections (d) through (1). The subsection would also redesignate subsection (g) as subsection (h).
Section 6(j) of the draft bill would add several new subsections to section 922 of title 18.
Proposed section 922(d) (1) would make it unlawful for any licensed manufacturer, licensed importer, licensed dealer, or the collector to manufacture, assemble, sell, or transfer a handgun, other than a curio or relic, unless the hand-
gun model had been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to proposed section 922(k) of title 18. It is necessary to assert that the handgun is a "straw man" in a situation in which a person has merely intended to resell the handgun to a person barred from receiving or transfer of handguns by preventing resale or transfer of handguns to a "straw man" in a situation in which a purchaser of handgun is in a location where he has no permission to receive a handgun. The transferor would have to take certain specified steps to as-
sure that purchase and possession of the handgun would be in accordance with Fed-
eral law and with State law and published ordinances at the place of transfer. The transferee, therefore, would not be barred from receiving or possessing the handgun, even though the transferee was barred by Federal, State, or local law from receiving or possessing the handgun. The reports from the law enforcement officers within fourteen days of the date he for-
warded the sworn statement to the law enforce-
mint officer, he may transfer the handgun.
It is necessary to send the sworn state-
mint to the law enforcement officer of the trans-
feror's place of residence and that the law enforce-
mint officer of the place where the handgun would be kept.
Proposed section 922(g) sets forth the re-
quirements which must be met by a licensee or person to whom proposed section 922(g) would apply. The sale or trans-
feror of possession of a handgun. It is not intended that a person be barred from

purchase of a handgun if he is permitted, for example, to possess a handgun at the place where he intends to keep the gun but not at his place of residence, the transferor could not deliver the handgun. Of course, if Federal law barred possession of a handgun outright, no transfer would be permitted.

Proposed sections 923(h), (i), and (j) of title 18 carry forward provisions of present subsections (d), (g), and (h) of section 922, and of section VII of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (18 U.S.C. App. 1202-1203), which describes the persons who are not entitled to possess handguns under Federal law.

Existing sections 922 (g) and (h) of title 18 bar shipment, transportation, and receipt of firearms and ammunition in interstate or foreign commerce by the listed categories of persons. Existing 18 U.S.C. App. 1202 lists the persons barred from receiving, possessing, or transporting “in commerce or affecting commerce.” Existing section 922(d) bars licensees from sale of firearms and ammunition to aliens and categories of persons the language of which bars certain persons from shipping or transporting firearms or ammunition in interstate or foreign commerce. Sections 6 (k), (l), (m), and (n) of the draft bill would amend existing sections 922(g) and (h) of title 18. Proposed sections 922(h) and (i) would update the cross-references to the Controlled Substances Act.

Section 6 (n) would redefine the language of the section relating to gross incapacity and commitment proceedings, consistent with the language now used in 18 U.S.C. App. 1202(a).

Section 6 (n) would add to the end of the list of persons prohibited from shipping or transporting firearms or ammunition the category of aliens who are illegally or unlawfully in the United States. That category is barred under existing law from receiving, possessing, or transporting “in commerce or affecting commerce” any firearm under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. App. 1202(a), which is repealed by section 11 of the draft bill.

The reference in existing subsection (g) to “interstate or foreign commerce” has not been carried forward to proposed subsection 922(h), nor has the phrase “in commerce or affecting commerce” presently contained in 18 U.S.C. App. 1202. In United States v. Buss, 434 U.S. 335 (1971), the Supreme Court found the language “in commerce or affecting commerce” in existing 18 U.S.C. App. 1202(a) to be ambiguous on the question whether it was necessary to prove in an individual case concerning illegal possession or receipt of a firearm that the possession or receipt was “in commerce or affecting commerce.” In resolving this ambiguity, the Court narrowly construed the provision so that, for example, possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, without specific intent that the firearm be “in commerce or affecting commerce” was insufficient for conviction. Under the amendment to section 922(h), the language “in commerce or affecting commerce” was substituted in order to eliminate the ambiguity cited by the Supreme Court in favor of the ability to prosecute without having to prove a connection with interstate commerce. Consistent with eliminating proof of the connection to commerce of illegal possession or receipt, transportation, or possession, the reference to “interstate and foreign commerce” has also been eliminated.

The coverage in existing sections 922(g) and (h) concerning receipt, possession, transportation, or sale of firearms or ammunition would also be carried forward to proposed section 922(h).

The offense described in subsection (h) would be a 5-year felony, consistent with the penalty for violation of existing sections 922(g) and (h) of the 2-year penalty under 18 U.S.C. App. 1203(a).

The section 2(e) of the draft bill, there is a congressional finding that receipt or possession of firearms or ammunition by persons barred from the receipt, purchase, or receipt of such firearm or possession constitutes a burden on commerce within and among the States and is a threat to the national security.

Proposed section 922(g) carries forward the provisions of existing 18 U.S.C. App. 1203(b) barring persons employed by a person, firm, or corporation other than the employer if they were secreting, or transporting a firearm in the course of employment if he knows or has reason to believe the employer is in one of the groups barred from receiving, transporting, or possessing a firearm. The provisions would also apply to ammunition, consistent with proposed subsection (h) and existing sections 922(g) and (h). Under section 924(a) of the present Act, which is amended by section 6(b) of the bill, the fine of $2,000 in the misdemeanor subject to up to one year’s imprisonment and a $1,000 fine, rather than a 2-year felony provided for under 18 U.S.C. App. 1202.

Proposed section 922(i), relating to bars against sales of firearms or ammunition by persons barred from receipt, transportation, and possessing, shipping, transporting, and receiving any firearm or ammunition under proposed subsections (g) and (h), would carry forward the provisions of existing section 922(d), amended to cover offenses by any person rather than limiting the provision to licensees.

Proposed section 922(k) would bar the shipment or transportation of firearms or ammunition in commerce or affecting commerce if the shipment or transportation was in violation of a State law in a place to which or through which the firearms or ammunition was shipped or of a published ordinance applicable at the place of sale, delivery, or other disposition.

Proposed section 921(f) (1) would bar the sale by licensees of two or more handguns to a single person in a period of thirty days or less, and proposed section 921(f) (2) would bar the purchase by a person of two or more handguns in a period of thirty days or less. The provisions would apply to firearms and ammunition was shipped or of a published ordinance applicable at the place of sale, delivery, or other disposition.

Proposed section 921(f) (1) would bar the sale by licensees of two or more handguns to a single person in a period of thirty days or less, and proposed section 921(f) (2) would bar the purchase by a person of two or more handguns in a period of thirty days or less. The provisions would apply to firearms and ammunition was shipped or of a published ordinance applicable at the place of sale, delivery, or other disposition.

Proposed section 922(m) carries forward the license fee for firearms other than destructive devices and handguns, or of firearms including handguns but not including destructive devices, from $50 to $250 per year. The license fee for manufacturers of firearms including handguns, but not including destructive devices, would be $500 per year. The license fee for manufacturers of ammunition for firearms other than ammunition for destructive devices would be raised from $10 to $250 per year.

Section 7(c) of the draft bill would raise the license fee for importers of firearms other than destructive devices and handguns and importers of ammunition for firearms other than ammunition for destructive devices from $50 to $250 per year. The license fee for manufacturers of firearms including handguns, but not including destructive devices, would be $500 per year. The license fee for manufacturers of ammunition for firearms other than ammunition for destructive devices would be raised from $10 to $250 per year.

The present fee is $10 for all dealers other than those who deal in destructive devices. A dealer in firearms including handguns but not destructive devices would pay a fee of $200 per year. Gunsmiths, as defined in proposed section 922(a) (13), would pay an annual fee of $50 per year. An ammunition retailer, as defined in proposed section 922(a) (12), would pay a license fee of $25 per year. The fee for gunsmiths is kept low because they are generally craftsmen not doing a substantial business and not conducting any retail business. The fee for ammunition retailers is kept low because they are usually not retail dealers and generally a small store which keeps ammunition in hand for the convenience of its customers.

Sections 7(e), (f), and (g) of the draft bill contain amendments to the existing provisions of section 922(d) of title 18.

Under existing law, the Secretary of the Treasury has no authority to deny a license to a person if he meets the age and criminal record requirements and has premises from which he conducts the licensed business or from which he intends to conduct business. Section 7(e) would amend section 922(d) (1) to provide that the determination whether the Secretary will issue a license is based on a finding of the existence of the factors. Under section 8(6), section 922(d) (1) (B) would be amended to provide that the Secretary would make findings in two additional areas before he could issue a license: first, the person has to find under section 922(d) (1) (B) (ii) that the applicant is not prohibited by State law or a relevant ordinance of his place of business from conducting the business or that the business would apply; and, second, that the applicant is, by reason of his business experience, financial standing, or trade connections, likely to commence the business in conformity with federal, state, and rele-
vant local law applicable at his place of business.

The word "relevant" has been used in describing local laws which would be of concern to the Secretary in determining whether to license an individual in order to ensure compliance with state or local firearms laws but also of such matters as laws prohibiting the conduct of business at the place of business where the application is submitted. A similar argument could be made if it is believed that compliance with such details of conducting business is a matter of local law or regulation.

Section 7(g) would amend section 923(d)(2) to increase the length of time in which the Secretary of the Treasury must act on a license application from 45 to 90 days. The extension of the time limit is necessary to give the Secretary sufficient time to check the background record of the applicant in order to assure himself of the legality of the license and to ascertain whether the applicant is a bona fide businessman.

Section 7(h) of the draft bill would amend sections 923(e) and (f), relating to denial or revocation of licenses, and administrative and judicial review procedures to include administrative and court review of suspension of licenses and assessments of civil penalties.

Section 7(i) of the draft bill would add several new subsections to section 923 of title 18. Proposed section 923(k) would require the Secretary of the Treasury to approve for importation, manufacture, assembly, sale or transfer a handgun model which he had tested and evaluated and which met specified criteria. To be approved, a handgun would have to be particularly suitable for sporting or valid defensive purposes. In addition, a pistol, as defined in proposed section 923(k), would have to meet the minimum requirements of the Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers' Institute, and be manufactured in accordance with the National Firearms Act, to bar licensing of a firearm or of violating the chapter or the National Firearms Act of 1968.

As to handguns not in production since 1968, the Secretary, if he has approved test old handgun models according to their relative availability and that he will publish in the United States, a list of approved handgun models within sixty days after the date of enactment; since many of these weapons have already been tested in conjunction with the import restrictions contained in the Gun Control Act of 1968.

To transfer a handgun model which he had tested a handguns with a barrel length of at least 4 inches, certain safety features, and a total of 60 points under a set of criteria relating to, among other things, barrel length, construction, frame, construction, weight, caliber, and safety features. The subsection would require that a handgun had a barrel length of at least 4 1/2 inches (measured from the end of the frame nearest the muzzle, parallel to the line of the bore, to include a combination of parts from which a handgun can be assembled, the provision would also ban the importation of parts of such handguns for assembly in the United States.

Section 926 of title 18 is amended by section 9(b) giving officers and employees designated by the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the provisions of chapter 44 of
title 18 the authority to administer oaths and affirmations.

Section 17 would repeal title VII of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act (18 U.S.C. App. 1201-1263) which would be covered by proposed sections 223 (b) and (1) of title 18.

Section 12 would amend section 1715 of title 18, to ban mailing of any handgun not approved by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to regulations by the Secretary of the Treasury to ban mailing of any handgun not approved by the individual. The Postal Service would issue regulations, subject to concurrence in the regulations by the Secretary of the Treasury, concerning such handguns and government in the United States or an entity thereof. It is intended that there be no transfer at a Saturday Night Special to individuals except when they receive guns in their capacity as Government employees, and that, even in that case, transfer be made by the government entity to the individual rather than by a licensee. It is also intended that these firearms not enter the flow of commerce at anytime. It be returned to the government entity by which they were issued if they are no longer needed by the employee's governmental function.

Section 13 of the draft bill provides that the effective date of the bill would be 90 days after the date of enactment, except that under section 13 (b), the provisions concerning approval of handgun models would be enacted on the effective date of enactment. In order to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to begin testing. Under section 13 (a), a dealer would be permitted to return to the owner an approved handgun model, even if the handgun model approved by the Secretary of the Treasury would have to be published in the first sixty days after enactment.

AMENDMENT No. 280
On page 1, line 1, insert the following:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO S. 1

On page 26, add the following after the material following line 1:

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED FOR PRINTING

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM ACT OF 1975—S. 1

If a defendant is convicted of an offense described in 18 U.S.C. 2307 (a), the court, prior to imposing sentence, shall hold a hearing to determine whether a term of imprisonment and parole ineligibility is mandatory under 18 U.S.C. 2307 (a). That the hearing shall be held before the court sitting without a jury, and the defendant and the government shall have the right to present evidence, including information submitted during the trial, during the sentencing hearing, and in so much of the pre-trial report as the court relies on, that the defendant is subject to a mandatory term of imprisonment and parole ineligibility, the court shall sentence the defendant in accordance with the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2301 (e) and 2307 (a). The court shall place in the record its findings, including an identification of the information relied upon in making its findings.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

S. 1359
At the request of Mr. Muskie, the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Clark) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1359, a bill to coordinate State and local government efforts to establish economic recovery by establishing a system of emergency support grants to State and local governments.

S. 1878
At the request of Mr. Tower, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McClellan) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1878, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, by defining navigable waters.

S. 1965
At the request of Mr. Montoya, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Brooke) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1965, a bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the bicentennial of the U.S. Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

S. 2104
A a request of Mr. Tower, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Morgan) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2104, a bill to establish a National Commission on Small Business in America.

AMENDMENT NO. 820

(Signed to be ordered and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

Mr. PONG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1) to codify, revise, and reform title 16 of the United States Code; to make appropriate amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure; to make conforming amendments to criminal provisions of other titiles of the United States Code; and for other purposes.
PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1975—S. 1587

AMENDMENT NO. 821

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, the amendment I am submitting today is designed in such a way that funds authorized under this bill, which aims to help reduce unemployment, are sent to areas of highest unemployment where the need is greatest.

As reported, the bill has two principal sections. The first authorizes $1 billion for Title I public works. The second authorizes an additional $1 billion for the Title X job training program.

The public works section of the bill has a formula which stipulates that 70 percent of the available funds must go to areas whose unemployment rate exceeds the national average.

The title X section has no such stipulation. Funds are available to any area whose unemployment rate is over 6.5 percent, and that will not put the funds where they are needed most.

My amendment simply takes the committee's 70-percent language from Title I and applies it also to Title X.

By amendment, the Senate can, by directing aid to those areas with the greatest need, further the stated aim of the bill, "To amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to increase the antirecessionary effectivity of the program."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment be placed in the Record.

The amendments, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 821

On page 16, line 2, insert the following: beginning with the coma, strike out all through the word "average" on line 3 and insert in lieu thereof a period and the following: "The national unemployment rate is equal to or exceeds 6% per centum for the most recent three consecutive months, such period to be determined by the Secretary of Commerce in consultation with the President, in such a manner as to include in such period the national average rate of unemployment for the most recent three consecutive months. Seventy per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available only for grants in areas as defined in the second sentence of this subsection. If the national average unemployment rate exceeds 6% per centum for the most recent three consecutive months, the authority of the Secretary to make grants under this section is suspended until the national average unemployment rate has equaled or exceeded 6% per centum for the most recent three consecutive months".

NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES—S. 2173

AMENDMENT NO. 822

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. BARTLETT submitted an amendment to the bill (S. 2173) to fully explore and develop the naval petroleum reserves of the United States and to permit the leasing of public lands with revenues derived therefrom to be placed in a special account, and for other purposes.

HOME MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE ACT—S. 1281

AMENDMENT NO. 823

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. STONE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Amendment No. 596, intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 1281) to improve public understanding of the role of depository institutions in home financing.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, I wish to inform my colleagues in the Senate and the Indian community that the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will continue its review of Indian housing needs and programs through two days of field hearings during the August recess.

The distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Senator Dewey Bartlett, will chair the hearings at two sites in Oklahoma as follows: in Muskogee, August 6; and in Anadarko, August 7.

I feel that the forthcoming hearings will add to our growing record in the area of Indian housing. Such a record will contribute to legislative proposals designed to meet more realistically Indian housing needs as they exist today.

Anyone desiring further information on the proposed Indian housing hearings should contact Ella Mae Horse of the committee staff on extension 47144.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REGULATORY REFORM

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, together with other of my colleagues, I have been meeting with the President in discussions having to do with the need for regulatory reform.

The President has expressed his concern about costly and outdated regulation and is seeking reforms in the executive branch. Our colleagues on the House floor and on the executive side are suggesting a summit in order to obtain a wide-range discussion of the leading issues relating to regulatory reform.

The bottom line is, we need improved regulation in the public interest. Total deregulation is not a panacea. What we need is less obstruction and swifter action.

Frustration with the regulators is something we have all experienced. Following is a chronology of a simple application pending before the Federal Power Commission for approval of 33 miles of pipeline to provide needed gas to the Wasatch Front in Utah this winter. This maddening and inexcusable delay is a prime example of the frustra-

tions of the public in dealing with these agencies.

First. The original application for these facilities was filed with the FPC on January 7, 1973.


Third. On May 1, 1973, the FPC requested additional information and documentation.

Fourth. On May 18, 1973, Mountain Fuel responded to the FPC request for information by filing a supplement to its application.

Fifth. On August 20, 1973, a request was received from the FPC for certain additional environmental information.

One environmental study had been completed prior to the request, and a further environmental study was underway at the time of the request. The later study was completed and furnished to the FPC on December 10, 1973, shortly after it was received by the commission.

Sixth. On February 27, 1974, the FPC instructed Mountain Fuel to amend its application, since the environmental impact report indicated change in pipeline routing. Mountain Fuel was also instructed to supply certain other additional information.

Seventh. Mountain Fuel's file copy of the requested amendment and additional information is stamped as received by the FPC on March 14, 1974.

Eighth. At the late date of May 10, 1974, the FPC made a prior change in the suplementation of the application, or in the alternative, for the withdrawal of the application without prejudice to its resubmittal at a later date.

Ninth. The requested supplement to the application was filed on May 20, 1974, stressing the urgency of the situation and the need for an immediate decision.

Tenth. On May 28, 1974, Mountain Fuel again pleaded with the FPC for construction authorization by filing a "Request * * for Immediate Certificate Authorization."

Eleventh. On June 4, 1974, the Company received a telephonic request for additional information from an FPC staff member.

Twelfth. On June 5, 1974, the information was telephonically supplied, followed by written confirmation the same day.

Thirteenth. On June 7, 1974, Governor Rampton wrote to the FPC requesting an expedited resolution of the case.

Fourteenth. On June 10, 1974, the Public Service Commission of Utah sent a telegram to the FPC urging that the FPC promptly authorize commencement of construction of the pipeline.

Fifteenth. On June 27, 1974, the FPC published notice of the amendment to the application, giving interested parties until July 16, 1974, to respond.

Sixteenth. On July 16, 1974, Hal S. Bennett, executive director of the Public Service Commission of Utah, sent a telegram to the FPC urging that the FPC promptly authorize commencement of construction of the pipeline.

Seventeenth. On July 22, 1974, the FPC issued an order denying our request for a temporary certificate, instituting a show cause proceeding, setting the
matter for formal hearing, and establishing procedural dates. The order, in effect, stated that our filings to that date had failed to establish a need for the pipeline and set forth in some detail the additional information which should be filed. The order set the date of August 20, 1974, for the filing of Mountain Fuel's direct testimony and exhibits and the date of October 8, 1974, as the hearing date. The order noted that Mountain Fuel did not have certificates to construct and operate storage reservoirs in the Bridger Lake and Chalk Creek fields and ordered Mountain Fuel to show cause what certificate applications for these fields should not be filed.

Eighteenth. On August 5, 1974, Mountain Fuel filed all of its testimony and exhibits in support of its application. The testimony and exhibits were filed 15 days early to support a petition for immediate reconsideration of the Commission's July 22 order denying the temporary certificate and renewing Mountain Fuel's request for the issuance of the temporary certificate. Concurrently with the filing of the testimony, exhibits, and petition for reconsideration, Mountain Fuel filed an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the development of the Coalville field, which application was filed under Mountain Fuel's underground storage development, docket No. CP-71-52. No certificate of public convenience and necessity for the development of the Coalville field was issued.

Nineteenth. On August 30, 1974, the Federal Power Commission issued an order denying Mountain Fuel's request for reconsideration of its July 22, 1974, order, denying Mountain Fuel's request for temporary certificate authorization. Although the order concedes that Mountain Fuel's evidence may address the issues raised by its filings in the docket, the order indicates that this direct evidence has not been subjected to the scrutiny of cross-examination and evaluation in a public hearing and restates the Commission's position that significant issues have been raised which should be dealt with in a formal public hearing.

Twenty-first. On September 19, 1974, the company was served with a letter request from the FPC staff requesting voluminous amounts of data on the Chalk Creek storage project, which was assigned FPC docket No. CP-75-33, and an application for additional expenditure authorization and an extension of time to complete the further development of the Coalville field, which application was filed under Mountain Fuel's underground storage development, docket No. CP-71-52.

Twenty-second. On October 19, 1974, an affidavit by Mr. Douglas Reese was filed with the Commission as an expert geological opinion indicating that the feasibility of the development of the Coalville storage field into a substantial gas storage reservoir had been proven.

Twenty-third. On November 25, 1974, the Commission staff filed its reply brief responding to Mountain Fuel's initial brief, along with its answer to Mountain Fuel's motion to reopen the record.

Twenty-fourth. On November 27, 1974, Mountain Fuel's reply brief was filed, responding to the Commission staff's initial brief.

Twenty-fifth. On March 27, 1975, the presiding administrative law judge submitted his initial decision issuing a certificate of public convenience and necessity, authorizing Mountain Fuel Supply Co. to construct and operate certain facilities as described more fully in the application filed in docket No. CP-71-52.

Twenty-sixth. On April 25, 1975, a brief on exceptions to the initial decision was filed by the Commission staff.

Twenty-seventh. On May 12, 1975, a brief was filed by Mountain Fuel Supply opposing staff's exceptions to the initial decision. A motion was also submitted on this date to expedite the decision.

Twenty-eighth. On May 17, 1975, a letter was sent by Calvin L. Rampton to the Federal Power Commission urging an expedient decision.

Twenty-ninth. On May 17, 1975, a letter was sent by Gov. Calvin L. Rampton to the Federal Power Commission urging an expedient decision.

Thirty-first. On May 22, 1975, a letter was sent by Senator Frank E. Moss, also urging the Federal Power Commission's immediate, positive response.

Thirty-second. On May 28, 1975, Senator E. J. Garn sent a letter to the Federal Power Commission urging the importance of expediting a decision.

Thirty-third. On June 13, 1975, Gov. Calvin Rampton sent a telegram to the Federal Power Commission stressing the urgency of the matter and noting possible action which he might be required to take if the issue were held up in the FPC decisions.

Today is July 26, 1975, with not the slightest indication of when the FPC will act—if ever.

Surely this is an example of the need for regulatory reform. There must be a responsible regulatory structure under which rules an application is in the public interest, the staff which presented no evidence back in October 1974 again intervenes and further delays approval.

Winter is coming and Utah citizens may be cold unless the pipeline can be built this summer. What a price to pay for timid, indecisive, procrastinating regulation.

NEW HAMPSHIRE VACANCY

Mr. McClure. Mr. President, it seems to remain clear that the overwhelming sentiment in the country supports resolving the New Hampshire election contest by sending it back to the people who are to decide it. Senator and Governor, an editorial appearing in the Harrisburg Patriot on July 24, 1975, reaches that conclusion after analyzing the constitutional argument which has often been raised on the floor of this Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed in the Record.

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

NEW HAMPSHIRE VACANCY—LET NEW HAMPSHIRE CITIZENS DECIDE

In the enerating and senseless controversy under way in the U.S. Senate over picking a winner in last November's senatorial race in New Hampshire, Majority Leader Mike Mansfield is fond of quoting the U.S. Constitution which says that "each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members."

Mansfield adds: "We seem to have some editorial writers against us but the Constitution is, with us," and his fellow senators steadfastly refuse to return the matter to the New Hampshire voters to select between the Republican, and John Durkin, the Democrat.

Mansfield's contention—that this matter belongs solely in the Senate and nowhere else—is based on the most wooden of interpretations of that constitutional passage. To the contrary, being equally legal, it is possible to argue that since neither Wyman nor Durkin is yet a member of the Senate, the Senate has no jurisdiction whatever.

Reader-based rebuttal to the Mansfield position is grounded on what appears to be a reasonable definition of the word "judge." According to Mansfield, the "judge"—that is, decide—who won the November election. It never seems to occur to him that an equally valid judgment by the Senate would be that, in view of irreconcilable technical difficulties, the last election was no election at all—and order that another ballooning be held.

Or the problem could be resolved by Wyman and Durkin themselves. Since each is on record as being willing to participate in a new election, let them issue a joint statement that neither will serve unless the voters go to the polls again and make a clearcut selection between them.

There can be little doubt that this is the will of the New Hampshire citizenry, since its Legislature, the undeclared, has modified state law to make a new election legal.

In any case, what is now under way in the Senate is unfair to the candidates, both of whom have conducted themselves as gentlemen and a denial of ongoing representation to New Hampshire. Section two of the Constitution, from which Mansfield has not quoted, says that "no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate." But that's what's happening and, in view of the confrontation between Senator and Governor, an editorial appearing in the Harrisburg Patriot on July 24, 1975, reaches that conclusion after analyzing the constitutional argument which has often been raised on the floor of this Senate.

In any case, what is now under way in the Senate is unfair to the candidates, both of whom have conducted themselves as gentlemen and a denial of ongoing representation to New Hampshire. Section two of the Constitution, from which Mansfield has not quoted, says that "no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate." But that's what's happening and, in view of the confrontation between Senator and Governor, an editorial appearing in the Harrisburg Patriot on July 24, 1975, reaches that conclusion after analyzing the constitutional argument which has often been raised on the floor of this Senate.

There can be little doubt that this is the will of the New Hampshire citizenry, since its Legislature, the undeclared, has modified state law to make a new election legal.

In any case, what is now under way in the Senate is unfair to the candidates, both of whom have conducted themselves as gentlemen and a denial of ongoing representation to New Hampshire. Section two of the Constitution, from which Mansfield has not quoted, says that "no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate." But that's what's happening and, in view of the confrontation between Senator and Governor, an editorial appearing in the Harrisburg Patriot on July 24, 1975, reaches that conclusion after analyzing the constitutional argument which has often been raised on the floor of this Senate.

There can be little doubt that this is the will of the New Hampshire citizenry, since its Legislature, the undeclared, has modified state law to make a new election legal.

In any case, what is now under way in the Senate is unfair to the candidates, both of whom have conducted themselves as gentlemen and a denial of ongoing representation to New Hampshire. Section two of the Constitution, from which Mansfield has not quoted, says that "no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate." But that's what's happening and, in view of the confrontation between Senator and Governor, an editorial appearing in the Harrisburg Patriot on July 24, 1975, reaches that conclusion after analyzing the constitutional argument which has often been raised on the floor of this Senate.
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Any other course will lead to charges of theft of an election, of bitterness and recrimination. How strange that the members of the Upper House can't see this—a matter that is simplicity itself to most anyone but a partisan U.S. senator.

THE NEED TO PREPARE CAPITOL HILL FOR THE BICENTENNIAL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Bicentennial year is upon us, various ceremonies and celebrations have been taking place across this Nation for the past several months, and yet on Capitol Hill, we are not prepared.

It could be a catastrophe around here unless proper plans are made. It is essential that we get fully and properly prepared to receive literally hundreds of thousands of tourists who will be touring the Capitol next year, not to mention the need for governmental and nongovernmental programs to celebrate our Bicentennial.

We know that Capitol Hill buildings are so ill-equipped that they cannot house even the Members and their staffs. We cannot even permit our interns to eat in the staff restaurants during lunch hour, because of the problem of congestion and long lines in the cafeterias. The eating facilities in the Capitol are totally inadequate for visitors, and there are few eating establishments immediately adjacent to Capitol Hill which can take care of our current lunch-hour crowd demands, much less the tourist masses which are expected next summer.

The problems we confront in feeding our visitors are equal to those we confront in providing an adequate number of restrooms, water fountains, resting benches, first aid services, lost and found centers, children locaters, and the many other services for large numbers of people.

Mr. President, on June 13, the Senate passed a bill to provide for the appointment of a Joint Committee on Arrangements for Commemoration of the Bicentennial of the United States. The House did not pass a similar measure. However, no further action has been taken. I would urge my colleagues to act, to take final action on this legislation in order that this joint committee might begin its work. There is much to be done and so little time to do it that we cannot afford any further delays.

One of the major responsibilities of the joint committee will be to work with the Congress and with governmental and nongovernmental groups, including the State and local governments, private groups, and the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration. As part of this overall responsibility, I would hope that the joint committee would also deal with the more immediate logistical and facility problems—the basic people needs to which I have referred.

The transportation appropriations bill just passed by the Senate includes $10 million requested for the special Bicentennial fringe parking and bus service plan. The money would provide parking space for 16,000 tourist cars on existing lots at the Pentagon, Kennedy Stadium, and Fort Myer, and for buses to shuttle visitors to the mall. The House-passed allowance for $5 million is insufficient. I would urge my colleagues in the House to accept the Senate level of funding, because this city can ill afford the massive traffic jams which would result if we cannot get the additional traffic which is expected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record a copy of a Washington Post editorial of Friday, July 18, entitled "Federal Hospitality," which discusses our current lack of preparedness for the Bicentennial celebration.

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

FEDERAL HOSPITALITY

We are much encouraged that the Ford administration has not accelerated federal responsibility in the millions of tourists from all over the world expected in Washington next year. The White House is doing what it can to help region-wide efforts to accommodate them, having stepped in nine weeks ago, when presidential efforts to form a meeting of the representatives of ten federal agencies, the Washington Metropolitan Council of Governments, the American Bicentennial Administration, and the city government. The President assured the group of his concern for the welfare of the visitors.

At the meeting, White House task force, headed by Robert Hite of the Interior Department. The task force is not yet concerned with any bicentennial celebration of such. Its concern is entirely with logistic matters, such as transportation, parking, emergency services, accommodations and information. Mr. Hite, a seasoned administrator, seems to have a good grip on most of these problems, but he and his task force still face some formidable obstacles.

The foremost need, perhaps, is for Congress to restore the $5 million cut made by the House in the budget request for the special bicentennial fringe parking and bus service plan. The plan, worked out by the Transportation and Public Works Committee, would provide parking for 16,000 tourist cars on existing lots at the Pentagon, Kennedy Stadium, Ft. Myer and other places and minibuses for 250,000 tourist cars. This is the only way to prevent the capital bicentennial celebration from being marred in traffic congestion and pollution. The original cost estimate for this project was $211 million. A $10 million minimum is needed for the acquisition of buses and an extensive information program to tell motorists about the parking service before they bring their cars downtown. All six area members of Congress have contacted the Senate to restore the budget cut to "avoid what could be an embarrassment to the entire nation." Another bill, the Department of Defense, would provide parking for 16,000 tourist cars on existing lots at the Pentagon, Kennedy Stadium, Ft. Myer and other places and minibuses for 250,000 tourist cars. This is the only way to prevent the capital bicentennial celebration from being marred in traffic congestion and pollution. The original cost estimate for this project was $211 million. A $10 million minimum is needed for the acquisition of buses and an extensive information program to tell motorists about the parking service before they bring their cars downtown. All six area members of Congress have contacted the Senate to restore the budget cut to "avoid what could be an embarrassment to the entire nation."

Another bill, the Department of Interior, has been introduced for full cooperation on the part of the Department of Defense. There are several ways in which the military can, and should, contribute to the national celebration and Interior Secretary Morton has written Defense Secretary Schlesinger about them. One is to make available to the joint committee the military real estate in the area, notably Anacostia-Bolling, available for visitor parking and camping. The White House task force has also suggested placing federal workers and people who prefer their tents or recreational vehicles to motels or hotels. The military properties would of course be used only for the "duration"—that is to say the bicentennial sum-

mer months. The military has also been asked for medical help—first aid stations and ambulance services. The military medical community surely would give training and good will by helping out. While there are regulations that allow assistance to civilians only in emergencies, the expected presence of 200,000 daily visitors on the Mall is surely just that.

To direct, inform, clean up after, and control this many people, the White House task force estimates that additional overtime funds are going to be needed for the Capitol Park Services. For the visitors, the task force hopes to organize a central referral system for telephone reservations. Such a system, which worked well at the Montreal and San Antonio world fairs, would cost about $300,000 and Mr. Hite will be talking to the Office of Management and Budget about that.

 Provision is also going to have to be made for adequate food service and adequate rest rooms. The Mall visitors, particularly since the new National Gallery cafeterias will not be completed in time. The proposal to invite tourists to the National Mall and facilities of nearby government buildings strikes us as less than promising. Government cafeteria lines are already too long. We would rather see the National Mall to open two or three competing summer restaurant and cafe concessions on the Mall. They could operate under light regulations and structures and serve simple, high quality fare.

Come to think of it, the Mall could use some light refreshments—with or without the bicentennial.

In all the planning for the health and welfare of bicentennial visitors—as in the bicentennial celebrations in the local jurisdictions and communities—some careful divisions of labor, responsibility and authority will have to be established and faithfully observed. Just as the District, for example, must contribute its share of resources and energy to strictly local projects if it is to expect federal assistance for these projects, so the federal government, in fulfilling its obligations to supply the local program, must take care not to impinge upon the home rule powers recently bestowed upon the local government. In the same way, local jurisdictions and play host as they cannot be expected to pay the heavy costs entailed in handling this extensive navigation of visitors. This divvying up of the burden strikes us as a fundamental principle in bicentennial planning and we are pleased to see it acknowledged in the President's initiative and in Mr. Hite's activities.

SENIOR HUGH SCOTT'S RECORD ON DEFENSE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, never before in history has our Nation been faced with the prospects of a lasting generation of peace. Agreement among the world's great powers can lead to such a peace—agreements to hold the spread of nuclear weapons, agreements to refrain from the hostile settlement of conflict.

Congress plays a vital role in the development of America's defense posture. From the authorizing and appropriating of funds to the ratification of treaties, we do to a unique extent. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have long noted Senator Hugh Scott's consistent support of a strong defense policy. While keeping the lines of communication open, Senator Scott's record on defense matters deserves public recognition. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.
There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**DEFENSE—94TH CONGRESS**

**LEGISLATION**

S. Res. 27—a resolution to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950.

S. Res. 48—a joint resolution to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes.

**S. 156**—a bill to require the termination by July 1, 1975, of all Naval weapons range activities on and in the vicinity of the Puerto Rican Island of Culebra.

S. 3961—a bill to authorize the release of 1,553,500 pounds of cadmium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

S. Res. 115—a resolution to pay tribute to members of the Armed Forces who are missing in action in Indochina.

S. Res. 117—a resolution to commemorate the loss and suffering of the dead and wounded from Tivoli, and for other purposes.

S. Res. 200—a resolution relating to the National Security of the United States.

S. Con. Res. 69—Seek new efforts to obtain compliance with the terms of the Paris Peace agreements as applied to prisoners of war and personnel missing in action. Amend. No. 1613—an amendment to S. 3417, military construction authorization bill, that makes provisions for missing military personnel.

**VOTES**

Voted for Amendment expressing sense of Congress that the United States and the Soviet Union should seek an agreement on specific mutual reductions in military expenditures so each country can devote a greater proportion of resources to its domestic needs.

Voted for Amendment to strike bill's section 7 barring use of funds to carry out Anoas base agreement with Portugal until it had been submitted to the Senate as a treaty for its advice and consent.


Voted for Continuing Appropriations, fiscal year 1974.


Voted for amendment to reduce the number of enlisted men used as aides by the military.

Voted for amendment calling for the Secretary of the Army to keep the new main battle tank within strict cost parameters.

Voted for amendment to restore $496.5 million in funding for procurement of F-14 type aircraft.

Voted for amendment calling for President to seek, through bilateral and multilateral arrangements, payments to offset fully any balance-of-payments deficit incurred by the United States during fiscal year 1975 as a result of the deployment of forces in Europe to fulfill NATO commitments.

Voted for amendment calling for reduction of 110,000 rather than 125,000, in the number of U.S. military forces assigned to duty in foreign countries.


Voted for War Powers Resolution.

Voted for Military Construction Authorization.


Voted for amendment to limit to 218 the number of enlisted personnel who could be assigned to the Seabees by the Secretary of Defense to high-ranking military officers to meet their official responsibilities.

Voted for amendment to prohibit use of dogs under this act in research, testing, or evaluation of toxic or radioactive agents.

Voted for amendment to bar expenditures of funds for naval ordnance training operations at the Culebra complex (Puerto Rico) or at any keys within three nautical miles thereof after December 31, 1975.

Voted for amendment to prohibit DOD, in carrying out any program under which financial assistance is provided to persons pursuing an education program (other than persons enrolled in a ROTC program), from denying assistance to enrollees in a college or university solely on the grounds that such institution had previously terminated its ROTC program.

Voted for amendment to make the role of the Secretary of DOD in reviewing the export of goods and technology a recommendation one.

Voted for amendment to bar U.S. economic and military aid to any government which does not effectively prevent the diversion of opium and its derivatives into illicit markets and which permits the production of opium poppies.

Voted to extend and expand authority for carrying out conservation and rehabilitation programs on military reservations, and to authorize the implementation of such programs in certain public lands.

Voted for amendment placing restrictions on the objects provided for the expansion of the Naval Communications Station on the Island of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean.

Voted for amendment to appropriate an additional $600 million for Israel.

Voted for amendment to authorize the President to suspend section barring military assistance to Turkey beginning on date of enactment and ending on December 18, 1974, if he determined that such suspension would further negotiations for a peaceful resolution of the Cyprus conflict.

Voted for Further Continuing Appropriations, fiscal year 1975.

**UNITED STATES-CUBA POLICY**

**Mr. STONE.** Mr. President, on June 16, 1975, Puerto Rican Gov. Rafael Hernandez Colon declared that terrorists who have been placing bombs throughout Puerto Rico and the United States are very well trained in Cuba to carry out such subversive activities. He said that many members of the Puerto Rican Communist Party, Socialists and Socialists frequently to Havana, a capital which he described as containing great knowledge of how the terrorist acts are conducted in Puerto Rico and in the United States.

My office has contacted Gov. Hernandez Colon's assistant, Jose Luis Lopez, who not only confirmed the Governor's statement, but sent me the taped remarks, which were made to newspeople in a press conference given in the city of Ponce, P.R.

In 1972, J. Edgar Hoover declared that the Cuban regime’s activities directed against the United States. Since then, events have added evidence to confirm these words and to illustrate the Cuban regime’s encouragement of terrorism within and against the United States.

A June 17 article from the Chicago Tribune describes in detail how Cuban-trained agents were responsible for two bombings in the area of Chicago's Loop. It states that “accidental Federal investigations, ‘at least six persons, trained in Cuba to carry out guerrilla warfare and prepare explosive devices, are based in Chicago as members of the FALN’—

In an article he wrote for the New York Times, Puerto Rico's Resident Commissioner Jaime Benitez mentions this group in connection with a similar Castroite following operating in Venezuela. Pelloerto Ojeda Rios, a Puerto Rican born and raised in Cuba and a leader of the FALN, has been identified as the Cuban agent responsible for the January 24 explosion of the Federal Electric Building in New York City, which took the lives of 5 persons and injured 56 others. The attached article describing these events appeared in the May 10 edition of the New York Post and states that this same Cuban-trained spy has been responsible for other bombings in New York, Chicago, and Puerto Rico.

Nevertheless, on July 16, U.S. Ambassador to the OAS William Miliband made clear that the United States favors terminating the OAS sanctions against the Cuban regime, and that our Government will do so at an OAS Meeting of Consultation of Foreign Ministers of which will probably be discussing the matter next Tuesday. Ambassador Mili­ liard said that—

Cuba does not constitute a serious and important threat to the Organization of American States.

Significantly, he added that—

I have not seen that country change its policy of exporting revolution.

To admit this while favoring the termination of the sanctions, which were originally imposed because of the present Cuban regime’s subversive interference in the internal affairs of other countries, is an explicit acceptance by the State Department of such illegal foreign policy measures of the Cuban regime. The Sen­ tor from Florida does not understand why Communist Cuba’s subversive activities mattered so much to us in 1964, when the OAS imposed the sanctions and isolated Cuba from the Inter-America­ n system if they matter not at all to us now.

If the United States votes "yes" in the upcoming OAS Meeting of Consultation, it will be flagrantly ignoring the ample showing of the present Cuban regime’s assistance of acts of terror, sabotage, and violence against an intelligent people even including our own country.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles published in the June 17 Chicago Tribune and the June 20 New York Daily News be printed for the Record.

The Sergeant at Arms ordered the articles to be printed in the Record, as follows:
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[From the Chicago Tribune, June 7, 1975]
CUBA-TRAINED GUERRILLAS TIED TO BOMBS

(From Ronald Kozol and William Griffin)

Federal investigators disclosed Monday that at least six persons, including in Cuba to carry out guerrilla warfare and prepare explosive devices, are based in Chicago as members of the FALN, a Puerto Rican nationalist group responsible for two terror bombings in the Loop Saturday.
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The tree measurement method has been used for many years in the Forest Service's eastern and southern regions, on some thinning or prescribed burn units, and in certain western regions, and by the Bureau of Land Management. At issue, however, is the extension of tree measurement to merchantable old-growth trees which make up a large part of the Forest Service's timber holdings in the Western regions. The timber industry has the major concern that the tree measurement method will bring about many uncertainties, additional costs, and large financial and scheduling risks in harvesting old-growth western timber and that there is no conclusive evidence that tree measurement, even if done well, will actually cost less than log measurement.

Although the Forest Service proposed a timetable in mid-1973 to gradually increase the volume of timber sold by tree measurement from 5 percent by the end of 1973 to 80 percent by the end of 1980, the Forest Service has abandoned the timetable because of concerns expressed by the Senate Appropriations Committee (see p. 16) and because of the inadequacy of funding for tree measurement sales.

The Forest Service does not want to abandon its efforts to increase the use of tree measurement, but it believes that there are long-range benefits in savings and management flexibility which will justify using the method for a higher proportion of sales, including those in some areas where other measurement methods are used. However, the Forest Service recognized that before moving ahead with tree measurement, it will have to:

1. Establish through test sales the comparative cost and accuracy of volume and value estimates under each method.
2. Use tree measurement only where it has the lowest assurance that the costs are professional and accurate sale preparation job.

### Industry Views on Change of Sale Method

Timber industry representatives told us that they were generally opposed to the Forest Service's plan to increase its western regions' use of the tree measurement method of selling, except for small, low-value timber sales where the financial risk is low and the cost of scaling is not justified. They said that their primary concerns with the proposed increased use of tree measurement included funding and manpower.

The Forest Service's inability to accurately estimate the volume of merchantable wood under the tree measurement method due to:

1. Difficulty of estimating volume in high-defective timber.
2. Large turnover of Forest Service personnel.
3. Varying accuracy reliability among Forest Service personnel.

The resulting increased costs of tree measurement sales to timber purchasers because:

1. Each prospective purchaser would need to cruise the sale area to assure himself of the accuracy of Forest Service volume estimates.
2. Additional scaling and recordkeeping would be required to develop scaling data so that adequate production controls could be met. The system would customarily provided much of this scaling data although timber sales contracts do not require that it be done.

The industry representatives emphasized the need for industry participation in any Forest Service study or comparison of the two sale methods. They believe that the solution to the differences of opinion about the accuracy and cost of each method is to get comparable data for each method and demonstrate to the Congress, the Office of Management and Budget, and the public which is the best method of measuring timber for sale.

### Regional Test Sale Programs Were Not Adequate to Compare Sale Methods

The three regions selected for review had carried out only limited test sales programs and had not developed sufficient volume and cost information on their test sales to compare the accuracy of the volume estimates from each method. These weaknesses are attributable to a lack of adequate guidelines and procedures and insufficient funding for conducting test sales.

At the time of our fieldwork, seven test sales had been completed and eight were under way in the three regions. The completed test sales are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Date Estimated</th>
<th>Total sale volume</th>
<th>Total sale pleted value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>10-72 10-73</td>
<td>61,076.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>6-73 12-73</td>
<td>209.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutmeg</td>
<td>4-73 10-73</td>
<td>735.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>5-71 9-72 23.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piceo</td>
<td>4-73 11-73</td>
<td>342.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Southwest</td>
<td>5-73 8-74</td>
<td>214.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern</td>
<td>12-72 9-74</td>
<td>249.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Need for Adequate Fundings

The Forest Service had provided its regions with special funds for their test sale programs; instead, each region was requested to fit the test sales into its regular timber sale programs as the funding and manpower would permit. As a result, the sales volume of each region's test sales was a very small part of its total sales volume, as shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Date Estimated</th>
<th>Total sale volume</th>
<th>Total sale pleted value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>18-72 11-73 1974</td>
<td>2.4 1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>0.2 0.04 0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern</td>
<td>2.3 2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officials in each region said that the lack of adequate funding and manpower had limited their ability to carry out comprehensive test sale programs. In test sales, two measurements—one to measure the standing trees and one to measure the cut timber—need to be made for comparison purposes. According to one region, these double measurements slowed and decreased headquarter officials agreed that the lack of funding had inhibited the regions in conducting their test sale programs.

### Need for Adequate Guidelines and Procedures

Because national guidance had not been provided for conducting test sales, each region had structured its test sale program to achieve its own objectives, which were generally as follows:

- **California** region officials said that their region's test program was initially intended to give district personnel experience in setting up tree measurement sales and to assess the impact on district operations. They said that their primary concern was to compare the costs of tree measurement and log measurement sales were included in their test program only to measure and control new pressure began to mount following a Forest Service announcement in May 1973 of the planned conversion to tree measurement sales by the end of 1980.

- **Pacific Northwest** region officials said that their region's test sale program was designed primarily to investigate the technical aspects of tree measurement and to determine what combinations of sampling and volume estimating techniques were best suited to various timber types. No effort was made to develop cost data for comparing tree measurement and log measurement sales.

- **Southwestern** region officials said that their region's test program was to give forest and district personnel more experience using the
We recommend that the Secretary of Agriculture direct the Chief, Forest Service, to:

Set dates for timely completion of test sales and give high priority to meeting those dates.

Take steps to provide the Forest Service's regions with the funds needed to conduct adequate and timely test sales.

Evaluate and report to the appropriate congressional committees the results of test sales as they apply to the specific forests, tree species, and timber conditions.

Use the tree measurement method for all forests, tree species, and timber conditions for which test sales benefits are to be gained from its use and where Forest Service personnel have the capability to prepare and administer the test sales professionally and accurately.

As your office agreed, we are sending copies of this report to the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations and on Government Operations; to various other congressional committees and subcommittees; and to Senators James A. McClure and Bob Packwood and Representatives Patricia Schroeder, Al Ullman, and Don H. Clausen, because of their interest in this matter. We are also sending copies to the Director, Office of Management and Budget, and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS, Chairman.
The Federal Timber Purchasers Committee, a timber industry group which meets periodically with Forest Service officials, questioned the speed with which some Forest Service regions were moving to tree measurement sales, alleging that these regions were not living up to the Forest Service's prior commitment to develop plans to increase the number of such sales. The Forest Service said that its objective was to increase tree measurement sales considerably, and it expected to use management systems which would produce acceptable results.

The Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Cost of Living Council announced that, as one of the actions to meet increased timber productivity goals, conversion to the tree measurement method would be pursued by Forest Service officials to a greater extent than in the past. The Secretary of Agriculture said: "In a brief paper distributed to the western regions, the Forest Service told that because additional financial had not been received for fiscal year 1975, the proposed timetable for converting to tree measurement sales had to be reviewed. It also said that the western regions had already reduced their estimates of progress by 1980 to 46 percent but that this figure might need to be reduced further.

The Forest Service added that: Although it could not visualize eliminating all scaling, it continued to believe that, in the long run, tree measurement would be the best system. However, it did not want to move so fast that it made mistakes and risked discrediting the method. It was thinking in terms of delaying making any additional tree measurement sales in high-value, high-defect stands until it had accumulated more comparative data on costs and volumes.

To obtain that data, it would prepare as many sales as possible to tree measurement standards but would sell them as scaled sales. Exceptions might be necessary for individual sales where, for some reason, scaling could not be provided at reasonable cost.

It would continue to increase using tree measurement sales of low-value, high-defect, old-growth timber experience had shown this method to be satisfactory.

The Forest Service included $1 million in its budget request for fiscal year 1975 to partially cover the costs of converting to the tree measurement method. The Department of Agriculture deleted the fund request in September 1975 because of higher priorities.

At a tree measurement conference of Forest Service headquarters and field officials, it was pointed out that, to accomplish the transition from log measurement to tree measurement, a well-planned implementation program was needed to establish confidence in the equity of such a change. Also pointed out were the needs of (1) national instructions, which would establish the bases for accuracy standards for tree measurement sales, and (3) additional financial assistance for the cost of conversion. In addition, it was noted that the following considerations must be analyzed carefully in any comparison of conversion costs and benefits:

- The relative costs of both methods.
- The availability of personnel involved in making these comparisons.
- The sampling-error standard used for the tree measurement method.
- The accessibility and conditions of timber in the sale area.

At a meeting with Forest Service officials, the Federal Timber Purchasers Committee stated that it intended to talk further with the Office of Management and Budget and western congressional delegations to try to prevent the Forest Service's making widespread changes in the West. The Forest Service said that it intended to proceed only as rapidly as its ability to make acceptably accurate volume estimates permitted. Its budget request for fiscal year 1976 included $200,000 for the testing of area scaling which maximum long-term cost savings could be realized.

The Forest Service said it expected to move toward using tree measurement in the next several years but that it could not predict whether implementation plan targets could be met.

In a brief paper distributed to the western regions, the Forest Service told that because additional financial had not been received for fiscal year 1975, the proposed timetable for converting to tree measurement sales had to be reviewed. It also said that the western regions had already reduced their estimates of progress by 1980 to 46 percent but that this figure might need to be reduced further.

The Forest Service added that: Although it could not visualize eliminating all scaling, it continued to believe that, in the long run, tree measurement would be the best system. However, it did not want to move so fast that it made mistakes and risked discrediting the method. It was thinking in terms of delaying making any additional tree measurement sales in high-value, high-defect stands until it had accumulated more comparative data on costs and volumes.

The accessibility and conditions of timber involved in making these comparisons.

At a meeting with Forest Service officials, the Federal Timber Purchasers Committee stated that it intended to talk further with the Office of Management and Budget and western congressional delegations to try to prevent the Forest Service's making widespread changes in the West. The Forest Service said that it intended to proceed only as rapidly as its ability to make acceptably accurate volume estimates permitted. Its budget request for fiscal year 1976 included $200,000 for the testing of area scaling which maximum long-term cost savings could be realized.

The Forest Service said it expected to move toward using tree measurement in the next several years but that it could not predict whether implementation plan targets could be met.

The Committee added: "For the past two years the Forest Service has continued to apply for separate funding for the sales of timber on a tree measurement basis."

"Tree prices throughout the Nation have continued to rise and it is important that both the buyer and seller for the National Forest timber be able to rely on measured and priced timber. It is recognized that current log scaling practices include truck scaling, weight scaling, and sample scaling. Where the practices are sound they should be continued unless the above criteria are met.

"Tree measurement procedures in such timber have been developed quite accurately. However, the method has not enjoyed complete confidence by many purchasers of defective timber who might well be more interested in sound, flat-rate pricing. In both trees, both in inches and feet. With the widespread use of tree measurement in the West, the Department of Agriculture, which planned to offer old growth timber sales, and (2) additional financing, to offset the Department's concern that its budget request for fiscal year 1975 to partially cover the costs of converting to the tree measurement method. The Department of Agriculture deleted the fund request in September 1975 because of higher priorities.

At a tree measurement conference of Forest Service headquarters and field officials, it was pointed out that, to accomplish the transition from log measurement to tree measurement, a well-planned implementation program was needed to establish confidence in the equity of such a change. Also pointed out were the needs of (1) national instructions, which would establish the bases for accuracy standards for tree measurement sales, and (3) additional financial assistance for the cost of conversion. In addition, it was noted that the following considerations must be analyzed carefully in any comparison of conversion costs and benefits:

- The relative costs of both methods.
- The availability of personnel involved in making these comparisons.
- The sampling-error standard used for the tree measurement method.
- The accessibility and conditions of timber in the sale area.

At a meeting with Forest Service officials, the Federal Timber Purchasers Committee stated that it intended to talk further with the Office of Management and Budget and western congressional delegations to try to prevent the Forest Service's making widespread changes in the West. The Forest Service said that it intended to proceed only as rapidly as its ability to make acceptably accurate volume estimates permitted. Its budget request for fiscal year 1976 included $200,000 for the testing of area scaling which maximum long-term cost savings could be realized.

The Forest Service said it expected to move toward using tree measurement in the next several years but that it could not predict whether implementation plan targets could be met.

In a brief paper distributed to the western regions, the Forest Service told that because additional financial had not been received for fiscal year 1975, the proposed timetable for converting to tree measurement sales had to be reviewed. It also said that the western regions had already reduced their estimates of progress by 1980 to 46 percent but that this figure might need to be reduced further.

The Forest Service added that: Although it could not visualize eliminating all scaling, it continued to believe that, in the long run, tree measurement would be the best system. However, it did not want to move so fast that it made mistakes and risked discrediting the method. It was thinking in terms of delaying making any additional tree measurement sales in high-value, high-defect stands until it had accumulated more comparative data on costs and volumes.

The accessibility and conditions of timber involved in making these comparisons.
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comparison of savings to justify moving ahead with tree measurement.

JANUARY 1975

The Forest Service sent its western regions (excluding Alaska) proposed procedures and a statement for collecting time and costs on test tree measurement sales. According to these procedures, both Governmental agencies and timber companies were to be involved in the process, and all parties were to be given an equal opportunity to participate. The agencies felt that tree measurement was one method by which timber utilization could be increased.

On April 10, 1975, a letter was sent to President Ford by the Dulles Corridor Committee, a group representing the USOS employees. The letter was framed as a petition, bearing 1,339 signatures, and it urged the prompt opening of the Dulles Access Road to work trips for USGA personnel, without the necessity for the more than 100,000 employee trips to the airport.

As you will note in paragraph 8 of the letter, Virginia now has done what the FPA requested. I note unanimous consent that the letter of the Dulles Corridor Committee to President Ford be printed in the Record.

DUllES CORRIDOR COMMITTEE,

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: We would like to call your attention concerning the Dulles Access Road and access to the U.S. Geological Survey facility at Reston, Virginia.

1. The U.S. Geological Survey National Center for research in natural resources was built without provision for acceptable access to it. The location of this facility at Reston, Virginia, was part of a plan for decentralization of government.

Such a move involved great sacrifice on the part of the Federal employees.

2. The country roads that the Survey employees are now forced to use are very unsafe. Even during the summer, there are numerous potholes. During the winter they are impossible. We have to come to work in the dark, dodging school children and animals. The roads are narrow and winding, hilly and bumpy. Accidents and near-accidents are common.

3. An obvious solution to these problems is the use of the Dulles Airport Access Road.

4. The Dulles Road was built with public funds; yet it is reserved for the sole use of a narrow segment of private industry. This is a subsidy of the airlines to the detriment of Federal employees who are serving the public interest.

5. The P.A.A. holds that their road was built for a specific purpose, and therefore cannot use it for commuting. The roads that we are forced to use were not built for commuting either. While using these country roads we interfered with the purpose for which they were built.

6. The Dulles Road is now in fact being used as a commuter road by residents of Sterling Park, Leesburg, and other areas to the west as well as by Geological Survey employees who make the approach from the west. Between 7:00 and 8:00 a.m. and between 5:00 and 6:00 p.m., 90% of the traffic on the road is commuter non-airport traffic that makes the turn around at the airport and then heads back toward Washington.

7. Wolf Trap Farm Park is another Interior Department facility located on the property, where the Geological Survey is de-

Road to commuter traffic until such time as the road becomes crowded, at which time other highways should be completed to handle the congestion at rush hours.

Recently the employees of the U.S. Geological Survey at Reston have been seeking to work for the interagency task force on soft-wood and hardwood and that both agencies felt that tree measurement was one method by which timber utilization could be increased.

The agencies felt that tree measurement was one method by which timber utilization could be increased.

A Forest Service headquarters official told GAO that specific funds would not be designated for collecting this information. Instead, the regions would be required to submit the test sales into their regular timber sale programs as funding permitted. The official said that a date for completing the test sale program had not been determined and that completing the program would probably depend upon the availability of funding and manpower within each region.

USE OF THE DULLES AIRPORT ACCESS ROAD

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., Mr. President, when Dulles International Airport was built in northern Virginia, a special access road was constructed to provide rapid transportation to and from the new facility.

This road serves only Dulles, commuters are prohibited from direct access to the road between the airport and the terminus of the road at I-95, the Capital Beltway. Those using it must drive to the airport and "double back" to their destinations.

While the Access Road is underutilized, commuter automobiles making use of the "turnaround" at Dulles form the bulk of the traffic at rush hours, and at other times it is nearly empty.

By contrast, other roads in the area, many of which were never designed to handle commuter traffic, are badly congested.

Since 1968 I have advocated the provision of direct access to Dulles Access Road to commuter traffic until such time as the road becomes crowded, at which time other highways should be completed to handle the congestion at rush hours.

JULY 26, 1975

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., Mr. President: I would like to call your attention concerning the Dulles Access Road and access to the U.S. Geological Survey facility at Reston, Virginia.

1. The U.S. Geological Survey National Center for research in natural resources was built without provision for acceptable access to it. The location of this facility at Reston, Virginia, was part of a plan for decentralization of government.

Such a move involved great sacrifice on the part of the Federal employees.

2. The country roads that the Survey employees are now forced to use are very unsafe. Even during the summer, there are numerous potholes. During the winter they are impossible. We have to come to work in the dark, dodging school children and animals. The roads are narrow and winding, hilly and bumpy. Accidents and near-accidents are common.

3. An obvious solution to these problems is the use of the Dulles Airport Access Road.

4. The Dulles Road was built with public funds; yet it is reserved for the sole use of a narrow segment of private industry. This is a subsidy of the airlines to the detriment of Federal employees who are serving the public interest.

5. The F.A.A. holds that their road was built for a specific purpose, and therefore cannot use it for commuting. The roads that we are forced to use were not built for commuting either. While using these country roads we interfered with the purpose for which they were built.

6. The Dulles Road is now in fact being used as a commuter road by residents of Sterling Park, Leesburg, and other areas to the west as well as by Geological Survey employees who make the approach from the west. Between 7:00 and 8:00 a.m. and between 5:00 and 6:00 p.m., 90% of the traffic on the road is commuter non-airport traffic that makes the turn around at the airport and then heads back toward Washington.

7. Wolf Trap Farm Park is another Interior Department facility located on the property, where the Geological Survey is de-

voted to solving the long-range energy and environmental problems of the Wolf Trap enjoys the use of the Dulles Road and the Survey employees are kept on the byways.

Mr. Dexter Davis of the F.A.A. stated that if the Virginia authorities made a definite decision to build parallel commuter roads, the Dulles Road would not be usable. The Virginia legislature has now passed the bill authorizing the parallel roads, and the governor has signed it. There is now an obligation on the part of the F.A.A. to respect this commitment.

The times of day when the Federal employees of the U.S. Geological Survey would be using the Dulles Road and the directions they would by travelling are such that their commuting either. While using these country roads we interfered with the purpose for which they were built.

9. Denial of the right to use the Dulles Road by the Federal employees of the U.S. Geological Survey is affected adversely by this road situation. We did not choose to come to Reston; our agency was moved here and we were ordered to report.

10. National Airport is approached on the heavily travelled George Washington Parkway, yet there is never any trouble getting into National because of the Parkway traffic. In comparison, Survey traffic on the Dulles Road would not be noticed.

11. Denial of the right to use the Dulles Road by the Federal employees of the U.S. Geological Survey is affected adversely by this road situation. We did not choose to come to Reston; our agency was moved here and we were ordered to report.

12. Denial of the right to use the Dulles Road by the Federal employees of the U.S. Geological Survey is affected adversely by this road situation. We did not choose to come to Reston; our agency was moved here and we were ordered to report.

Yet, twice each day we have to pass over this fine highway that is empty of traffic, or if we use it we have to drive the extra ten miles to the airport and back. Twice a day we feel the pang of being neglected by a government which has a network of Federal employees that the energy crisis is over. Their posture is unconscionable with respect to the matter of wages.

13. Denial of the right to use the Dulles Road by the Federal employees of the U.S. Geological Survey is affected adversely by this road situation. We did not choose to come to Reston; our agency was moved here and we were ordered to report.

We urge that you take immediate steps to gain access to the Dulles Road for the employees of the Geological Survey.

I urge that you take immediate steps to gain access to the Dulles Road for the employees of the Geological Survey.

Very sincerely,

JAMES WOOD CLARKE,
WILMA B. WRIGHT,
Chairman,
Chairman,
DUllES CORRIDOR COMMITTEE,
DUllES CORRIDOR COMMITTEE,
(Washington, D.C.),
(Washington, D.C.),

Mr. GARN. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to a very important editorial which appeared yesterday, July 25, 1975, in one of our finest and most respected newspapers, the Wall Street Journal.

The former mayor of Seattle surprised me to me that the mayor of Seattle referred to in this editorial ranks the growing power of municipal unions only second to his concern for money problems. He said that in particular he was concerned with compulsory unionism and binding arbitration mean to a State or local government official charged with the responsibility of governing.

What it means is that a third-party arbitrator who has not been elected by the
people or by their representatives can set a wage rate that a local government official does not have the tax money to cover. And, the end result is that indirectly someone who is never accountable to the voter establishment in local and in essence the people who set the pace of government and in essence the people who elect the public officials authorized to do so.

Whether we talk of public employee unions at the State or at the Federal level, what we need to ask and have answered is whether government, by its nature a monopoly and the protector of all citizens, has the authority legally and morally to transfer functions vital to the very existence of government to a private individual or an independent organization.

The answers to these questions are coming in daily as we see our cities and government become sicker and sicker, to a point which is fundamental in the event firemen, policemen or other key workers refuse to serve. In that event a strike is not merely an inconvenience, but perhaps a matter of life or death. Therefore, it is timely, and certainly well, that the public and the employee unions enjoy unprecedented job security; only in the very worst of times is there any suggestion that civil service can be reduced or eliminated. But few trade unions are insulated from the economic vagaries. Furthermore, while it is not unknown for trade unions to demand the moon at contract time, most contracts in the private sector are settled with an eye toward profit and loss. But municipal union employees often act as though there were no limits to what they can demand.

This attitude is understandable, especially since not a few politicians have encouraged municipal unionists to believe that government treasuries are bountiful. But in New York City officials are finally learning, there is a limit to how much the public can be taxed before it finally rebels. It doesn't take a mathematical genius to realize that the public unions often act as though there were no limits to what they can demand.

This situation isn't likely to get any better unless city halls, state houses and even Washington begin showing more backbone. One way of imposing automatic penalties against municipal strikers, perhaps by reducing their retirement benefits for each day they remain out on strike. But the best way to avoid illegal walkouts in the future is for politicians to resist the outstretched efforts to expand the power of public employee unions.

RESIGNATION OF SECRETARY HATHAWAY

Mr. McGEE, Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I bring to the attention of the House the resignation yesterday of Stanley K. Hathaway as Secretary of the Interior after 6 short weeks in that important office.

As I said in June in supporting the confirmation of my friend Stan Hathaway:

The most important ingredient in a man or woman is whether or not they are capable of creativity, their integrity, and their ability is above reproach.

Mr. President, I think it is no secret that Stan Hathaway and I have had our disagreements over the years as spokesmen for differing political points of view and parties, but, as far as respect for the man, his integrity, and his ability, is undiminished. It is most unfortunate that the vicissitudes inherent in the human condition, one's personality, visited upon this able and dedicated public servant at the acme of his public life just as he was setting about a new position of service to the entire Nation.

The people to whom Stan Hathaway was an effective and respected Governor for two terms and where he enjoys inestimable esteem, join me, I know, in wishing Governor Hathaway a speedy return to good health, in hoping for good fortune to follow for him, his wife Bobby and their children, and in expressing thanks for the distinguished public service which he attributed himself through a difficult period.

THE EMPRESS OF IRAN ON SCIENCE AND SOCIETY

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, today's New York Times carries an article condensed from a speech made in Colorado by Farah, Empress of Iran. She has posed the predicament of the modern man so succinctly that her speech merits the close attention of the Senate. We must be blind and deaf to the disintegration of values in the world around us if we do not respond when she asks—

. . . how to reconcile the computer with the demands of a spirituality that underlines the very substance of human life. . .

. . . how to harmonize the achievements of science and technology without depriving mankind of his human heritage. . .

It should be noted, of course, that few nations confront this challenge more squarely than Iran. Iran's most ancient cultures is threatened by the affluence derived from oil which on the one hand produces great revenues and on the other induces heavy expenditures for technology and energy.

But in the resulting atmosphere of activity and change the Empress has been an articulate and effective advocate of the preservation of the rich heritage of science and technology without depriving mankind of his human heritage.

As she travels from one historic Iranian city to another the Empress pleads that progress should not be purchased at the price of the sacrifice of a culture that extends over a period of more than 2,500 years. The Iranian press carries her message beyond the range of her own voice and helps to raise the national level of consciousness of the Persian past and of the danger of a catastrophic collision between that past and the on-rushing future. The United States and the rest of the world should clearly understand that Iran, like America, appreciate both the depth and the urgency of the issue before mankind.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Computer and the Spirit: The Chasm," adapted from the Empress' speech be printed in the Record.

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

COMPUTER AND THE SPIRIT: THE CHASM

(By Farah Pahlavi)

I want to comment on a chasm that tends to separate more and more the technological world from the spiritual heritage of civilization.

It appears that the material achievements of our age have come about at the expense of the spiritual. The world is faced with a period of spiritual sterility that has taken the toll of so many centuries to accumulate.

The development of communications and the general tendency toward uniformity of the modes of life seem to have endangered cultural diversity, itself the fountainhead of creativity and progress.

Traveling at the speed of sound and communicating at the speed of light, we have
More than ever, the concept of “gross national happiness” should stand beside that of “gross national product.” In this context, it is indeed important to remain alert to the role of creatively inspired artists in the process of over-all planning.

Another disparity is the abyss that separates the masses from a smaller group of specialists. This is largely due to the fact that the discoveries of contemporary science do not lend themselves to normal expression in everyday language. As the physicist Erwin Schrödinger said, “new and scientific discoveries can be expressed in clear words, one is confronted with statements that are less abstract than ‘trivial, cut’ but more so than ‘winged lions’. It is obvious that the divorce between scientific expression and the understanding of the masses cannot continue. The man’s condition could become increasingly precarious.

Finally, and this is perhaps the most pressing problem, the environment is being rapidly degraded by the thrust of an unbridled technology that has lost sight of the ultimate aim of progress, namely, man and his needs. The optimists may say that for decades we have been witnessing the ascendance of man over the universe and the domination of matter by spirit, and yet, without being a pessimist, one may wonder at the folly of a chaotic material growth that yields in nature while pretending to be honoring them.

Should one, under the circumstances, condemn, decry, or would one suggest, the acceleration of technological progress? Or even claim a moratorium on scientific research? I do not believe so, because scientific discovery, even if it cannot be held responsible. In my opinion, the basic cause of our present dilemmas lies elsewhere. The human race today is at the mercy of the unchecked capabilities of its own inventions—inventions that are blind to their own consequences, or to the means to rectify their mistakes. The problem lies before us if we seek to avert a catastrophe upon future generations. This task is nothing less than to check the determinate effects of technology while at the same time restoring the balance between men of science and men of people.

We will have to embark on a gigantic program of education. To be sure, one cannot expect everyone to master every discipline of science, but they should at least understand its essence, that is, the scientific spirit and method that characterize it.

The limitless powers of modern science call for a redefinition of scientific responsibility. The unpredictable progress of knowledge must comply with the fundamental right of each individual to know. The benefit of science and technology should be made available to all countries, rich or poor.

WHERE ALL ROADS LEAD TO ROAM

(Robert Cantwell)

Along with wheat and forest products, laws are one of the major exports of Oregon. The state is fertile ground for legislative ideas. American voters in general say, “The government ought to do something.” Oregon folks say, “We ought to do something to the government.” It is a land of close votes, of high expectations, of bold experiments, and partial accomplishments. Oregonians are praised abroad but often bog down at home. In the 1860s, when the covered wagon emigrated across the nation, a maker of wagons made a law which led to four drives in the ground which could claim that they were the Homestead Act. This legislation was one of the forerunners of the Homestead Act, which led to the settling of the West. That little boundary line that the family histories of the old aristocracy can usually be traced through the court records of their suits for fraud.

Nowadays, when the citizens of the state

“hundreds of pamphlets”. He is also honored with the Medal of the City of Hartford for community involvement. Dr. Feldman has always worked closely with other religious and civic leaders in the region.

Rabbi Feldman’s religious career has been long and worthy of recognition. He holds the title of President of the Temple Beth Israel in West Hartford where he has recently completed 50 years of leadership in that congregation. He is a past President of the Central Conference of American Rabbis and of the Synagogue Council of America which includes all divisions of the Jewish faith. Rabbi Feldman is the President of the Connecticut State Guard, retiring with the rank of Colonel. He has also been a chaplain to many non-denominational services in the process of over-all planning.

RABBI FELDMAN—"RELIGIOUS Liberal"

Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. President, Rabbi Abraham J. Feldman, of Congregation Beth Israel, West Hartford, Conn., is an old, respected, and dear friend. He has served not only the Jewish community but the overall Hartford community for many, many constructive years. He has also been a chaplain at the Institute of Living for more than 40 years.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, Rabbi Feldman has served the Jewish Community at the Institute of Living as Chaplain for over 40 years. During a recent interview Dr. Feldman reflected on the changes which have evolved in the role of religion within the hospital, and the increasingly relaxed services which have allowed him to interact with patients, to discuss and explain points made during his sermons. He spoke of the many people who have come to him with questions or concerns about the Jewish faith, and especially about the strengths and reasons for their own beliefs.

Over the years Dr. Feldman has worked closely with our other two chaplains, Father Kiely and the Reverend Bobbitt, and expressed the close cooperation among them. He has provided many non-denominational services in the last several years, with the other chaplains on Ecumenical Services which are held, notably on Thanksgiving, each year. The chaplains work out a service, and then take turns delivering the sermon each year. Next Fall will bring the hundredth anniversary of our Elizabeth Chapel, and plans are already in motion for a celebratory ecumenical service. Plans include inviting prominent speakers to participate in the ceremonies.

Two books have come to mind in connection with my remarks. The first is of course a familiar figure here, there are probably many aware of how illustrious a man he is. Dr. Feldman was born in the Ukraine and came to the United States as a boy. He attended Columbia University and received his B.A. from the University of Cincinnati. He then went on to earn the Rabbinical Degree from Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. He will be honored soon at the centennial celebration of the Hebrew Union College which he will attend with his wife.

Time permitting, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WHERE ALL ROADS LEAD TO ROAM

(Robert Cantwell)
are not fishing, or dedicating historic sites and campgrounds, or attending hearings to prevent their dismemberment. Instead, they are putting down volumes of the Oregon Laws and dreaming up ingenious new measures. In fact, increasing the bounty on jackrabbits, whether it wanted to or not. The legislature answered its critics by creating the initiative and referendum, which enables voters to put their own laws on the ballot by their own initiative was a wide sensation when Oregon adopted it in 1970, and other states eventually followed suit. Until Oregon, election officials had rejected ballot measures because they didn’t use enough space, or because they were printed in typewriter type. A questionnaire was sent to 600 bicyclists asking why they rode: For touring? For exercise? For fun? Forty-nine percent replied that they rode for exercise. Ten thousand copies were mailed to names selected by a “silly lottery questionnaire,” hurled by the Eugene Register-Guard, noting that many of the respondents undoubtedly didn’t own bikes.

For their English assignment the sixth-grade class filed out. For three hours equally concerned spokesmen told the committee what was wrong with Oregon’s bicycle paths and how to make them better. They would have liked to see new paths located and why bicycle routes combined with roads or streets were no good. More than 100 witnesses appeared, and from their accounts emerged a picture of the common themes: the bike paths were cracked, broken, washed out or covered with mud. “A pretty lousy job,” said Les Anderson, the mayor of Eugene, who has been swept into office with the enthusiastic support of the city’s bicycle owners. “A waste of money,” said others.

Still, by the time the 1973 Oregon legislative session opened,自行车 highway department had completed or had under construction about 100 miles of bikeways. The legislature answered its critics by setting up the Bicycle Advisory Committee to oversee the program. The eight-member committee goes from town to town holding hear­ings—usually only a few hours long—until 10 at night. A kind of game is involved, absorbing but entirely serious, which anyone with Oregon lawmakers can play. You mark where you think drivers, tailgated by sports cars, toppled by debris, and so harassed, honked at and be­fore they do anything, every single safe bike in Oregon would be one that was able to climb a tree.

In the wake of the testimony of 54 wit­nesses until the accounts of hazards and discomforts set off some automatic switch: each new report sounded like a replay of the one before it. Could this be the result of HB 1700? The Magna Carta of bicycle riders? The measure that cyclists in 30 states were urging their legislatures to adopt? But occasional­ly a speaker described the bicycle paths he would like to see, summoning up a vision of secluded, rustic trails in country settings.

Take Fort Stevens, for example. It stands on a peninsula beside the mouth of the Columbia River. In the days when the Union Army had a fort there, it was sieged by enemy gunfire. It could be the result of HB 1700? The Magna Carta of bicycle riders?

The measure that cyclists in 30 states were urging their legislatures to adopt? But occasional­ly a speaker described the bicycle paths he would like to see, summoning up a vision of secluded, rustic trails in country settings.
Shevlin, a boy in Newberg, south of Portland, was a boy in Newberg, south of Portland, and became famous. He got a job in the sawmill. A legendary ladies' creation, the masquerade, happened by, and the masquerade, sometimes called the most outrageous mistake of London, New York, and Bourne, long after it was well known there was no gold in its mines. The whole town was on the secret, and two different (but identical-appearing) editions of the local newspaper were printed, one containing some news, the other, distributed in distant cities, containing entirely fictitious references to nonexistent gold strikes. The inhabitants spent much of their time talking in case a manufacturer happened by, and the masquerade, sometimes called the most outrageous mistake of London, New York, and Bourne, long after it was well known there was no gold in its mines. The whole town was on the secret, and two different (but identical-appearing) editions of the local newspaper were printed, one containing some news, the other, distributed in distant cities, containing entirely fictitious references to nonexistent gold strikes. The inhabitants spent much of their time talking in case a manufacturer happened by. In order to renew the pledge that every American, regardless of racial or ethnic background, should have an equal right to register and vote, Congress enacted the Voting Rights amendments which extended the ban on discriminatory tests in all jurisdictions for a period of 5 years. This ban is due to expire on August 6. The Voting Rights Extension Act will extend the lifetime of the 1965 law as amended for 10 years and add a number of provisions.

First, a permanent ban would be enacted on literacy tests and other discriminatory voting practices. Second, the bill would prohibit for 7 years, the use of English-only election materials in a jurisdiction if more than 5 percent of the residents of voting age are members of a language minority group. If less than 5 percent of the residents of voting age participated in the 1972 Presidential election. If coverage is triggered under the act, then first, election materials must be provided in the language of the minority group that triggered the coverage, and second, the jurisdiction becomes subject to preclearance and to monitoring by Federal registrars and observers.

Title III of the act also adds provisions to protect against discrimination in voting rights on the basis of illiteracy. If more than 5 percent of the residents of the state in which a jurisdiction are members of a language minority group, they may have an illiteracy rate for the minority group that is higher than the national average, then the jurisdiction must provide election materials in the language of the minority group in question.

Census figures indicate that seven counties in Nevada will come under the coverage of Title III of this act. These counties were found to have Spanish-speaking populations greater than the 5 percent specified in the act combined with an illiteracy rate greater than the
I therefore support this measure. It has short term applicability to Nevada. But it has long-range importance for America. I look forward to the day when laws of this sort will no longer be necessary. If the United States as a whole can match the good will of Nevada in protecting the voting rights of its people, I am confident that day is not far in the future.

THE AEROSOL CONTROVERSY AND JOHNSON WAX

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, as co-sponsor with my colleagues from Oregon, Mr. Packwood, of legislation to regulate aerosol sprays, S. 1982, I read with great interest an advertisement that ran here in Washington in the Star on June 20. It appeared in other publications also.

The ad sets out the Johnson Wax policy on this issue. In print blacker than most of that in the ad, the company policy is spelled out clearly.

Effective today, the company has removed all fluorocarbon propellants from our production lines in the U.S., and we are aggressively reformulating our product ingredients worldwide to achieve the same goal.

I congratulate Johnson Wax, and applaud this decision by the company. Let me point out that it would have been normal, in the minds of some, for this company to close ranks with other companies in opposition to any restrictions on aerosols. I note this fact as the sponsor of the bill, S. 613, to ban all throw-away beverage containers and to substitute returnable bottles.

To Samuel C. Johnson, who signed the ad as chairman of the company, I also extend thanks from the people of Oregon, where a law has been signed to put limits on aerosols using certain fluorocarbons. I hope residents of Oregon will show their support of this company's decision in the marketplace, where it can be known that consumerism pays off "on the bottom line," to quote the phrase currently in vogue.

People who are concerned about the allegations regarding ozone damage should support companies such as Johnson, where they would rather switch than fight.

I imagine some of the other companies with a stake in continuing unregulated fluorocarbons in aerosols will tell me that Johnson was about to do this anyway, for various reasons. That possibility could be true. I do not know. I do know, however, that we should recognize when a company veers away from the pack in these situations. Here, they are putting the customers' welfare first, and I want to thank them.

I call the attention of my colleagues to this statement contained in this ad, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the ad and an article by Steven Greenhouse entitled "Aerosol Feels the Ozone Effect" which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, June 22, 1975, be printed in the Record.

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

Dear Customer:

For 89 years my family and our company have endeavored to develop new, modern, efficient quality products.

Our company still is a family venture; I am the fourth-generation member to head it. We have four children, so, I hope, will want to carry on the tradition.

About 25 years ago, modern technology brought to the American homemaker a familiar symbol of the age of ease and convenience. This was the aerosol can.

As you are no doubt aware, a lot of confusion and consternation has developed over the last few months about aerosols. Since we have been closely involved in their development over the past couple of decades and because we know a great deal about aerosols, I want to try to clear up some of the misapprehensions you may have about them.

The most important problem right now is that some aerosol cans release a certain tentatively named greenhouse gas that some scientists feel may be damaging the upper atmosphere ozone layer around the earth.

Although this was a totally unforeseen concern, scientific investigation is constantly providing a vital public service by calling attention things about our environment that may present serious problems.

The particular aerosol propellant under question is a fluorocarbon. It has several trade names, (e.g., Freon, Genetron, Ucon, Isotron). Some scientists feel that the possible impairment of the ozone layer in the upper atmosphere would permit greater penetration of the sun's ultra-violet rays with unforeseen effects on our health.

Obviously this is a very serious concern. However, company scientists confirm that as a scientific hypothesis it may be possible, but conclusive evidence is not available one way or another, at this time.

We concur that the pressing need is for reliable scientific investigation; this is being carried on by the International Ozone Committee. In addition, the National Academy of Sciences has stratospheric investigations underway expected to be completed early next year. Additional investigations are being sponsored by aerosol manufacturers and suppliers.

Not all aerosols contain fluorocarbons.

In the meantime, it is important to note that not all aerosol products sold in this country contain fluorocarbon propellants. As a matter of fact, approximately half of all aerosol products use other kinds of propellants, including hydrocarbons and carbon dioxide.

About 15 years ago Johnson Wax invented what is known as the "water-base" aerosol system that permitted the use of propellants other than fluorocarbons in many household products.

As a result, we have been reducing our use of fluorocarbon propellants over a long period for a variety of different reasons, including that we made the decision to use our unique water-base formulations using other propellants are less expensive.

During the past three years, fluorocarbons have made up less than five percent of the total propellants we use. And because we share the concern of our customers and do not wish to have the public think we are expected to do so in our products, we have made a policy decision.
Numerous scientific studies have confirmed the initial (1974) Rolfs and Molina report of fluorocarbon-caused ozone depletion:

Ten days ago a Federal interagency task force recommended after four months of study that all aerosol propellants be banned by January, 1978—unless today's ozone depletion theories are refuted.

Last Monday, Oregon became the first state to enact a bill banning fluorocarbon aerosols, effective March 1, 1977. Legislation in 13 other states and in Congress has introduced bills to ban, restrict or amend aerosol fluorocarbons. Last year, after a quarter century of spectacular growth in which aerosol production rocketed from 4.3 million cans in 1947 to a record 2.7 billion cans in 1976, production dropped to 2.7 billion cans, reflecting both the ozone controversy and recession.

This year, some aerosol producers have cut output by 25 percent or more. Hoping to postpone or prevent additional market erosion, the aerosol industry has begun its own ozone study, mustered sophisticated lobbies against anti fluorocarbon bills, and expanded research and development programs.

Aerosol spray cans use pressurized gases such as chlorofluorocarbons as propellants. These gases hold the can's active ingredients—deodorant, insecticide, plant growth stimulator, or any one of 300 others. Whether products injure or are helpful, when the aerosol valve is pressed, the propellant shoots out of the can and forms a fine mist, taking the active ingredients with it.

About half the aerosols sold are propelled by fluorocarbons—which constitute the problem now being debated. They are compounds of carbon, chlorine and fluorine. Personal care products, which often employ a water base, which overpowers the flammable gases that reduce the flammability of personal care products, which often have an alcohol base. If fluorocarbons, which are cheaper than fluorocarbons, were used as propellants for alcohol-based aerosols, the result would be an extremely flammable product.

Shaving creams and most household products, furniture polish and air fresheners, use hydrocarbons, which are not suspected of depleting ozone. These products employ a combination of ethylene, which overpowers the hydrocarbons' flammability.

Aerosols are not the only things being affected. The downside of the controversy is the outright ban of fluorocarbon aerosols.

Before any other states or Congress join Oregon in legislating bans, the industry wants time to research whether projected ozone depletion will be borne out in experimentation.

One industry spokesman, who requested anonymity, said, "All the scientific theories against fluorocarbons are just that—-theories, not facts. What we need is more research before there are any more bans or badmouthing. We don't want another false scare."

Critics, however, assert that any delay in banning the product will mean increased ozone depletion and an inexusable increase in skin cancer and Presidential support for the aerosol ban is strong.

The industry assures its critics that, like everyone else, it does not want to see more ozone losses. But if the consensus is not accurate, useful industry should not be sued without conclusive proof of damage.

Indeed, the industry is confident that the ozone depletion theories will be overturned. "It is possible that consumers are starting to regard Rowland's assumptions as the non-sense they are," Mr. Abplanalp said.

A. Karim El-Maliky, staff scientist of the Natural Resources Defense Council, an environmental organization with offices on both coasts, looks harshly upon the aerosol industry's tactics.

"It's like Watergate," he said. "They want to see a smoking gun. Well, we'll have to wait 25 years for that, and by then the irreparable damage will be well underway."

"They haven't come up with one iota of evidence that the scientists' theories are wrong, and we've been waiting a full year."

To conduct research for the industry, 30 corporations and five trade associations have formed the Council on Atmospheric Studies, which has a three-year study costing up to $5 million of how chlorine-containing compounds, including fluorocarbons, affect the atmosphere and stratosphere.

Meanwhile, state legislators have introduced their fluorocarbon bills, and the industry is making every effort to turn them back. In six of the 14
right, and in four all action on fluorocarbon aerosols is dormant.

In California, the bill was killed in committee by State Sen. O. E. Harrington, a staff consultant on the legislation, defeat followed the concentrated efforts of DuPont, Continental Can, American Can, the California Manufacturers Association, the California Chamber of Commerce, the Teamsters union and other labor unions.

Mr. Harrington said that one Senator on the committee considering the bill had been visited by 12 industry representatives.

In a letter overwhelmingly passed on June 2 a bill that would ban fluorocarbon aerosols beginning Oct. 1, 1978, unless the state's environmental commissioner rules that they are harmless.

The bill now awaits action in the Senate Rules Committee.

Raymond L. McCarthy, technical director of DuPont's Freon division, commented that "the bill gives the industry the real and impossible task of proving that something will never happen."

In Congress, Representative Paul D. Rogers, Democrat of California chairs the subcommittee on public health and the environment, originally drafted an amendment to the bill that would have banned fluorocarbon aerosols.

However, under industry pressure, Mr. Rogers' amendment was killed so that instead of requiring a ban it would require the Environmental Protection Administration to report to Congress within two years, after researching ozone depletion, to recommend whether action be taken.

For now, the bill is held up in committee but may be spurred or even strengthened by the recent Federal interagency task force's recommendations in favor of a ban.

Some estimate that, in the event of a ban, three to nine years would be needed to develop and market substitutes which would match fluorocarbon aerosols desirable characteristics--scarcity of spray, nonflammability and chemical inertness.

Aerosol critics maintain that there need be no great search for substitutes at all, maintaining that acceptable alternatives are already on the market. They also criticize aerosol packaging, hazardous waste and being non-reusable and expensive.

A recent consumer study found that one aerosol antiperspirant contained 4.3% times as much propylene glycol as the manufacturer's roll-on.

The price difference was attributed to most aerosols being composed of 46 to 48% of the inert ingredients (propulsive agents) and only 5 to 15% active ingredients.

With aerosols under attack, there are signs that non-aerosol sales are rising. Pump-tops, roll-ons, squeeze sprays and just plain bottles are selling strongly, and several companies have started actively promoting non-aerosols.

Gillette, whose Right Guard deodorant and Adore and the Dry Lock hair sprays in aerosol cans account for 10 per cent of company sales, has just put its first pump-top hair spray on the market.

Bristol-Myers, which produces Ban deodorant and Vitalis and Clairol hair sprays in aerosols, has introduced two new pump-top hair sprays, one for men and one for women.

Carter-Wallace, marketer of Arrid aerosol antiperspirant, is testing two squeeze spray products, an anti-perspirant and a hair spray.

Nevertheless, millions are still buying aerosol products, an attractive and convenient aerosol substitutes to fluorocarbons will continue.

Last week Johnson Wax burst out of the starting blocks in the race when it announced that it had reformulated the three fluorocarbon-propelled aerosols--two insect repellants and an insecticide--in its large line of household aerosols to allow them to use cheaper, non-suspect hydrocarbon propellants.

The Sterigard Corporation of Irvin, Calif., has patented an aerosol that consists of a plastic bag holding the active ingredients, with a pressurized gas surrounding the bag within the can.

The gas forces the contents out of the bag and a break-up valve vaporizes the contents. The propellant is hydrocarbon dioxide or just compressed air, remaining in the can. Since no propellant escapes, much makes for a cheaper product--and no pollution.

The question with innovative substitutes, of course, is whether they will work. The Davies Can Company of Solon, Ohio, a subsidiary of the Van Dorn Company, is making the Sterigard can and preparing to market it. The confidence that the product has great promise.

However, the American Can Company, having produced and sold several thousand Sterigards, halted production. It concluded that they wouldn't work because of problems in seams in their sides.

ALBUQUERQUE JEWISH WAR VETERANS

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America represent the oldest war veteran organization in the United States, founded in March 1866. Jews have served with distinction in U.S. wars from the Revolution to the war in Vietnam, and have always participated in all military and naval events and their actions have been due numerical proportion.

Today I am proud to recognize that an organization of such fine men, Albuquerque Post No. 375, has been established for the first time in the State of New Mexico.

Installation of officers and administration of the oath to 77 charter members of Albuquerque Post No. 375 of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, took place on June 14, 1975. Those responsible for the formation of this historic post were the installed officers: Robert Fleisher, commander; Ben Sidles, senior vice commander; Joseph S. Feit, junior vice commander; Marvin Dollin, quartermaster; Ben Bernknopf, adjutant; and Charles Glass, Esq., judge advocate.

Also involved in the creation of post No. 375 were installation committee chairman Gerald I. Feit; installation officer Lawrence Mandell, deputy Texas commander; George Fenster, national deputy chief of staff, and Mr. Sol Hoffman.

I ask unanimous consent that certain copies of the Congressional Record to me at the following address: Gerald I. Feit, 310 Cerro de Ortega Dr., S.E., Corrales Heights, Rio Rancho, New Mexico 87124.

I shall have them distributed amongst our members.

The list of Officers Installed are as follows: Commander, Robert Fleisher.

Senior Vice Commander, Ben Sidles.

Junior Vice Commander, Joseph S. Feit.

Quartermaster, Marvin Dollin.

Adjutant, Ben Bernknopf.

Judge Advocate, Charles Glass, Esq., Chairman of Installation Committee--Gerald I. Feit.

Thank you for your time and trouble in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT FLEISHER, Commander.

(For the Commander, Gerald I. Feit, Chairman of Installation Committee).
JEWISH VETS TO TAKE OATHS

U.S. Sen. Joseph Montoya, D-N.M., will be the featured speaker Saturday at installation ceremonies for offices of Albuquerque Post 375 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, U.S. The ceremonies, which will include the administration of oath to all charter members of the post, will be held Sunday at the Albuquerque Airport. Cocktails will be from 6 to 7 p.m., the installation ceremony will begin at 7:30 p.m. and a buffet dinner will begin at 8 p.m.

Admission is $6 a person and tickets will be available at the door.

Albuquerque Post No. 375, Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A. cordially invites you to attend the Institution of Albuquerque Post No. 375.

Installation of Officers and Administration of Oath to all Charter Members to be held on Saturday, June 14, 1975 at the Sun Room of the Albuquerque Airport.

Cocktails: 6:00-7:00 P.M.
Installation Ceremony: 7:00 P.M.
Buffet Dinner: 8:00 P.M.

Admission $6.00 per person, payable at the door.

DISTRIBUTION OF ALBUQUERQUE, N. W. Post No. 375, JEWISH VETERANS OF THE U.S.A. AND INSTALLATION OF OFFICERS

Chairman: Gerald I. Felt, Dept. Executive Committee, N.Y. Past Comdr, Bronx County, N.Y. Founder, Organizer & Past Comdr, Fellowship Pathway Parkway Post No. 769.


PROGRAM

Entrance Music: Grand March, Aida, Act II, Verdi; By Boston Pops Orchestra, Arthur Fiedler, Conductor. The American Army (Military Quickstep) By National Gallery, Art Institute of Chicago, Member of the Jewish War Veterans of the Albuquerque Airport.

Preparation of Altar by Dept. of Texas: Ruffles and Flourishes.

Color Guard and Air Force Base, T/Sgt.-Robert H. Griffith, T/Sgt.-James E. Hardin, T/Sgt.-Dale L. Dunnell, AIC-Danny J. McCarthy, AIC-George D. Fenster, Ben Bernknopf, Marvin D. Dolin, Quarter-master of Post 375 for his aid in the program and for obtaining the Commanders and Membership pins, and for permitting the Post to meet the regulations.

Installation of Officers: Sound of Sol Hoffman and Ben Sides, Sr. Vice Comdr.

Frank Lyons, Manager of Fred Harvey Restaurant of Albuquerque Air Base.

THE ADMINISTRATION’S OIL POLICY—WHO ADMINISTERS IT?

Mr. ABOURREZIK. Mr. President, in the last 6 months, the President’s energy proposals have been greeted consistently with cheers of support from the oil industry.

In fact, it is often difficult for me to distinguish between administration policy and the self-interested proposals of the oil companies. Can it be oil or can it be the oil companies? I believe that significant numbers of former oil company employees, lawyers, and consultants occupy top-grade positions in the Federal agencies, with responsibilities directly affecting their former employers and associates.

I asked the GAO to identify such individuals in 11 agencies working at the GS-13 level and above. All but two agencies responded in whole or in part. They found at least 201 people with ties to energy companies. These agencies all have responsibilities which bring them into direct competition with oil companies. They administer vast Federal budgets, help determine energy policy and administer the regulations which are supposed to implement that policy. At all of these levels, these employees have inputs of every conceivable nature, from the smallest adjustment to the broadest exemption.

This situation provides ample potential for abuse. Couple this with the recent revelations of matter-of-course corporate campaign contributions, and you have a meshing of Government activity and oil company interests that bodes ill for the diffuse, underrepresented public interest.

Now, I know that the presence of former oil executives in Government is nothing new. Indeed, I fear that it is business as usual.

Yet I submit that the presence of at least 201 former oil company employees and affiliates in top-level positions in the executive agencies raises serious questions about the nature of our energy policy.

The companies listed below do not control only domestic oil supplies. They control production and reserves in each and every one of the fuels available to the consuming public and to energy intensive industries. They control enormous capital reserves, and their financial behavior affects every segment of our economic lives from balance of payment to unemployment, to whether or not you can borrow money to buy a house.

Clearly, it would be useful, if these companies had a good understanding with and access to a couple of Under Secretaries of the Treasury, The No. 1 industrial corporation in the United States, Exxon, is also No. 1 in former employees working for the Government.

Is there no relation between these two facts?

The overall figure of 201 does not include all individuals formerly associated with oil companies. Of the 11 agencies combined, the CIA, according to the GAO, did not answer its phone. The Commerce Department under Frederick Dent refused to comply with the GAO inquiry even though ordered to do so by the Civil Service Commission. I have written to Secretary Morton to ask that he supply the information requested. The Treasury Department response excludes certain personnel. The FEA declines to say whether persons in its Office of General Counsel had had previous company clients. Thus, we can assume that today’s figure is greater than 201.

If the FEA is presenting today merits closer scrutiny, for the actions of individuals can be as important as the diffuse presence of many close associates who are sympathetic to the needs and problems of the oil industry. Has its special duties with regard to the regulation or other ties to the oil companies.

For example, though its make-up will soon change, the Federal Power Commission was headed by lawyers whose law firms represented corporate oil and gas clients. Can it be any surprise that these commissioners, with one exception, have all but announced that they favor deregulation of gas prices by the regulatory agency they head?

In the FEA, 65 individuals have ties with oil companies. Forty-two had ties with major and smaller companies, and the rest are former oil company employees or consultants. If the Federal Energy Administration is supposed to implement the policies of the Federal Energy Administration, it is hard to see how its independent role is maintained.

The allocations and equalization programs distinguish significantly between major and smaller companies, and between integrated and independent refiners. What better way to ensure that the point of view of the companies which dominate the oil industry will dominate the Government.
FEA personnel formerly in oil company employ have responsibility over what petrochemical plants and refineries are eligible for import quotas; set up programs to alleviate the supposed gas and oil shortage; and exchange views on legislation and administration of mineral leases. These are sensitive posts of particular interest to oil and gas companies.

In the Treasury Department, 21 former employees of oil companies are spread among the top grades and supergrades. Two Treasury undersecretaries—one quit last week, citing poverty—came from the oil companies.

In the Department of Defense, 6 of the 19 former oil company employees serve as consultants—to the tune of $138 per day. One wonders at the need for six "consultants." What is their role?

Exxon it should be remembered, is one of the 25 largest defense contractors. The Deputy Secretary of Defense is formerly an Exxon consultant. It is the chairman of the board and chief executive of the Oil Company, Inc.

The Department of the Interior, Department of Commerce, Department of Transportation, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission are eligible for import quotas; set up procedures and administer them by the oil company executives.

The Central Intelligence Agency, Energy Research and Development Administration, and the Federal Power Commission are sensitive posts of personnel that preserve this balance. They must be made public and available to the GAO.

There being no objection, the report from the U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C., on its examination of the report of the Comptroller General of the United States is admitted.

Mr. President, I think it is of enormous importance to make these facts available to the public. They can draw their own conclusions. I ask unanimous consent that the contents of the report from the GAO be printed in the Record.

The majority leader said the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department or agency</th>
<th>Number of employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Research and Development Administration</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Power Commission</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Commerce Commission</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 201

1. Includes one employee below the GS-13 level.
2. Includes two employees below the GS-13 level.

The Central Intelligence Agency did not respond and our efforts to contact the Agency to determine if plans to respond have been unsuccessful.

Although the Civil Service Commission advised the Secretary of Commerce that he should make the requested information available to us, the Secretary advised us that he was unable to furnish the information because it was impossible to identify the individuals about whom the information was sought within a detailed analysis of the lump-sum payment records of nearly 10,000 employees and, on the basis of past experience, soliciting the information directly from employees would result in any aggregate man-hour savings.

The task was not feasible within the time allowed.

And the Department believed the release of the information for the stated purpose would be a clearly unwarranted invasion of the personal privacy of the individuals involved.

Enclosure 1 contains our analysis of the departments' and agencies' responses. For Federal employment, we have listed the employee's name, grade, and position/title. Our analysis does not show whether the employee was an expert or consultant position. However, with only a few exceptions, such individuals are paid the same maximum rate allowable—the daily equivalent of $36,000 per annum or $138 for each day services are rendered. For the employee's former employment, we have listed the company name, position/title, and any lump-sum payments or deferred compensation rights received at time of separation. The enclosure also contains a list of examples of the duties performed by the employees in their Federal positions.

Enclosure 2 contains the department's or agency's letter transmitting the requested information to us and fact sheets on each employee. This enclosure also includes the lump-sum payments and deferred compensation rights received at time of separation. The memorandum contains the rationale used by the departments and agencies in responding or not responding to the request.

We trust the information furnished will serve the purpose of your request. We do not plan to distribute this report further unless you agree or publicly announce its contents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee name</th>
<th>Grade/Position/Title</th>
<th>Company name</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adie, Joseph H.</td>
<td>GS-13 Personnel management specialist</td>
<td>Texas Oil Co.</td>
<td>Warehouseman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliah, Robert R.</td>
<td>GS-14 Physical science administrator</td>
<td>Exxon Standard Oil Co.</td>
<td>Weightman/electrician</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal employment—Federal Energy Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

LISTING OF FORMER OIL COMPANY, OIL COMPANY AFFILIATED AND OIL COMPANY RELATED EXECUTIVES AS WELL AS ATTORNEYS WHO THEMSELVES OR WHOSE LAW FIRMS REPRESENT OIL COMPANIES NOW WORKING FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN POSITIONS PRIMARILY ABOVE THE GS-12 LEVEL.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position/Title</th>
<th>Company name</th>
<th>Position/Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Texas W.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Director, operations division</td>
<td>LeSidne Refining Co.</td>
<td>Laborer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arens, Herbert H.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Congressional and intergovernmental</td>
<td>Harbinger Oil.</td>
<td>Management trainee, special task force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relations officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>member, real estate analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeker, Robert O.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Supervisory price analyst</td>
<td>Union Oil Co. of California.</td>
<td>Accounting clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeny, Robert B.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Economist</td>
<td>Continental Oil Co.</td>
<td>District representative and real estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agent supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevan, William</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Petroleum engineer</td>
<td>Shell Oil Co.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cebie, James A.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Member, Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Sunray Oil Co.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connal, Melvin A.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Executive V... Assistant administrator</td>
<td>Exxon Corp.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for international energy affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cree, Edward G.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Supervisory financial analyst</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Corp.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'Ambra, Lucio A.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Industrial specialist</td>
<td>Ohio Oil Co.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, Dwayne</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Supervisory industrial specialist</td>
<td>Gulf Oil Co.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas, R. Dean</td>
<td>GS-12</td>
<td>Program analyst</td>
<td>Oasis Oil Co.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupuy, Kenneth L.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Acting regional administrator</td>
<td>Standard Oil of California.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezzel, Alii</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>International economist</td>
<td>Iranian Oil Refining Co.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill, James R.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Petroleum engineer</td>
<td>Gulf Oil Co.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwell, Darrell D.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Supervisory case resolution officer</td>
<td>Ohio Oil Co.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiler, Donald, K.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>Gulf Oil Co.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haase, John E., Jr.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Auditor</td>
<td>Humble Oil</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, George E.</td>
<td>GS-17</td>
<td>Fuels manager</td>
<td>Cities Service Oil Co.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsh, Douglas</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Industrial specialist</td>
<td>Croix Oil Co.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes, Donald, K.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Union Texas Natural Gas Co.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, Leon</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Co.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahn, Robert M.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Industrial specialist</td>
<td>Atlantic Oil Co.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane, Robert J.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Industrial specialist</td>
<td>Standard Oil Co.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keenon, Phillip F.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Program analyst</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Corp.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koenig, Karl Dennis</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Petroleum specialist</td>
<td>Gulf Oil Corp.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugao, Gerald L.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Economist</td>
<td>Shell Oil Co.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langdon, James C.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Supervisory natural law specialist</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Co.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layton, Sydney</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Operations research analyst</td>
<td>Shell Oil Co.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, John R.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Economist</td>
<td>Harbinger Oil</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichtenthaler, Charles</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Auditor</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Corp.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lufles, Lawrence</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Physical science administrator</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Corp.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malin, Clement B.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Foreign affairs officer</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Corp.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple, Ivan F.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Trade specialist</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Corp.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfield, Ira C.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Physical science administrator</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Corp.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCauley, James A.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Director, operations division</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Corp.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehovic, George E.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Executive assistant</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Corp.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metz, Alfred C.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Supervisory industrial specialist</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Corp.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, Robert W.</td>
<td>GS-16</td>
<td>Regional administrator</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Corp.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, James B.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Program analyst</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Corp.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muller, John G.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Mechanical engineer</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Corp.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nugent, John M., Jr.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Staff assistant</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Corp.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver, David R.</td>
<td>GS-12</td>
<td>Assistant director programs and analysis</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Corp.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osborne, John H.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Program analyst</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Corp.</td>
<td>Financial analyst/computer analyst</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lump-sum payments or deferred compensation rights received on separation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
<th>Company name</th>
<th>Former employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parker, Norbert A</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Geologist</td>
<td>Carter Oil Co.</td>
<td>Lamp-sum payments or deferred compensation rights received on separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>British Oil Development Co., Ltd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E. &amp; D. Bryant Co. &amp; Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stanolind Oil &amp; Gas Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B &amp; G Oil Basin Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Davis Bros. Oil Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kewanee Oil Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conoco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisory resource development</td>
<td>OLUM Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>automobile specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelto, Chester R.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Supervisory geologist</td>
<td>Standard Oil Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry, Dell V.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Assistant director</td>
<td>Humble Oil Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prexley, Donald R</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Auditor</td>
<td>Shell Oil Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandgren, Fred A</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Financial analyst</td>
<td>California Research Corp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stein, David I</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Director, industrial systems</td>
<td>Exxon Corp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story, Joseph C</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>International economist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Barlock</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Economist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topping, Clyde P</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Industry economist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenkle, Erwin</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Economist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinson, Stanley L</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Auditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner, Arthur J</td>
<td>GS-16</td>
<td>Physical scientist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, George W</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Supervisor case resolution officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willock, Jack</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Petroleum engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willock, Jack</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Petroleum engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Samuel O</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Petroleum engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yost, Stewart W</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Expert—energy resource development</td>
<td>Shell Oil Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Listing of former oil company, oil company affiliated and oil company related executives as well as attorneys who themselves or whose law firms represent oil companies now working for the Federal Government in positions primarily above the GS-12 level.**

**FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION**

Excerpts of duties performed by the above employees:

- Performing economic analyses of current and proposed energy conservation measures.
- Coordinating and implementing programs for energy self-sufficiency.
- Determining eligibility of petrochemical plants and refineries for import quotas.
- Analyzing capacities and facilities for transmission and distribution of natural and manufactured gas.
- Identifying factors causing oil and gas shortages and developing programs to alleviate this problem.
- Developing recommendations for legislation and administration procedures to update mineral leasing acts.
- Developing, reviewing, and coordinating policies related to internationally-oriented activities in areas of energy matters, multinational corporations, equitable allocation, pooling and utilizations.

**LISTING OF FORMER OIL COMPANY, OIL COMPANY AFFILIATED AND OIL COMPANY RELATED EXECUTIVES AS WELL AS ATTORNEYS WHO THEMSELVES OR WHOSE LAW FIRMS REPRESENT OIL COMPANIES NOW WORKING FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN POSITIONS PRIMARILY ABOVE THE GS-12 LEVEL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
<th>Company name</th>
<th>Former employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams, Maurice V</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Area oil and gas supervisor</td>
<td>Century Services, Inc.</td>
<td>Lamp-sum payment or deferred compensation rights received on separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avery, William H</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Staff assistant to Assistant Secretary—Energy and Minerals</td>
<td>Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauprez, D. Ols.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Standard Oil of New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackmore, R.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Hydrologist</td>
<td>Petrobras Brasileiro S.A.</td>
<td>Geological supervisor—Exploration geologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, William S</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Patent attorney</td>
<td>Union Oil Co. of California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, Morton W</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Chief, Bureau of Land and Minerals, Division of Resources</td>
<td>Tidewater Oil Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman, C. Browder, Jr.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Assistant Solicitor, Territories</td>
<td>American Pipeline Corp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, C. Keith</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Geologist (administrative)</td>
<td>American Strategic Corp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froelich, Albert J</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Geologist</td>
<td>San Jose Oil Co., Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrity, Thomas A</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Field selector</td>
<td>Canso Oil &amp; Gas Ltd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammel, Judge</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Administrative Law Judge</td>
<td>Magellan Petroleum Corp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waid, William</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Geologist</td>
<td>Sinclair Petroleum Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Federal employment—Department of the Interior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
<th>Company name</th>
<th>Former employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams, Maurice V</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Area oil and gas supervisor</td>
<td>Century Services, Inc.</td>
<td>Lamp-sum payment or deferred compensation rights received on separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avery, William H</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Staff assistant to Assistant Secretary—Energy and Minerals</td>
<td>Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauprez, D. Ols.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Standard Oil of New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackmore, R.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Hydrologist</td>
<td>Petrobras Brasileiro S.A.</td>
<td>Geological supervisor—Exploration geologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, William S</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Patent attorney</td>
<td>Union Oil Co. of California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, Morton W</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Chief, Bureau of Land and Minerals, Division of Resources</td>
<td>Tidewater Oil Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman, C. Browder, Jr.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Assistant Solicitor, Territories</td>
<td>American Pipeline Corp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, C. Keith</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Geologist (administrative)</td>
<td>American Strategic Corp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froelich, Albert J</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Geologist</td>
<td>San Jose Oil Co., Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrity, Thomas A</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Field selector</td>
<td>Canso Oil &amp; Gas Ltd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammel, Judge</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Administrative Law Judge</td>
<td>Magellan Petroleum Corp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waid, William</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Geologist</td>
<td>Sinclair Petroleum Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee name</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Position/title</td>
<td>Company name</td>
<td>Former employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horowitz, Raymond H.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Research chemist</td>
<td>Central Research Laboratories</td>
<td>Research chemist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbert, M. King</td>
<td>GS-17</td>
<td>Research geophysicologist</td>
<td>Amerada Petroleum, Shell Oil Co., Shell Development Co.</td>
<td>Commercial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings, Thomas</td>
<td>GS-12</td>
<td>Petroleum engineer</td>
<td>Mobile Oil Co. de Venezuela</td>
<td>Senior petroleum engineer/ planning associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy, Joseph B.</td>
<td>GS-16</td>
<td>Administrative Law Judge</td>
<td>Bowrey &amp; Simon</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketner, W. P.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Deputy Chief, Office of Scientific Publications</td>
<td>Cities Service Oil Co.</td>
<td>Assistant to chief geologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimball, Sherman P.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Member (Administrative Judge)</td>
<td>Board of Contract Appeals</td>
<td>Staff attorney on staff of general counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kublin, John A.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Civil Policy Coordinator</td>
<td>Consolidation Coal Co. of Continental Oil Co.</td>
<td>Assistant vice president-sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanz, Robert J.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Geologist</td>
<td>The Pure Oil Co.</td>
<td>Division stratigrapher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libby, D.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Staff assistant, environment consultant</td>
<td>U.S. Potash &amp; Chemical Co.</td>
<td>Executive vice president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lohrnen, John</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Chief, SA development</td>
<td>International Petroleum Inc.</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallory, Charles K., Jr.</td>
<td>GS-17</td>
<td>Deputy Assistant Secretary (Power Resources and Legislation)</td>
<td>Carter Oil Co. (wholly-owned subsidiary of Standard Oil Co. of N.J. (now Exxon)).</td>
<td>Landman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherhead, James R.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Assistant Regional Solicitor</td>
<td>Carter Oil Co.</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, Alan K.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Assistant Solicitor</td>
<td>Covington &amp; Burling</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish, William W.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Assistant to the Secretary</td>
<td>Aramco</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmitt, James K.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Law firm (name not given)</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, David W.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Geologist</td>
<td>Texaco Co.</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shreve, Dewitt C.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Attorney-advisor</td>
<td>Anglo-Hollingbrook Oil Co.</td>
<td>Exploration manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons, Gayton H., Jr.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Staff assistant to Assistant Secretary, Management (as member of President’s executive interchange program).</td>
<td>Sen Oil Co.</td>
<td>Senior attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soper, Charles M.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Assistant solicitor</td>
<td>Rockwell International</td>
<td>Dean of geological sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talley, John R.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Assistant regional solicitor</td>
<td>Continental Oil Co.</td>
<td>Staff engineer, district office and chief reservoir and well engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trachut, Robert H.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Research botanist (cactobotanist)</td>
<td>Creole Petroleum Corp.</td>
<td>Assistant research coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worrell, James E.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Assistant regional solicitor</td>
<td>Exxon Oil Co.</td>
<td>Tax attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnickie, William E.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Petroleum engineer</td>
<td>Stallion Research</td>
<td>President and manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of former oil company, oil company affiliated and oil company related executives as well as attorneys who themselves or whose law firms represent oil companies now working for the Federal Government in positions primarily above the GS-12 level:

Developing theoretical analyses of geologic structure and processes and conducting studies of energy resources. Collecting and analyzing offshore engineering and environmental data concerning the Outer Continental Shelf leasing program. Rendering legal advice on problems resulting from the expanded energy related activities. Approving permits on shore for oil and gas lease management. Communicating with individual members of Congress on administration and policy matters affecting energy and minerals. Presiding over formal hearings held by the Department. Formulating, directing, and evaluating all programs related to government information service, e.g., oil and gas resources. Determining appeals by contractors on disputed questions. Directing research and design of automated systems used to plan and manage a national program of energy and mineral resource evaluation and lease. Developing training programs.
Federal employment—Federal Energy Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
<th>Company name</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burkhardt, Winston</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Sr. chemical engineer</td>
<td>Aerojet General Corp.</td>
<td>Site manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, Walter R</td>
<td>GS-16</td>
<td>Branch chief, DRL</td>
<td>Shell Oil Co.</td>
<td>Research chemist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colton, John P</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Fuel fabrication engineer</td>
<td>Gulf United Nuclear Corp.</td>
<td>Quality control manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kovacs, John M</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Mechanical engineer</td>
<td>Aerojet-General</td>
<td>Engineering specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraus, Harry Eueribus Peter, Jr.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Licensing project manager</td>
<td>Exxon Nuclear</td>
<td>Senior nuclear engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larson, Howard James</td>
<td>GS-17</td>
<td>Director, materials and fuel cycle facility licensing.</td>
<td>Allied-General Nuclear Services (a Gulf Oil Corp.)</td>
<td>President and general manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacIntosh, Richard B. NA</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Phillips Petroleum Co. (Hanford Nuclear Corp.)</td>
<td>Manager of licensing for enrichment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker, Frank L</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Atlantic Richfield Hanford Co.</td>
<td>Consultant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmucker, Robert D. GS-15</td>
<td>Business development manager</td>
<td>Gulf Nuclear Fuel Co. (and predecessor)</td>
<td>NA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schroeder, Frank, Jr. GS-17</td>
<td>Actmg Director</td>
<td>Division of Technical Review, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation</td>
<td>Phillips Petroleum Co.</td>
<td>Manager, water reactor safety program office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiley, S. N.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Director, Office of Special Studies</td>
<td>NUMEC—subsidiary of Atlantic Richfield</td>
<td>Manager, research and development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Former employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
<th>Company name</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beardsley, Bruce M.</td>
<td>GS-16</td>
<td>Director, Office of Computer Science</td>
<td>Phillips Petroleum Co.</td>
<td>Manager, computer science branch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett, Jack F.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Executive level III, Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs</td>
<td>Standard Oil Co. and subsidiaries</td>
<td>Director, ESSO International.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dam, Kenneth W</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant (intermittent)</td>
<td>Kirkland &amp; Ellis</td>
<td>Consultant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easley, Philip L</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Program analysis officer</td>
<td>Ohio Oil Co. (now Marathon Oil Co.)</td>
<td>Senior petroleum engineer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Samuel C.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Equal opportunity specialist</td>
<td>Sinclair International Oil Co. (now part of Atlantic Richfield)</td>
<td>Corporate personnel advisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard, Robert A.</td>
<td>GS-17</td>
<td>Director, capital markets policy</td>
<td>Atlantic Richfield Co.</td>
<td>Associate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbs, Lawrence V.</td>
<td>GS-18</td>
<td>Assistant Commissioner (technical)</td>
<td>Branchock, Thompson, Galy &amp; Hall, Partner</td>
<td>Not given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong, Donald J.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Attorney-adviser (tax legislation)</td>
<td>Brobeck, Phleger &amp; Harrison</td>
<td>Associate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemple, Roger J.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Special projects officer</td>
<td>Gulf Oil Co.</td>
<td>Region marketing manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDonald, David R.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Executive level IV, Assistant secretary (enforcement, operations, and tariff affairs)</td>
<td>Kirkland, Ellis, Hodson, Chaffetz &amp; Masters</td>
<td>Attorney.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnote on following page.
LISTING OF FORMER OIL COMPANY, OIL COMPANY AFFILIATED AND OIL COMPANY RELATED EXECUTIVES AS WELL AS ATTORNEYS WHO THEMSELVES OR WHOSE LAW FIRMS REPRESENT OIL COMPANIES NOW WORKING FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN POSITIONS PRIMARILY ABOVE THE GS-12 LEVEL—Continued

Federal employment—Department of the Treasury

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
<th>Company name</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann, Phillip L.</td>
<td>GS-18</td>
<td>Director, Office of Tax Legislative Counsel</td>
<td>Fulbright &amp; Jaworski</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCracken, Paul W.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant (intermittent)</td>
<td>Standard Oil Co. of Ohio</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naehrke, Stephen A.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant (intermittent)</td>
<td>Surrey, Karasaki &amp; Morse</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodes, Theodore I.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Attorney-advisor (tax legislation)</td>
<td>Morrison, Forester, Halloway, Clinton &amp; Clark</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmitts, Edward C.</td>
<td>Executive Level III</td>
<td>Under Secretary of Treasury</td>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitaker, Meade</td>
<td>Executive Level V</td>
<td>Chief counsel for the Internal Revenue Service</td>
<td>Cabaniss, Johnston, Gardner, &amp; Clark</td>
<td>Attorney and partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whithall, William H.</td>
<td>GS-17</td>
<td>International economist (Director, Office of Financial Resources)</td>
<td>Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey</td>
<td>Economist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of former oil company, oil company affiliated and oil company related executives as well as attorneys who themselves or whose law firms represent oil companies now working for the Federal Government in positions primarily above the GS-12 level.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Exception of duties performed by the above employees:

Serving as a legal advisor on tax legislation and assisting in providing leadership to assure an integrated legislative program on tax matters.

Developing and coordinating Executive Branch policy and research activities concerned with the structure and operations of the capital market.

Conducting analyses of and developing and coordinating policies, plans, and programs of all headquarters activities such as tariff administration and law enforcement.

Supervising the management and operation of a computer service center.

Advising and counseling management on such functions as management and organizational analysis and data processing.

Federal employment—Department of Defense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
<th>Company name</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Herbert R.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Computer systems analyst</td>
<td>Atlantic Richfield Co</td>
<td>Junior operations research analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clements, William P.</td>
<td>Executive level</td>
<td>Deputy Secretary of Defense</td>
<td>Sedco, Inc</td>
<td>Chairman of board and chief executive officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danier, John J.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Sup. operations research analyst</td>
<td>Shell Oil Co</td>
<td>Sales representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallagher, William C.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Gulf Refining Co</td>
<td>Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins, Glenn J.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Sanitary engineer</td>
<td>Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey)</td>
<td>Sanitary engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillburgh, Gary W.</td>
<td>Executive advisor (general)</td>
<td>Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey)</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladd, Frederick A.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Mechanical engineer (general)</td>
<td>Carter Oil Co</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard, Robert E.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Attorney-advisor real property leg.</td>
<td>Frontier Refining Co</td>
<td>Land superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauer, Morton A.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Landis Oil Co</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougal, Wyma S.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Gulf Oil Co</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math, Edward W.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Realty specialist</td>
<td>Pacific Gas &amp; Electric Co</td>
<td>General assistant real estate dep't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monismith, Carl L.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Shell Oil Research Lab</td>
<td>Research programmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichols, Joe E.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Mathematical</td>
<td>Standard Oil of California</td>
<td>Geophysicist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckard, David W.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Quaker Hill Oil Co, Bradley Exploration Co</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeves, Bruce B.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Operations research analyst</td>
<td>Overseas Tankship Corp</td>
<td>Executive trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed, Thomas C.</td>
<td>Executive Level IV</td>
<td>Director, telecommunications and command control system</td>
<td>Exxon Standard Oil Co</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reese, Howard C.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Foreign affairs specialist</td>
<td>Tesoro</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rensier, James J.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Rexall Drug Co</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scharfen, Charles P.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Standard Oil Co of Ohio</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of former oil company, oil company affiliated and oil company related executives as well as attorneys who themselves or whose law firms represent oil companies now working for the Federal Government in positions primarily above the GS-12 level.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Exception of duties performed by the above employees:

Providing technical assistance and guidance in the conduct and analysis of all phases of engineering investigations of structure foundations and flexible airfield pavements.

Developing, constructing, and analyzing mathematical models.

Coordinating telecommunications and command and control systems.

Advising on developments in foreign affairs, international relations, national and military policies.

Providing legal advice on international law matters concerning the use of the ocean and coastal waters.

Providing team leadership in the analysis of system requirement documentation and the development of computer system.

Furnishing technical guidance and information in the field of family housing design and estimating.

Developing, issuing, and updating procurement policies and directives.

Developing improved procedures and techniques associated with the functional design of water quality control techniques.

Preparing legislation and reports on proposed legislation affecting acquisition, management, and disposition of real estate.

Providing advisory services relating to the establishment of professional standards, research and development and program development.

Lump-sum payments or deferred compensation rights received on separation.

Equivalent to GS-16.

July 26, 1975

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE
LISTING OF FORMER OIL COMPANY, OIL COMPANY-AFFILIATED AND OIL COMPANY-RELATED EXECUTIVES AS WELL AS ATTORNEYS WHO THEMSELVES OR WHOSE LAW FIRMS REPRESENT OIL COMPANIES NOW WORKING FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN POSITIONS PRIMARILY ABOVE THE GS-12 LEVEL

Federal employment—Energy Research and Development Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
<th>Company name</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
<th>Lump-sum payments or deferred compensation rights received on separation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian, Robert D.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Chemical engineer</td>
<td>Gulf Research &amp; Development Co.</td>
<td>Senior project engineer</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiessling, Carl</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Continental Oil Co.</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacey, James J.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Chemical engineer</td>
<td>Standard Oil of New Jersey</td>
<td>Chief process engineer</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacey, James J.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Chemical engineer</td>
<td>Consolidation Coal Co.</td>
<td>Manager, maintenance branch</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacey, James J.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Consulting engineer</td>
<td>Phillips Petroleum Co.</td>
<td>Project engineer</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazzecco, Nester John</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Supervisory chemical engineer</td>
<td>Continental Oil Co.</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mott, William E.</td>
<td>STS</td>
<td>Thermal applications specialist</td>
<td>Gulf Research &amp; Development Co.</td>
<td>Research physicist head, nuclear science section</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall, James E.</td>
<td>GS-4</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Jersey Nuclear Co. (affiliate of Standard Oil of New Jersey)</td>
<td>Job analyst</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River, Wayne W.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Industrial relations officer</td>
<td>Phillips Petroleum Co.</td>
<td>Salary administrator</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steffensen, Frederick W.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Research supervisor, chemistry</td>
<td>Nevada Operations Office, Atlantic Richfield Co.</td>
<td>Research, associate-catalyst</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavorsky, Paul M.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Research supervisor, exploratory engineering</td>
<td>Consolidation Coal Co. (affiliate of Continental Oil Co.)</td>
<td>Supervisor in process research</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Equivalent to GS-13.
2 Equivalent to GS-14.

Listing of former oil company, oil company affiliated and oil company related executives as well as attorneys who themselves or whose law firms represent oil companies now working for the Federal Government in positions primarily above the GS-12 level.

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Excerpts of duties performed by the above employees:

Planning and directing a systematic approach on the development and improvement of coal liquefaction processes.

Performing legal staff work on matters arising from problems encountered in the prosecution of its office activities.

Supervising the broadening and strengthening of fundamental and applied research on energy technology.

Planning, scheduling, coordinating and administering contractors' activities on authorized engineering, construction, drilling, mining and maintenance projects.

Advancing on the development and formulation of agency-wide policies, principles, and standards.

Planning, developing, and implementing real estate, maintenance, machine tool and related equipment management programs.

Reviewing, analyzing and reporting on the cost, configuration, schedule and development basis of a fuel processing facility.

Consulting with engineers for dual purpose nuclear plant locations.

Analyzing economic and technological characteristics of enriched uranium activities.

LISTING OF FORMER OIL COMPANY, OIL COMPANY-AFFILIATED AND OIL COMPANY-RELATED EXECUTIVES AS WELL AS ATTORNEYS WHO THEMSELVES OR WHOSE LAW FIRMS REPRESENT OIL COMPANIES NOW WORKING FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN POSITIONS PRIMARILY ABOVE THE GS-12 LEVEL

Federal employment—Federal Power Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
<th>Company name</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
<th>Lump-sum payments or deferred compensation rights received on separation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker, Frank E.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Geologist</td>
<td>Standard Oil &amp; Gas Co.</td>
<td>Asst. area geo</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrer, John W.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Supervisory regulatory gas utility specialist</td>
<td>Canada Southern Gas, Inc</td>
<td>Staff geologist</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd, Ellis R., Jr.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Head, planning and special projects section</td>
<td>Gulf Oil Corp.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd, Ellis R., Jr.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Administrative law judge</td>
<td>Marathon Oil Co.</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensen, William</td>
<td>GS-16</td>
<td>Administrative law judge</td>
<td>Marathon Oil Co.</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, John R.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Supervisory regulatory gas utility specialist</td>
<td>AEP Oil &amp; Gas Co. Inc. (affiliated with ENSCO Oil &amp; Gas Co., Inc.)</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loring, William</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Supervisory general engineer</td>
<td>ENSCO Oil &amp; Gas Co.</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, Beber, &amp; Richards et al</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Equivalent to GS-13.
2 Equivalent to GS-14.

Listing of former oil company, oil company affiliated and oil company related executives as well as attorneys who themselves or whose law firms represent oil companies now working for the Federal Government in positions primarily above the GS-13 level.

Excerpts of duties performed by the above employees:

Performing legal work on matters arising from problems encountered in the prosecution of its office activities.

Supervising the broadening and strengthening of fundamental and applied research on energy technology.

Planning, scheduling, coordinating and administering contractors' activities on authorized engineering, construction, drilling, mining and maintenance projects.

Advancing on the development and formulation of agency-wide policies, principles, and standards.

Planning, developing, and implementing real estate, maintenance, machine tool and related equipment management programs.

Reviewing, analyzing and reporting on the cost, configuration, schedule and development basis of a fuel processing facility.

Consulting with engineers for dual purpose nuclear plant locations.

Analyzing economic and technological characteristics of enriched uranium activities.
### Listing of former oil company, oil company affiliated and oil company related executives as well as attorneys who themselves or whose law firms represent oil companies now working for the Federal Government in positions primarily above the GS-12 level—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
<th>Company name</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
<th>Lump-sum payments or deferred compensation rights received on separation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morrison, Prof. Daniel F.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Union Oil Co., California</td>
<td>Geologist</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody, Ruth, Jr.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Stubsman, McRae, Sardy, Laughlin &amp; Brewer.</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Received balance in his capital account, his share of profits and return of contribution to firm retirement fund, upon withdrawal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassikas, John N.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive level III</td>
<td>Baker, Botts, Andrews &amp; Shepherd</td>
<td>Defense trial attorney</td>
<td>Received balance of proportionate share of the undistributed net income of the firm, balance in the capital account, and a settlement amount of his partnership share on account of dissolution of the firm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Mahoney, Robert M.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Office of Special Assistant</td>
<td>Ross, McCord, Ice &amp; Miller (now Ice, Miller, Drabble &amp; Ryan)</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reusch, Charles F.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Chemical engineer</td>
<td>Amoco Chemical Co.</td>
<td>Research engineer</td>
<td>None, but has 12 shares of stock in blind trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, Weldon</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>General engineer</td>
<td>IFI Gas Co.</td>
<td>President and general manager</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LISTING OF FORMER OIL COMPANY, OIL COMPANY AFFILIATED AND OIL COMPANY RELATED EXECUTIVES AS WELL AS ATTORNEYS WHO THEMSELVES OR WHOSE LAW FIRMS REPRESENT OIL COMPANIES NOW WORKING FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN POSITIONS PRIMARILY ABOVE THE GS-12 LEVEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
<th>Company name</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
<th>Lump-sum payments or deferred compensation rights received on separation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aubury, Robert F.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Petroleum engineer</td>
<td>Marathon Pipeline Co.</td>
<td>Project engineer</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyce, James W.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Supervisory electrical engineer</td>
<td>Sun Oil Co.</td>
<td>Senior asphalt representative</td>
<td>$7,000 deferred pay in 5 annual installments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engelhard, Irwin</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Operations research analyst</td>
<td>Standard Oil of Indiana</td>
<td>Not given.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graggery, James B.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Executive level III</td>
<td>Union Oil Co. of California</td>
<td>Not given.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lundgren, Jerome F.</td>
<td>GS-12</td>
<td>Attorney-adviser</td>
<td>Texaco Inc.</td>
<td>General sales representative</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattee, Frank S.</td>
<td>GS-12</td>
<td>Highways safety management specialist</td>
<td>Cities Service Oil Co.</td>
<td>Lubrication engineer, wholesale sales management specialist</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, James C.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Transportation safety manager (pipeline)</td>
<td>Consumers Power Co.</td>
<td>Senior engineer (general gas distribution)</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, John B.</td>
<td>GS-12</td>
<td>Transportation industry analyst</td>
<td>Texaco.</td>
<td>Not given.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wissel, Robert W.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Electronics engineer</td>
<td>Amerada Petroleum Corp.</td>
<td>Not given (college student)</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Leonard E.</td>
<td>GS-12</td>
<td>Supervisory environmental sciences research specialist</td>
<td>Mobile Oil de Venezuela</td>
<td>Not given (graduated student training program)</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adviceing on all electrical engineering matters related to the power, heating and illumination of ships and small boats to be constructed.

Initiating, preparing, and reviewing instruments, documents and correspondence pertaining to legal aspects of various programs.

### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.
TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATION ACT, 1976

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate was unordered to consider the amendment of H.R. 8597, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 8597) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Time for debate on this bill is limited to 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Hatfield) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Montoya), 1 hour on amendments on a 2-minute basis, and 30 minutes on any debatable motion, appeal, or point of order.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purposes of amendment as original text.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 8, strike $27,000,000 and insert $27,500,000;
On page 2, line 16, strike $87,500,000 and insert $63,000,000;
On page 2, line 25, strike $6,200,000 and insert $6,000,000;
On page 3, strike $14,000,000 and insert $12,000,000;
On page 4, line 4, insert:

GRANTS TO THE HOWER INSTITUTION ON WAR, REVOLUTION, AND PEACE:

For payments to the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace as provided by Public Law 93-585, $7,000,000, to remain available until January 30, 1976.

On page 5, line 3, strike $310,000,000 and insert $304,920,000;
On page 5, line 8, strike $77,500,000 and insert $76,230,000;
On page 5, line 14, strike $41,440,000 and insert $41,330,000;
On page 6, line 16, strike $10,307,500 and insert $10,307,500;
On page 6, line 8, strike $44,000,000 and insert $44,000,000;
On page 6, line 10, strike $11,000,000 and insert $11,125,000;
On page 7, line 30, strike $785,000,000 and insert $767,500,000;
On page 7, line 24, strike $191,250,000 and insert $189,250,000;
On page 7, line 9, strike $835,250,000 and insert $833,000,000;
On page 8, line 11, strike $205,250,000 and insert $203,500,000;
On page 8, line 23, strike $92,000,000 and insert $90,250,000;
On page 9, line 5, insert:

Revolving Fund Payments: Advance Payments to United States International Air Carriers:

There shall be appropriated to the United States Postal Service $7,000,000 for the establishment and operation of a Revolving Fund pursuant to section 2602(c) of title 39, United States Code.

On page 11, line 14, strike $1,000,000 and insert $500,000;
On page 11, line 16, strike $235,000 and insert $135,000;
On page 12, line 3, strike:

EXPANSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT:

For payment of interest into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts on the current market value of the materials procured under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. 2093), as provided by any debatable motion, appeal, or point of order.

That all amounts remain available until September 30, 1976, for programs and activities under this appropriations Act and for the protection of the Federal buildings fund, pursuant to section 7(a) (3) of the Act.

That all amounts remain available until September 30, 1976, for programs and activities under this appropriations Act and for the protection of the Federal buildings fund, pursuant to section 7(a) (3) of the Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, I am pleased to present the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government appropriations bill for fiscal year 1976, H.R. 8597.

The President's budget, as amended, requested $8,330,463,000 for programs and activities under this appropriations bill. The recommendation of the committee is $8,338,555,000. This is a reduction from fiscal year 1975 appropriations to $8,345,584,000. Of Postal Service appropriation, $1,750,000 was in support of a one-time payment of $50 to social security recipients, which was authorized by the Tax Reduction Act of 1975—Public Law 94-34.

The bill passed the House of Representatives July 17, 1975 in the amount of $8,265,532,152. The committee recommendation is an increase of $8,482,000
over the budget estimate and an increase of $73,422,848 over the House bill. The increase above the House allowance is primarily for two structurally required by the President as budget amendments following completion of House hearings. These amendments were denied by the Senate on a 277 to 129 vote. I will briefly highlight the major items in the bill.

**Title I—Treasury Department**

The committee recommends for the Treasury Department is $2,463,866,-00. This is a reduction of $1,661,662,000 from the fiscal year 1975 appropriation, a reduction of $14,000,000 from the budget estimate and an increase of $18,639,000 over the House bill. The reduction from last year is primarily the result of the one-time social security payment of $1,150,000,000 which I mentioned previously.

The major increase to the House allowance is a restoration of $15,000,000 to the International Revenue Service. The House bill reduced these appropriations by $261,778,000. The increased funding will provide staffing and resources to support increased tax administration responsibilities under the Revenue Sharing Act, the Privacy Act, the Tax Reduction Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, and the Social Security Act.

The bill includes $7,000,000 for the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace which was authorized by Public Law 93-565. The House denied these funds in 1974, but the amendment was received too late to hold hearings. Appropriation of these funds will enable the Department of the Treasury to match private contributions, over a 3-year period, for construction of educational facilities for the Hoover Institution.

Increases to the House bill include $500,000 for the Library of Congress and $180,000 for the Office of Revenue Sharing for increased staffing; and $350,000 for the Secret Service to provide additional agents for protective assignments prior to the forthcoming political conventions, the 200th anniversary of the United Nations, the Bicentennial celebration, and the ever increasing number of visits of foreign dignitaries.

**Title II—U.S. Postal Service**

The committee recommends concurrence with the House bill of $1,582,185,000 for the U.S. Postal Service. This is an increase of $92,300,000 over the budget estimate to provide funding for the extended periods of phasing authorized by Public Law 93-328.

Although Public Law 93-328, which was Senate bill S. 411, extended the periods for phasing in full rates from 5 years to 8 years for certain regular-rate mailers and from 10 years to 16 years for certain nonprofit mailers, the President failed to include the fiscal year 1976 requirement of $92,600,000. Failure to include the subsidy funding would require the Postal Service to impose a substantial increase in postage upon the affected classes of mailers. As Public Law 93-328 passed the Senate by a vote of 71 to 11 and the House by 277 to 129, the committee believes this reflects the clear intent of the Congress that the extended phasing be supported.

Mr. President, I would like to ask for the years and nays on final passage.

The Acting President pro tempore, is there a sufficient second.

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MONDALE: Mr. President, I would like to ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

**Title III—Executive Office of the President**

The committee recommends $64,911,000 for the Executive Office of the President. This is a reduction of $18,151,000 from the budget estimate and a reduction of $16,200,000 from the House bill.

Public Law 93-346 established the former residence of the Chief of Naval Operations at the Naval Observatory as the temporary, official residence of the Vice President. The committee recommended an increase of $170,000 to the House bill to air-condition this residence. The Vice President and his family will occupy the residence during fiscal year 1976. In addition, $28,000 are recommended for $30,000 in travel and other expenses.

**Budgeting for the Secret Service**

For the Secret Service, the committee recommends $64,911,000, of which $60,000,000 is for operating and services at the fiscal year 1975 levels and provide for known in-service needs.

**The Federal Buildings Fund**

For the Federal buildings fund, which was created by the Public Building Act of 1972, Public Law 92-313, the committee recommends $1,661,662,000 over the House bill, increasing the availability of revenue collected from the standard level user charges of $1,142,554,000. This is an increase of $219,108,000 over the House bill and a reduction of $7,429,000 from the budget estimate. The increase over the House bill will provide for construction of a tunnel to the Federal building office building in Oklahoma City, Okla., and increased limitations for rental of space, program direction and centralized service, and for real property operations. The latter will continue current building operations under the fiscal year 1975 levels and provide for known increases in utility rates and fuel adjustment charges.

The House bill recommends language which would require all surplus profits accruing to the Federal buildings fund above $1,141,354,000 to be deposited in the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. The House language would include funds which were transferred from prior years. The committee recommends that prior year funds remain in the Federal buildings fund. It is the opinion of the committee that sufficient control of the fund is exercised by the Congress in approving the annual limitations on the availability of revenue.

The House bill directs construction...
funds for the projects specified in Public Law 93-381 which remain unobligated on September 30, 1976, to be re-
sicend and deposited in miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. Future require-
ments for such projects, if the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONToya) and to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii (Mr. ISoYOTO).

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I thank
the chairman very much.

Regrettably, I was not able to attend
to the markup of this measure on
Tuesday last. If I had been there, I
would have proposed a certain amend-
ment to this bill. At this time, I wish
to present this problem to the chairman,
statement by the subcommittee.

I congratulate the chairman for the
work he has conducted the affairs of the
subcommittee through these recent
months.

Unfortunately, but through no fault of
the subcommittee, this bill represents an
increase of $8,492,069 over the budget
estimate and an increase of $72,452,848
over the House bill. The prime reason for
these increases is that the committee had
to add $65,000,000 for a payment to the
general supply fund of the General Serv-
ces Administration. This payment was
expected to increase the capitalization of the re-
volving fund which had not been aug-
mented since 1967. Price increases over the
years have reduced the resources available to the fund. My

colleagues should know that the House de-
nied this increase without prejudice be-
cause it was sent up after hearings had
been completed.

The other big item involved a $92,5-
000,000 increase over the budget estimate
to provide funding for the extended peri-

dods of phasing authorized by Public Law
A new section 508 has been added to

A new section 508 has been added to
title V of the bill to allow funding to re-
maintain existing contract obligation through September 30, 1976.
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positions. The President, after we provided these positions, sent a rescission message in which he suggested the expenditure of funds for these positions. Congress, in turn, disapproved the rescission. In late June, at the direction of the House Appropriations Committee and the Office of Management and Budget, was requested to allow the Customs Service to staff these positions. At the beginning of fiscal year 1976, personnel staffing most of these positions were on board, but no funding was included in the fiscal year 1976 budget for their support.

So, Customs is in a quandary at the present time as to how to fund the additional positions. We in the committee had to face this issue. We had no budget message from the President to provide additional funding for these positions. Therefore, in the absence of a budget message by the President, we disallowed the $5,080,000 for these positions.

Since we disapproved this, we have been informed that it is very urgent that provision be made for funding these positions.

I can assure my good friend from Hawaii that we will discuss this matter very thoroughly and try to provide adequate funding in conference to assist in funding these positions.

Mr. MONTOYA. I thank the chairman very much.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from New Mexico, the floor manager of this bill.

I will not take up much of the Senate's time but I will make comments which I think are the responsibility of the Committee on the Budget.

Title I of the bill makes appropriations for the Treasury Department, title II for the U.S. Postal Service, title III for the Executive Office of the President, and title IV for certain independent agencies including the General Services Administration, the Civil Service Commission, the Post Office, the Federal Election Administration, and a number of commissions and agencies.

The budget authority in H.R. 8579 includes amounts which fall into seven functions of the Federal budget. As reported by the Committee on Appropriations, the bill makes appropriations of $6,338 billion. This amount appears to be within the budget resolution. I say "appears to be" because when the Senate Budget Committee was marking up the first concurrent resolution it did not establish exact figures for each line item in the bill. We regard this as a responsibility of the Committee on Appropriations. The best estimate of the staff of the Budget Committee, however, is that the amounts of this bill are well within the first concurrent resolution on the budget and that it will not jeopardize funding of other foreseeable legislation within the affected functions.

The language in this bill appears to be within the guidelines of the budget resolution.

I commend the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government (Mr. MONTOYA) and the members of his Subcommittee have performed in making judgments about national priorities that must be faced in arriving at base and fundamental operations of revenue which the President is also especially to be commended for making these priority judgments within the context of the congressional budget. His approach has been both highly responsible and highly responsive to the real limitation and tight fiscal situation which we face this year.

May I, in addition, Mr. President, express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations (Mr. McCLELLAN), who is exercising his traditional role of budgetary restraint in an effort to meet the pressing needs of our country within the resources that are available.

Mr. President, I submit this report for the record.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I certainly thank the distinguished Senator from Maine for his very kind words.

I know he has labored diligently in assisting us, in a nonpressurized way, in the budget, and his counsel and advice have been most helpful to us in arriving at the sums which we recommended in this particular bill.

I have no additional comments, and unless a Member requests that I yield to him, I will ask.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would like that.

Mr. MONTOYA. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Two minutes.

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we have two fine Senators who are managing this bill, and we all understand and recognize that. I have noted in the report and in the work of the Committee in that regard, and I highly commend, that for the National Commission on Productivity and Work Quality there was a cut in the budget estimate in the House, and the Senate committee went along with it. I do not blame them, because they probably were unaware of what I am about to tell them.

This is the situation: In the Committee on Government Operations—I am glad Senator Muskie is in the Chamber, because he knows a good deal about this—we have been deeply concerned with the problems of productivity in the United States. We succeeded in working out a bill which has been reported and which I believe is on the calendar. I will check that the record.

Under that bill, we have now provided for a new approach of the productivity centers which will improve materially and expand the work of the Productivity Commission. Indeed, it is a reorganization— that is why it was in the Committee on Government Operations—of the Productivity Commission. It involved the recommendations of the great AFL-CIO unions which will be the most involved in the productivity problem—the Steelworkers' Union and the United Auto Workers.

Fortunately, because my relations are very good with both unions, I was able to work out a reconciliation of those views, with the result that the bill was agreed upon, went through a great deal of consideration and discussion in the committee, and will result in decentralization of work on productivity and work quality to which I have been aspiring for 10 years and on which I feel the committee has made very significant progress.

I know that Senator Percy is out of town; Senator Nunn may be in town, but he is not now in the Chamber, and I have not had an opportunity to talk with him. Under the circumstances, inasmuch as this is a very gifted advance—I am able to speak about it because of my very longstanding relationship to the productivity problem—I inquire whether or not the managers would be congenial, for the purposes of today, to restore the budget amount, in order to take it to conference, so that the new factor of this new bill, which has been adopted by the Committee on Government Operations, may be considered by them, and so forth. Inasmuch as we are under the budgetary restraints, and the amount is not all that great, and the issue is very great—if they felt agreeable to it, I would move to offer the amendment.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I say to the distinguished Senator from New York that we have considered this budget request very thoroughly. We have tried to be very understanding and compassionate in the past with respect to this budget request.

Personally, I have tried to conduct very thorough hearings to develop the proper justification for the budget estimate which was presented to the committee. We in the subcommittee have not been completely satisfied that the Commission on Productivity and Work Quality has been exercising a meaningful, constructive, and recognizable job. Perhaps their work is effective; however, they have not presented adequate evidence to this effect to the subcommittee.

We have flavored them adequately. I believe the hearings will reflect this. In the past, they have received less funding. The Commission was authorized in 1970, and ample funds were provided for the Commission in the initial stages. In their appearances before the subcommittee, they presented little in the way of concrete results of their work. The House reduced the request by $500,000, and we followed the House recommendation.

I do not think there is any justification for increasing this amount by $500,000. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I think the Senator is out of the Chamber.
new information which they did not have, which I think bears materially upon the ability of this critically important operation, which has not been satisfied and last faced the first to assure the Senator of that.

The Senator knows how things move around here—glacially. It will be an enormous step forward if at least it will be considered in conference. It has not been increased it in the last 2 years—this fiscal year and last fiscal year—over the $885,000 which they had been receiving.

In fiscal year 1973, they did not receive any funding. I have requested this Commission to furnish us with specific and concrete data as to their performance. They have not completely presented this evidence to us. They are really at our expense to give us $2 million, because they have not provided adequate justification for us to recommend to Congress an appropriation of over $2 million.

In the first place, I say to my colleague that there are very few things that are as critical for our country as this. This is the guts of our country.

We are down, way down in the cellar, as they say in baseball, on productivity compared to Germany, Japan, and many other countries. This has been a long-standing problem which I have tried to deal with. I have been very disappointed in this commission. As I reported to the Senate, we are coming to life. We have now gotten reported out of the Committee on Government Operations a really effective bill to shake this thing up. All I am trying to do is win my colleague to a little faith in us, the Committee on Government Operations, to give us this conference. The conferences can easily throw it out. If we can demonstrate to the Senator that at last this thing will really deserve the money that is at least specified in the bill, I am really doing it the somewhat personal, if the Senator will not mind my saying so, because there is nothing on the record, I agree, on the facts as I am giving them to him now.

That is why I asked Senator Muskie to support me in it, because he sat through the sessions as we marked up this bill. After 2 months' work, we are really beginning to go to town. I really ask the Senator, on faith with us, at least to leave the door open so that if the conference think it is deserved, they can do it, especially since I am not asking the Committee to go beyond the budget estimate.
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that he ask for any additional funding for what he is planning will require additional funding at the time the Commission receives a new mandate, at which time the Commission can put it together and make some proposals that will recommend the funding. I think the record should show that none of us is in disagreement, but I think it is a question of timing, and I think we can achieve the objectives that the Committee and Government Operations is proposing at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. I thank the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum can be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I am not a member—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield time to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations, but my attention has been called to section 508 on page 38 and page 39. There is some problem with the printing of this particular bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that there is a printer’s error. The pages are reversed.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes. This appears, first of all, clearly to be legislation in an appropriate bill.

I have made some inquiry and I know that there probably is a good and worthy purpose to this language, but it does, in my opinion, reach very far and could go beyond, perhaps, those who are seeking to put it in real. I should like to inquire of the distinguished manager of the bill whether or not any hearings were held in connection with it.

Mr. MONTOYA. There were no hearings held. The amendment was proposed in the full committee. This is not the recommendation of the subcommittee.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I see.

Mr. President, under those circumstances, I am going to make a point of order that this is legislation on an appropriate bill.

Mr. MONTOYA. Will the Senator withhold the point of order until Senator SCHWEIKER comes into the Chamber, so he may defend his position?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I shall not withhold the point of order, but I certainly—yes, I withdraw it. But I do intend to make it.

Mr. MONTOYA. That is fine.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the manager of the bill yield to me on another matter while we are awaiting Mr. Schweiker’s arrival?

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes, I yield.
The hope of all peoples of the world, now and for future generations, is a worldwide system of comprehensive and effective international safeguards. This purpose, which is to prevent the diversion of fissionable material from peaceful nuclear activities to nuclear weapons, can only be accomplished by full cooperation within the international community.

Today Senator Mondale and I are introducing a resolution which calls upon our President to initiate serious and urgent steps to call on the community of nations to strengthen international safeguards of peaceful nuclear activities. The resolution endorses the principle of additional and prompt efforts by the President which are appropriate and necessary in the interest of peace for the solution of nuclear proliferation problems.

In view of the very complex and dangerous world in which we live, an urgent effort on the part of the President to kindle anew an international effort to strengthen the safeguards system would be the exercise of the highest form of Presidential responsibility. If this challenge is not met, our legacy for future generations may be life under the continuing threat of nuclear blackmail, with the specter of a nuclear holocaust an ever increasing danger.

If the challenge is met, the legacy could well be a gift which would:

First, lessen the danger of nuclear war;
Second, increase the chance for nuclear disarmament;
Third, reduce international tensions; and
Fourth, stimulate the widespread peaceful development of nuclear energy.

Billions of people in this world look to the leaders of the international community for actions to deal with this gravely important issue. Our President should take the lead through the United Nations, as President Kennedy did in pressing for a limited test ban and as President Johnson did in urging the adoption of the Nonproliferation Treaty.

I urge President Ford to take this major step to assure a more peaceful world. This Senate resolution urges the President to exercise leadership as appropriate and necessary in this area. The international safeguards on peaceful nuclear activities are urgently strengthened. Nuclear technology was created by the minds of civilized people. Surely these same minds can also construct and agree to a system of international safeguards which will assure that nuclear material and equipment are not diverted from civilian to military uses. The world needs any and all assurance that the fissionable materials in the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency, there is no doubt that these safeguards must be strengthened. This should be a top priority item on the international agenda. For only with such safeguards will our people and the peoples of the rest of the world have some assurance against the peril of a nuclear holocaust from any quarter of the globe.

In view of the widespread use and knowledge of nuclear technology in the world, the improvement of international safeguards can only be accomplished by full cooperation within the international community.
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been under discussion by technical ex-

perts within the IAEA but they have never been enforced by the Agency, and the U.S. Government now appears to think that they will work. Such procedures will have to be much more restrictive than the traditional IAEA reactor safeguards. Relief reactors, separation plants will result in an or nearly constant on-
site surveillance to prevent diversion. Moreover, serious problems including the design of measures to guard against theft or diversion during transportation as well as at the plant, and to respond to the risk of terrorism, have yet to be resolved.

And it is not yet clear that these ques-
tions can be answered satisfactorily in the foreseeable future. Even in the United States, where we have had many years of military experience in the produc-
tion of plutonium, the physical and materials safeguards problems posed by commercialization of this process, were judged to be so severe as to warrant the recent decision by the Nuclear Regu-

latory Commission to postpone for 3 years any decision on whether to proceed with commercialization.

Third, there is serious question about the motivation of countries that are in such a rush to obtain plutonium separa-
tion facilities. There is no economic jus-
fication for the construction of a rela-
tively small national plutonium reproc-
ressing plant of the type involved in West Germany's negotiations with Brazil. As the New York Times pointed out in its June 9 editorial, Brazil would have to have a $500 million facility serving 30 giant reactors to make a plutonium separation plant commercially feasible. At the present time, Brazil does not have a single reactor in operation.

In fact, none of the individual coun-
tries that are reportedly seeking to buy plutonium separation plants would be in a position to buy these plants-Brazil, Argentina and Brazil signed their contract, which included uranium enrichment and plutonium re-
processing facilities. It was not until the German government was informed by Helmut Schmidt as having said at a news conference the day before that he had not heard "a word of criticism" of the agreement from the U.S. Government. That concern did ex-

ist within the Congress and within the Executive Department, but for a reason it was apparently not communicated strongly enough to nor directly by President Ford or Secretary Kissinger to the West German Chancellor.

There seems to have been a tendency among gov-

ernment officials in other countries, un-
doubtedly encouraged by spokesmen for their nuclear industries, to dismiss U.S. criticisms of the fuel cycle sales as the work of "greenies" that would like to obtain the contracts for them-

selves. This argument is untrue and it totally ignores the real issues that are at stake.

West German Government main-
tains that the safeguards included in their agreement with Brazil will be fully ade-
quate, noting that they go beyond the existing NPT requirements. General Schottky is reported to have said at a news conference the day before the agreement was reportedly reached that German-supplied technology, as well as materials and equipment, would be safe-
guarded by the IAEA, that safeguards would be maintained and that the third countries would be subject to safeguards, and that equip-
ment and technology transferred from West Germany to Brazil would not be used to build explosive devices. While these provisions are clearly better than no checks whatsoever, it remains to be seen whether they will be fully adequate.

In fact, the detailed safeguards require-
ments were not satisfied with respect to physical and materials security have yet to be spelled out. Noticeably absent is a requirement for regiona-
ization of the fuel cycle facilities—a step that would insure that multinational control and international surveillance could be exercised more effectively. And, although Germany has secured an agreement that not just the plants themselves, but also the technol-
ogy from those plants will be safe-
guarded, what is to prevent the Brazilian engineers and scientists who are trained by West Germany to operate these plants from developing their own technology?

My intention is not to make accusa-
tions against Brazil or any other coun-
try. I only point out that there are many unanswered questions with respect to safeguards and that the safeguards provisions are serious enough to warrant delay in the transfer of these equipment and technol-

ogy until a stringent program can be implemented.

If some form of international restraint is not exercised, it is obvious that the competition for sales and industry pres-
sure intensify, the temptation will be for suppliers to impose less rather than more effective controls over the use of this equipment. All efforts to achieve a fully effective international safeguards program could be completely undermined. For example, the NPT Re-

view Conference, which met several weeks ago in Geneva, recommended that future enrichment and reprocessing fa-

cilities be limited to regional nuclear fuel cycle parks which would be under multinational rather than national con-
trol. Such facilities would assure better surveillance and, at the same time, re-

strict the many or Brazil, it is clear that although they will work.

With these concerns in mind, Senator PASTORE and I joined in submitting our

resolution asking the Secretary of State to delay the transfer of technology until satisfactory international safeguards can be
developed and enforced.

This resolution is one I believe no Member of this Senate could oppose. We might remember the words of the late President John F. Kennedy, who on September 25, 1961, told the United Na-
gions General Assembly:

"Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contribute to the day when this planet may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us.

Fortunately, a spirit of cooperation, reflected in the Test Ban and Non-Pro-

liferation Treaties and, more recently, in the SALT I and Vladivostok Agreements, have helped reduce the threat of nuclear annihilation.

Unfortunately, this spirit may not yet be strong enough to prevent the transfer of technology until satisfactory international safeguards can be developed and enforced.

Attorney General ALGER B. HIRSCHBEIN, in his testimony before the Select

Committee on Intelligence, warned of the dangers created by the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

"Now, the pressure toward nuclear arms prolif-
eration is building once again, threatening to undermine the substantial progress that has already been made on nuclear weapons limitations and the hope for continued progress in the decades to come. The pressure to increase the risk of nuclear arms race.

It is a threat not only to international security, but to the continued prosperity of all nations."
The resolution Senator Pastore and I offer today will not solve the problem of future nuclear weapons proliferation. It is designed only to point the way toward steps whose positive United States and other countries must take if we are to keep that danger from growing. I simply hope that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will receive the resolution and act promptly and clearly so that the Senate can speak out in unquestionable terms against the growing and exceedingly dangerous development.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time? Mr. HATFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATION ACT, 1976

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8597) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, and the independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and the period ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes. Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment. The President pro tempore read as follows: On page 10, line 14, After "Director" insert "or whose position shall be in addition to the positions authorized in section 2(d)", and strike out "$1,550,000" and insert "$1,600,000".

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I change the last figure to $1,580,000.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows: On page 10, line 14, After "Director" insert "or whose position shall be in addition to the positions authorized in section 2(d)", and strike out "$1,550,000" and insert "$1,600,000".

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have had a chance to talk to the manager and the rankling minority member on this amendment. It is basically a technical amendment to clarify the previous actions that were taken.

Mr. President, the Supplemental Appropriation Act last December upgraded the Deputy Director's salary to level 5 and left some ambiguity. It gave the Deputy Director a status similar to five GS-14s in the 18 slots. So far, the Council considers the Deputy Director's slot to be part of the five authorized positions. All this would do is indicate to the Council that they should be able to keep the Deputy Director's position separate from the five other positions and to consider him as independent of those five positions, and it gives some modest increase in terms of the authorization.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the Council on Wage and Price Stability is really an extraordinarily important vehicle for us in the Congress and the country to deal effectively with the problem of inflation. I think it is probably one of the most undermanned bodies of the Government today, although the work they do is of first-rate quality. There would be a very small addition, but I think it would be an important one to help get some strength for their undertakings. I have mentioned it to the chairman and I hope it can be accepted.

Mr. MONTOYA. Will the Senator yield? Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the Senator. Mr. MONTOYA. What is the status of the authorizing legislation, because I understand that the present legislation expires August 15?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct. As I understand it, it is ready for action in the House at the present time.

As the Senator remembers, we expanded the council by three senior staff positions and specific authorizing legislation and we will just have to wait and see how the House responds. Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment, and I have been trying to locate my counterpart on the subcommittee, and he has no objection.

Mr. HATFIELD. That is right.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts. Do all Senators yield back their time?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield back my time.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a few moments?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I explained earlier that I intended to make a point of order against section 508 on pages 38 and 39, and I have now learned that this amendment was proposed by Senator Sweeney of Pennsylvania. We have sent for him and are trying and have been trying to locate him. He does not seem to be in his office. He was on the floor earlier. We are still trying. I will just put in a short quorum call and see if we can locate him. If we do not within a few moments, I will call it off and we will go ahead.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On whose time will the call be made?

Mr. GRIFFIN. On the time of the Senator from Oregon.

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

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

The legislature clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. ROBERT BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Bayh), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLASS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HART), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LORÉ), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. MORGAN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), are necessarily absent.

Since the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HARR), is absent because of illness, I further announce that, in the Senate, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. MORGAN), would each vote "yea." Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BARTLETT), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Bell-
Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message of the President on the veto of S. 66, the Special Health Revenue Sharing Act of 1975, be held at the desk temporarily.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT-INDEPEN- DENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1976

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order the Senate will now proceed to consideration of H.R. 8070 which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 8070) making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent executive agencies, boards, bureaus, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and for period ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time for debate on this bill shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Mathias) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Proxmire), with 1 hour on any amendment and 30 minutes on any debatable motion, appeal or point of order.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage on H.R. 8070.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield to the Chair.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be accorded the privilege of the floor during consideration of this bill.

Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Proxmire.

Mr. Mondale.

Mr. Williams.

Mr. Young.

So the bill (H.R. 8597), as amended, was passed.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make any necessary technical and clerical corrections in the engrossment of the Senate amendments to H.R. 8597.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. Stone) appointed Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. BAYH, Mr. Eagleton, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. McGEE, Mr. BELLMON, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Young, and Mr. SCHWIKER conferees on the part of the Senate.

SPECIAL HEALTH REVENUE SHARING ACT OF 1975—VETO—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The Acting President pro tempore (Mr. Stone) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States returning, without approval, the bill (S. 66), the Special Health Revenue Sharing Act of 1975.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message of the President on the veto of S. 66, the Special Health Revenue Sharing Act of 1975, be held at the desk temporarily.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Protection Agency, and a number of other agencies.

It is one of the three biggest appropriations that the Senate will consider, and this time it is a rather complicated budget.

This bill is very close to the budget request of the President, and it is also very close to the bill passed by the House of Representatives. Its cost is over by 1 percent, about $300 million.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator suspend momentarily. The Chair will get order and attention for the time.

Will all Senators wishing to converse kindly withdraw to the cloakroom, and the Senate will be in order. The Senators will take their seats.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Virtually all of the disagreement over the budget is in the HUD part of the budget. That accounts for the 3 percent between the committees over the request of the President and about 2 percent over what we feel the House of Representatives would have included in the bill if they had the same request before them then they did.

One of the most controversial parts of it, although I do not think it is controversial within the Senate, as far as I know—it may be controversial with the House of Representatives and the administration—is the way we treated housing assistance.

The administration requested $662 million for assisted housing for 1 year. They calculated that $662 million as if we would take the authorized program and make the total potential commitment for payments for housing, payable by the Federal Government.

As these programs are set up, the Federal Government only has to pay the difference between the amount required to be paid by the person who is paying rent and the amount required in order to give him decent housing. That difference varies quite a bit. But the $662 million is a very conservative estimate. It is based on the assumption that everyone going under this program all of a sudden has all his income disappear. That is not going to happen.

In fact, our experience with the 235 program, which was a similar Government-assisted homeownership program, was that the Government only has to pay about a third of the potential full cost. Nevertheless, the committee took that $662 million and included the full amount.

Furthermore, to make this conservative position even more unrealistic, the administration has said that we should take the $662 million, multiply it by 40 years, because the program is one that could go on for 40 years, and the potential effect on the budget could be 40 times $662 million or about $28 billion.

This is wrong. As the administration itself calculates, this program is unlikely to cost more than $16,250 million. Why? Because some of these programs are 10-year programs, some are 20-year programs, and only some are 40-year programs.
For that reason, we felt that to multiply this by 40 on top of the fact that the $662 million was extraordinarily conservatively would not be correct. We felt that way particularly because we have backup memorandums and opinions from the staff of the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, and also from the Congressional Research Service, arguing that, based on their examination of the past practices, and how we treat all other expenses, it was unnecessary and unfair to housing to multiply that $662 million by 40.

The reasoning is sound. Mr. President, as I understand it, there is a ceiling not only on outlays but also on authorizations.

It would put housing in the vulnerable position of having, say, $100 million that may be contemplated for housing for 1 year multiplied by 40, and all we have to do to cut the $4 billion out of the budget is take the $100 million, one-fourth of what we would have, and that would be the $25 million.

So, we think it is unrealistic, inaccurate, and unfair. For that reason, we decided to go with the 1-year figure, based on the best advice we could get from the experts. We worked on the budget and the Budget Act.

Mr. President, this bill is substantially over last year's appropriations bill for HUD for one reason, and that is because the bill passed the Senate by a 94-to-0 vote an emergency housing bill that provides a substantial amount to be loaned by the Federal Housing Administration, plus 4 points on new houses. That money will be repaid. The amount of outlay is extremely small. The amount of adverse impact on the budget in terms of outlay will be almost inappreciable in view of the size of the figure involved.

For that reason, it seems to me that the $5 billion in mortgage purchase assistance we are providing in the bill might give a distorted impression. Actually, this appropriation is very close to last year's budget, but that $5 billion had to be taken into consideration, and that is the reason why the figure is higher.

In addition, we provided $75 million to implement that part of the emergency housing bill that deals with foreclosures on homes, particularly homes of those who were unemployed. As Senators may recall, when we passed the emergency housing bill, we were concerned with what happened to people who were out of work. We have 1,300,000 people in this country who have been out of work 6 months or more. What happens to those who have to keep up payments on their housing? We passed the mortgage foreclosure provision to take care of this situation. We stated in the bill that no assistance was to be paid for any money for that program, although we authorized $100 million in the bill passed by the Senate and signed by the President.

The committee provided new budget authority of $75 million for the emergency homeowners relief fund and the bill is over the budget to that extent.

We provided $50 million for the rehabilitation of housing. This program has been especially helpful to low-income people. It is an economical program that keeps existing housing in operation, and I think it is well justified.

We also provided $35 million in construction and rehabilitation. This is a program that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER) has pushed very hard. It is a program that I think merits support, and we provided funds for this particular program.

We also provided $100 million for cities under 50,000—the cities that are most neglected in housing programs—who stand at the end of the line when dollars are provided under the community development program. This is $24 million over the House figure.

The committee added $200 million for housing for the elderly. This is a very popular program and is very economical. It is a program that has been operated efficiently, and the cost to the Federal Government has been very modest, In fact, the House was not reflected in the budget, it is borrowing authority that will be repaid.

The committee also added $25 million for operating subsidies and $76 million in the form of grants. Actually, $100 million, $75 million in operating subsidies and $25 million in grants. Frankly, I am somewhat skeptical about those planning grants; but there was great pressure from Governors, Mayors, and others for this program. Members of the subcommittee felt very strongly that we should provide more than that. The subcommittee acquiesced in providing $75 million for the planning grants program.

The House made some rather sharp cuts in the staffing of some of the HUD bureaus and departments, and I thought that those cuts, in large part, were merited. Nevertheless, the committee did restore $250,000 of the cut in the Office of General Counsel. It restored $4,992,000—almost $5 million—of the cut in the research and development program. This is an area where EPA could not spend the money. They have lapsed money in the past and we felt that this reduction could be absorbed. This is a cut of far less than 1 percent.

The committee was very generous with the space agency. I thought much too generous, but that was the decision of the committee. They added $56.4 million over what the House did. This increase was directed toward research and development, which is $7 million over the budget. In all fairness to NASA, we should recognize that they are one of the few agencies constrained by administration policy, and supported by congressional policy, to keep at a consistent level, at a steady level, adjusting for inflation and not permitting any significant increase over the years. I think that the $56.4 million addition, although I opposed it, is consistent with that principle.

With respect to the National Science Foundation, the committee added $8 million to the House-approved figure, about 1 percent.

The committee substantially cut the amount for the Selective Service System—on very good grounds, I believe. The Selective Service really has done nothing, and I mean nothing, for a couple of years now. They have not had an inducement; they have not given a physical. I believe this agency should be abolished, but it is very hard to abolish a Federal agency, as we have discovered. Nevertheless, we cut $7 million below the House and $17 below the administration's request.

As to the Veterans Administration, there were some adjustments and modifications, but it is just $7 million below the budget, with no changes.

Mr. President, I thank my distinguished minority colleague, Mr. Marzilli, for the opportunity to have a debate about as efficient and conscientious a colleague to work with as I have encountered in my 18 years in the Senate. He was very helpful with respect to this bill, devoted a great deal of time to it, and was supportive of what I thought was a responsible position on this budget.

I also thank Tom van der Voort, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee staff. He used to serve on my staff, and he did an excellent job—a very intelligent and thoughtful staff job. Bob Clark is a veteran of the Appropriations Committee, has worked on it for many years, and was extremely helpful. He is a wise and intelligent person who understands this HUD budget backward and forward. Bob Mills, a new member of the Appropriations committee staff, was also very helpful, indeed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the memoranda from the Library of Congress. There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,}
WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 22, 1975.
To: Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs. Attention: Robert Malskoff.
From: Allen Schnick, Senior Specialist in American National Government. Subject: Appropriations for "Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing".
In its July 1975 budget, the President requested $622.3 million in new contract authority for the Section 8 lower income housing program. Congressional estimates suggest that the full run-out cost of this contract authority will be $686 million and this amount is requested as budget authority for fiscal year 1976.
Until this year, only the amount of contract authority was computed in the Budget. According to OMB, the listing of the full run-out costs for the Housing Assistance Program would have made necessary by the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. Section 301(a) of that Act requires Congress to adopt a concurrent resolution defining "budget authority" for the next fiscal year. Section 3(a) of that Act defines budget authority as "lawfully obligated" by law into obligations which will result in immediate or future outlays involving Government funds. Thus, although only the $662 million of contract authority is not an actionable amount.

The intent is that any attempt was made to change the budget authority for the purpose of the congressional budget process be the same as that used for the executive budget.

(2) The $26 billion listed as budget authority is not an actionable amount. It is merely "imputed" budget authority, a projection of future costs based on certain assumptions. The only amount which requires congressional action is the $626 million. It would be a departure from congressional practice to list projections of costs to be incurred as many as 40 years from now as current budget authority.

(3) As an estimate, the $26 billion is sensitive to a number of assumptions. The range of reasonable assumptions is such as to permit a $100 million or more in the estimate. In fact, the House Appropriations Committee (H. Rept. No. 94-313, at 2 and 59). In order to avoid double counting, the $626 million is listed as budget authority.

In reporting H.R. 8070, the 1976 HUD appropriation bill, the House Appropriations Committee referred to the OMB approach. Thus, although only the $662 million of contract authority appears in the text of the appropriation bill, the full $26 billion is listed in the Committee's report. (H. Rept. No. 94-313, at 5). In order to avoid double counting, the $626 million is not computed as budget authority.

WHY THE SENATE SHOULD NOT ADOPT THIS APPROACH

Although it is possible to interpret Section 3(a) of the Budget Act of 1974 in the manner applied by OMB, an alternative interpretation is preferable. The "budget authority" figure for purpose of the congressional budget process is not with the President's budget or appropriations. The only reason why Section 3(a) was included in the Act was because of a need to define some of the key terms used in the new congressional budget process. Inasmuch as there was no precedent such as "O&M" and "budget authority" on the books, it was necessary to draft definitions for the law. In developing these definitions, the intent was to come up with a feasible, practical, not to increase. This intent is manifested in the Statement of Managers: The Managers understand that the definition of 'budget authority' for purposes of the congressional budget process is not the same as that used for the executive budget.

(2) The $26 billion listed as budget authority is not an actionable amount. It is merely "imputed" budget authority, a projection of future costs based on certain assumptions. The only amount which requires congressional action is the $626 million. It would be a departure from congressional practice to list projections of costs to be incurred as many as 40 years from now as current budget authority.

(3) As an estimate, the $26 billion is sensitive to a number of assumptions. The range of reasonable assumptions is such as to permit a $100 million or more in the estimate. In fact, the House Appropriations Committee (H. Rept. No. 94-313, at 2 and 59). In order to avoid double counting, the $626 million is listed as budget authority.

In reporting H.R. 8070, the 1976 HUD appropriation bill, the House Appropriations Committee referred to the OMB approach. Thus, although only the $662 million of contract authority appears in the text of the appropriation bill, the full $26 billion is listed in the Committee's report. (H. Rept. No. 94-313, at 5). In order to avoid double counting, the $626 million is not computed as budget authority.
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Although it is possible to interpret Section 3(a) of the Budget Act of 1974 in the manner applied by OMB, an alternative interpretation is preferable. The "budget authority" figure for purpose of the congressional budget process is not with the President's budget or appropriations. The only reason why Section 3(a) was included in the Act was because of a need to define some of the key terms used in the new congressional budget process. Inasmuch as there was no precedent such as "O&M" and "budget authority" on the books, it was necessary to draft definitions for the law. In developing these definitions, the intent was to come up with a feasible, practical, not to increase. This intent is manifested in the Statement of Managers: The Managers understand that the definition of 'budget authority' for purposes of the congressional budget process is not the same as that used for the executive budget.

(2) The $26 billion listed as budget authority is not an actionable amount. It is merely "imputed" budget authority, a projection of future costs based on certain assumptions. The only amount which requires congressional action is the $626 million. It would be a departure from congressional practice to list projections of costs to be incurred as many as 40 years from now as current budget authority.

(3) As an estimate, the $26 billion is sensitive to a number of assumptions. The range of reasonable assumptions is such as to permit a $100 million or more in the estimate. In fact, the House Appropriations Committee (H. Rept. No. 94-313, at 2 and 59). In order to avoid double counting, the $626 million is listed as budget authority.

In reporting H.R. 8070, the 1976 HUD appropriation bill, the House Appropriations Committee referred to the OMB approach. Thus, although only the $662 million of contract authority appears in the text of the appropriation bill, the full $26 billion is listed in the Committee's report. (H. Rept. No. 94-313, at 5). In order to avoid double counting, the $626 million is not computed as budget authority.
And insert in lieu thereof: "That at least $75,000,000 of such contract authority shall be available only for contracts for annual contributions provided in the Federal Housing Administration for the development or acquisition of low-income housing projects to be owned by public housing agencies other than under section 8 of the above Act. Provided, That not less than 75 percent of the funds made available by this Act which are used pursuant to section 312 of the above Act shall be allocated to contracts to make assistance payments with respect to newly constructed or substantially rehabilitated housing for the elderly and handicapped with no more than $100,000,000 may be made available for construction by the Federal Housing Administration, as provided by the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1701);" 

Page on line 9, strike $300,000,000 and insert $500,000,000; 

Page on line 11, after "subsection" insert: "of which not less than $400,000,000 shall be available only to nonprofit sponsors for the purpose of providing 100 per cent loans for the development of housing for the elderly and handicapped with no cash equity or other financial requirements imposed as a condition of loan approval. The full amount of such fund shall be available during such period for permanent financing (including construction) for financing projects for the elderly and handicapped, and not more than $100,000,000 may be made available for construction." 

Page on line 15, strike $825,000,000 and insert $850,000,000; 

Page on line 17, strike $825,000,000 and insert $850,000,000; 

Page on line 6, after "185,116,000" insert: "of which $158,650,000 shall be provided by transfer from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration;" 

Page on line 6, after "49,800,000" insert: "of which $45,850,000 shall be provided by transfer from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration;" 

Page on line 6, insert: "EMERGENCY PURCHASE ASSISTANCE" 

The total amount of purchases and commitments authorized to be made pursuant to section 313 of the National Housing Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1723; 88 Stat. 1964; Public Law 94–50), shall not exceed $5,000,000 outstanding at any one time which amount shall be in addition to balance of such fund available for purchase and commitments pursuant to said section and which shall continue available after expiration of this Act. Provided, That the Association may borrow from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with said section, the necessary funds to carry out the purposes and requirements of said section as authorized herein. 

Page on line 7, strike $1,287,000 and insert $1,350,000, of which $465,000 shall be provided by transfer from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration, as provided by the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1701);" 

Page on line 12, strike $1,287,000 and insert $1,350,000, of which $465,000 shall be provided by transfer from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration, as provided by the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1701);" 

Page on line 24, after "$2,615,000" insert: "of which $810,000 shall be provided by transfer from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration, as provided by the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1701);" 

Page on line 17, after "$4,935,000" insert: "of which $810,000 shall be provided by transfer from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration, as provided by the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1701);" 

Page on line 13, strike $336,032,000 and insert "$41,024,000, of which $15,560,000 shall be provided by transfer from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration, as provided by the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1701);" 

Page on line 14, strike $36,034,000 and insert "$10,306,000, of which $3,905,000 shall be provided by transfer from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration, as provided by the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1701);" 

Page on line 15, strike $42,790,000 and insert "$40,849,000;" 

Page on line 17, strike $10,697,000 and insert "$10,960,000;" 

Page on line 23, strike $6,000,000 and insert "$6,000,000;" 

Page on line 24, strike $1,000,000 and insert "$1,000,000;" 

Page on line 20, strike $2,628,080,000 and insert "$2,685,865,000;" 

Page on line 22, strike $600,000 and insert "$600,000;" 

Page on line 21, strike $600,000 and insert "$41,000,000;" 

Page on line 23, strike $4,000,000 and insert "$5,000,000;" 

Page on line 4, strike "$2,000,000 and insert "$3,000,000;" 

Page on line 16, after the comma, insert "for the activity for which the limitation applies;" 

Page on line 19, after the word "Act," insert: "for the activity for which the limitation applies;" 

Page on line 11, strike $400,000 and insert "$33,000,000;" 

Page on line 21, strike $8,300,000 and insert "$5,850,000;" 

Page on line 16, strike $9,713,000 and insert "$7,100,000;" 

Page on line 10, strike $7,100,000 and insert "$7,100,000;" 

Page on line 10, strike $7,700,000 and insert "$7,700,000;" 

Page on line 19, strike $1,885,000 and insert "$1,885,000;" 

Page on line 18, strike $4,214,745,000 and insert "$5,414,745,000;" 

Page on line 18, strike $854,472,000 and insert "$1,039,472,000;" 

Page on line 6, strike $496,300,000 and insert "$496,300,000;" 

Page on line 18, strike $292,924,000 and insert "$297,464,000;" 

Page on line 21, after "Texas," strike "and;" 

Page on line 23, after "Massachusetts," insert ", and $6,700,000 for construction of a research and education facility at Jackson, Mississippi;" 

Page on line 16, strike: "REIMBURSEMENT TO THE TREASURY, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION" 

There shall be transferred to the General Fund of the Treasury, out of the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration, an amount equal to the administrative expenses properly chargeable to such funds in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. Provided, That all expenses formerly chargeable to such funds in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles shall be included for employment under this Act may be used to administer any program to tax, limit or otherwise regulate employment or the operation of any company, or any other person engaged in such business, for the benefit of noise abatement or control, or for the benefit of any person, the age of noise abatement or control. Provided, That all expenses formerly chargeable to such funds in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles shall be included for employment under the requirements of the Noise Control Act of 1972 (42 U.S.C. 4901 et seq.)." 

And insert in lieu thereof: "SEC. 407. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency may be expended for the transportation of any officer or employee of such department or agency by any means other than the following: (A) such certification is accompanied by, or part of, a voucher or abstract, which describes the payee or payees and the items or services for which such expenditure is being made, or (B) the expenditure of funds pursuant to such certification, and without such a voucher or abstract, is specifically authorized by law. (2) unless such expenditure is subject to audit by the General Accounting Office or is specifically exempt by law from such audit."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for the kind and generous observations he has just made, but, even more, for the cooperation and the courtesy he has shown to all the members of the subcommittee as well as myself over the long and very difficult hearings and the markup on the bill. No one has invested more time and more of himself than the chairman.

In a meeting we had before we started work on the bill in this session of Congress, Senator Proxmire and I reached certain tentative agreements and conclusions as to the procedure and as to cooperation, and I am very happy that this has worked so well during the course of the entire year. I join Senator Proxmire in thanking Mr. Clark, Mr. van der Voort, and other
members of the subcommittee who have served on the subcommittee so well.

The chairman has gone through the items in the bill in a very thorough way but I want to mention a few of special concern.

I am very pleased that the subcommittee and I have accepted my recommendation to increase funds for housing for the elderly and handicapped to $500 million, which is $200 million more than the House. This increase is necessary to implement the mandate imposed as a condition of loan guarantees for this very critical study of the ozone, which the committee has included in its recommendation. I am pleased that the committee has considered the need for this additional funding.

In the Environmental Protection Agency, language in the report earmarks NASA for funds for the Pioneer Venus project, which was deleted in the House. NASA personnel have restored in the interest of maintaining the balanced space program. The Pioneer Venus project has been deleted by the Senate with the suggestion that it could be launched later. Testimony has shown, however, that a delay in launch would lose the current window in space and that the next possible window, sometime in 1980, which is not as favorable a window, would result in an increased cost of at least $50 million. It would put less of a payload into space, while requiring reconfiguration of the space instruments.

In the National Science Foundation, language in the report earmarks NASA for the long and hard work of research on the atmosphere, which was permitted to go forward under the leadership of Senator Proxmire—a LEGISLATION that has come to be known as the "limousine language." We have included language to ensure that funds are available for the limousine project.

I have had assurance from HUD officials that they will now go forward with this program after having held back last year depending on whether or not we voted funds for this program last year.

The most significant new HUD program is the so-called section 8 program, which was authorized in the 1978 housing bill as a new tool to end the economic need for the elderly and handicapped to be housed at favorable rates. The bill language was accepted by the Senate and then the full committee accepted the $1 million cut in the $3 million budget request for the transition account. The Senate Appropriations Committee has accepted the $1 million cut in the $3 million budget request for the transition period for the LST in the hope that the studies and preplanning can be completed within the available funds. After NASA submitted its budget to Congress, the space authorizing committee gave NASA a leading role in studying and monitoring the physical and chemical processes of the atmosphere. The Senate Appropriations Committee has accepted the $1 million cut in the $3 million budget request for the transition period for the LST in the hope that the studies and preplanning can be completed within the available funds.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has accepted the $1 million cut in the $3 million budget request for the transition period for the LST in the hope that the studies and preplanning can be completed within the available funds.

I am pleased to note that the committee has accepted the $1 million cut in the $3 million budget request for the transition period for the LST in the hope that the studies and preplanning can be completed within the available funds.
I am also pleased that the committee has voted the full budget estimate of $30 million for the Veterans' Administration program for health research and development for training institutions. There is a great demand and a great need in the various States for funding of projects to improve medical training. It may be that before the fiscal year is ended additional funds will be needed for these programs.

Again, I want to commend the chairman and all members of this committee that have worked on this bill.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I support the action of the Appropriations Committee in reporting H.R. 8070, the Department of Housing and Urban Development-Independent Agencies appropriation bill, 1976, to the Senate, and as an ex officio member of this committee for aeronautical and space activities, I would like to address the highlights of the bill with respect to these activities.

The committee added $56.4 million to the amount voted by the House for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and development of NASA for fiscal year 1976, and I think it is important that the Senate understand the reasons for this action and the impact of that action in relation to the total amount requested by and subsequently recommended for NASA. The committee restored a $48.4 million cut in the Pioneer Venus 1978 planetary mission, a program to be approved by the Congress for development in the fiscal year 1978 budget in accordance with logical, businesslike approaches to such undertakings based upon reviews of the project by NASA and scientific community, and the Congress.

Therefore, following the commitment to this project last year, the deferment recommended by the House in effect required the undertaking with the resultant loss in effort and hardware in the range of $45 to $50 million. The committee action restores this mission to its original funding and launch schedule.

The second restoration of a House cut that the committee recommends is $1 million to support ongoing studies of a large space project to refine this proposal and to complete the advanced technology development necessary to make an intelligent decision with respect to initiating the LST as a formal project. I emphasize that the LST is not in development and that these funds do not commit it to development, but merely support ongoing technical work which would provide us with the knowledge of the economic efficiency of such an undertaking if and when it is initiated.

Finally, in addition to restoring a total of $49.4 million in R. & D. funds cut by the House to the amount voted by NASA, the committee added $7 million, to the already budgeted $7 million, to support the upper atmospheric research program authorized and directed by Public Law 94-39 to be conducted by NASA. This will support a comprehensive program of research, technology, and monitoring of the phenomena of the upper atmosphere so as to provide improved guidance in fuel efficiency for commercial transport by 1985. This will be a significant step forward and a very meaningful contribution to the Nation in view of the increasing price and unavailability of petroleum for air transportation.

Underlying all of the programs and projects supported by the recommended appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration this bill is the continued advancement of science and technology which is so vital to the continued prosperity and world leadership of this Nation.

I want to recommit to my colleagues to support H.R. 8070 as recommended by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HUDDELESTON. Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee on HUD-Independent Agencies of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I am pleased to support the pending bill, H.R. 8070.

There are certain basic items which we in this Nation must provide for our people. Decent housing is certainly one of these. And while we have done much to provide adequate housing for millions of our citizens, much remains to be done. Over 17 percent of our Nation's 67.7 million housing units are considered substandard. Some 7 million families live in such housing. Another 9 million pay a disproportionate portion of their incomes for housing. Thousands other have recently found a lack of mortgage credit a barrier to new or improved housing.

New housing starts have dropped from an annual rate of over 2 million in 1973 to a rate of 1.07 million in June of this year. Unemployment in the construction industry remains high, despite a slight drop in the past several months.

The State of Kentucky has not been unaffected by these developments. Some 22.5 percent of our housing is considered substandard. The number of building permits issued has fallen. In mid-July, unemployment in the construction industry was running about 20 percent.

Certainly, with this appropriation, we will not solve all—or even most—of our housing problems, but it will help us move forward in a number of important areas.

First, the bill earmarks $100 million for the SM8A balance fund under the community development program. This is the fund which provides assistance to small communities within standard metropolitan statistical areas. Last year, the first year under this program, there were more than 1500 preapplications for assistance. The only funding available, however, was $54 million, and that was made available in a supplemental appropriation. Under the bill recommended for fiscal 1976, perhaps as little as $36 million would be available, which is far below what many of these areas expected to receive in fiscal 1976. The bill as currently drafted has been in the United States Senate, and the Appropriations Committee has recommended and has been passed by the House. The bill as currently drafted provides under the pending bill. This is a matter of serious concern to the Senate. And while we have done much to provide adequate housing for millions of our citizens, much remains to be done.

New housing starts have dropped from an annual rate of over 2 million in 1973 to a rate of 1.07 million in June of this year. Unemployment in the construction industry remains high, despite a slight drop in the past several months.

The State of Kentucky has not been unaffected by these developments. Some 22.5 percent of our housing is considered substandard. The number of building permits issued has fallen. In mid-July, unemployment in the construction industry was running about 20 percent.

Certainly, with this appropriation, we will not solve all—or even most—of our housing problems, but it will help us move forward in a number of important areas.

First, the bill earmarks $100 million for the SM8A balance fund under the community development program. This is the fund which provides assistance to small communities within standard metropolitan statistical areas. Last year, the first year under this program, there were more than 1500 preapplications for assistance. The only funding available, however, was $54 million, and that was made available in a supplemental appropriation. Under the bill recommended for fiscal 1976, perhaps as little as $36 million would be available, which is far below what many of these areas expected to receive in fiscal 1976. The bill as currently drafted has been in the United States Senate, and the Appropriations Committee has recommended and has been passed by the House. The bill as currently drafted provides under the pending bill.
rect way to proceed and I fully support the provision of the $100 million for these communities.

The committee has also provided $125 million for comprehensive planning under section 921 of the Housing Act of 1965. Section 701 provides our States, cities, and area-wide planning agencies with funds for carrying out a comprehensive planning program. As we all know, there are various types of planning funds available—for health, transportation, community development, et cetera. But, under this program, funds may be used to bring together the planning activities of the various sectors and to unite them into a workable whole. With the many burdens facing our localities, with the many complex problems they must handle, with the multitude of assistance programs which they must evaluate and make determinations on, comprehensive planning is a necessity. Further, the planning offers the hope of making effective use of the resources which we have—of insuring that Federal programs—taxpayers' dollars—are wisely and well spent.

For anyone concerned about housing for the elderly or handicapped program, the committee is recommending $500 million in loan authority. Those of our citizens who have spent years of their lives contributing to our Nation and society certainly deserve to spend their retirement time in respectable housing. Yet, these are often the persons who can least afford such housing. As housing costs and personnel costs rise, the ability of the elderly to compete in the housing market diminishes. This program, with its flexible direct loan permanent financing, can be a major factor in providing the needs of our elderly and handicapped citizens.

The legislation also contains $50 million for the section 312 rehabilitation loan program. In this program, loans are available at 3 percent interest for the rehabilitation of existing housing in specified areas. While some rehabilitation loan funds are available through the community development block grant program, there are a number of communities which receive little community development funding but which continue to have a need for rehabilitative activities. This program should help those areas where there is no effective alternative.

In addition, the pending bill contains authority to move ahead on the new section 103 housing assistance program. While many questions remain about this program and while it is largely untested at this time, it may serve as the needed spurs to flexible assisted housing for our lower income persons. As a member of the subcommittee, I know that we will be monitoring the program closely in the upcoming year to determine whether or not it is achieving its objectives and whether or not the costs associated with it are acceptable.

Finally, I would like to call attention to legislation in the committee report regarding two programs.

The first relates to construction grants available under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, which provides funding for up to 75 percent of the cost of municipal wastewater treatment facilities. While $18 billion was authorized for these projects, the progress in obligating and spending the funds has been slow. In response to a question I asked during subcommittee hearings, the Department indicated that obligations and expenditures were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Obligations</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$4.9 billion</td>
<td>$4.9 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is certainly a turtle's pace and unacceptable in view of the importance of meeting the goals of the act. I hope EPA will note the committee's concern with the pace and its desire for EPA to act to move the program ahead.

The second relates to the national flood insurance program. While there is little argument with the concept of having a flood insurance program, a number of elements in the existing program have proven most difficult for communities. First, the preliminary maps which the Flood Insurance Administration is using apparently contain many inaccuracies, and localities have faced obstacle after obstacle in getting them changed. Second, in the very small communities, the zoning, land use, and building codes required for participation in the program are imposing substantial new burdens upon the community. Therefore, I am pleased that the committee report includes language to give special attention to these two matters and to cooperate with the communities in resolving them.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore, Both the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from New York seek the floor. Who yields the floor? Mr. PROXMIER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

**On page 433, strike $100,000,000 and insert in lieu thereof $375,000,000.**

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have sent this amendment to the desk for the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) and myself.

Mr. President, this amendment would increase the amount of funding appropriated under the section 312 3 percent Federal housing rehabilitation loan program from $50 million to $75 million. I may not press for the adoption of this amendment, but we do feel it important that the issue be discussed.

After considerable debate earlier this year on the issue, the Congress extended the section 312 program as part of the Emergency Housing Act of 1975 with an authorization of $100 million for fiscal year 1976. I understand that the HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, acting consistently with this assessment, included in its draft bill an appropriation for the full $100 million. However, this amount was cut in half at the full committee level.

As coauthors of the Senate legislation to modify and amend this program, we are concerned that Congress follow up on its earlier efforts by providing adequate money for the program. The community development applications received by HUD clearly indicate the local interest in neighborhood preservation and housing rehabilitation actions. Local communities seem to have realized, apparently to a greater extent than the Federal Government, that this type of limited investment to prevent neighborhood decline is a wise investment in the long run. It also promotes energy conservation and stimulates jobs in the areas and industries they are needed most.

The section 312 program has a good track record and is the most efficient means of providing low-interest housing rehabilitation loan money. Its use avoids legal questions which still may be involved in some areas regarding the use of community development block grant funds. For this purpose, the Government will recoup almost its entire outlay amount in loan repayments.

Thus, we feel it is extremely important to see this $100 million appropriation now in the bill with at least the $50 million. Since the House bill was considered before the program extension was passed, there are no funds in its bill for this purpose and the conferences may be resistant.

With those thoughts in mind, can the chairman assure us that he will do what he can to see to it that the final bill contains the entire Senate appropriation for section 312?

Mr. PROXMIER. May I say to my distinguished friend from Ohio I will certainly do all I can in conference to see that the $50 million is retained in its entirety.

I might point out this program has $37 million of carryover. We provide $50 million which the President did not request. Furthermore, there would be a total of $107 million for the program.

I am sure the Senator knows of my deep and abiding interest and concern for the program. It is an excellent program and, as the Senator says, it is one of the most efficient programs to help people who need help to fix up old houses, ...
houses that otherwise might have to be abandoned.

I agree wholeheartedly that it is a good program. Incidentally, on the basis of our conferences with the House in the past, they recognize it as a good program, and they are very sympathetic with it. I think we have a good chance of holding onto a great deal of this amount we put in—I hope we will.

Mr. TAFT. I appreciate the chairman's comment. I was aware of the $57 million carryover. If it were not for that, I would be pressing for the whole amount by the court of this cause over the years.

Mr. MATHIAS. This is the distinguished hi~n~nself be pressing for the whole amount by the court of this cause over the years.

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank the Senator from Ohio for those generous words but more for the very effective and sustained effort he has made with respect to this legislation, which are under.

I hope very much that the sum covered in the Senator's amendment can be approved. I recognize that is what is largely on the Senate floor. I do want to strongly urge Senator PROXMIRE and Senator MATHIAS and the other Democrats who will be conferees to at least firmly hold the line on the $56 million in conference on the 312 rehabilitation loan program.

Presently 312 is the only program at HUD which deals with rehabilitation in the deteriorating neighborhoods. And, as we all know, we have all too many vast deteriorating neighborhoods in our cities and in smaller communities.

This is one of a few programs for enabling innercity residents who wish to remain in the central city to renovate their housing and stay where they presently are. As such it is a very important tool for stabilizing and upgrading neighborhoods. And I also would like to point out to our colleagues that 312 loans also help eliminate problems of financing in areas that have been "redlined." If we get the conferees to support a reasonably high level of appropriation for this program, the highest possible.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator for his comments, and I withdraw my amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem, Mr. JAVITS, the amendment is withdrawn.

The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senate yield a few minutes. Is there controlled time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield the Senator 3 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I just wish to comment on a few of the items. And first, let me include Senator PROXMIRE himself in the very pleasant and agreeable comment he made about Senator MATHIAS. This is a singularly fortunate team for housing, and while Senator PROXMIRE writes with a very sharp pen, he is also a man of great humanity, fairness, and understanding, and it is reflected in many of the aspects of this bill.

Might I say to my colleagues, first, I hope very much the Senate will support the $550 million provided by the Senate committee for the operation of low-income housing projects.

The main reasons for it, as far as we are concerned in the largest city in the country and in five other cities of major character in New York State, are that we have seen tremendous increase in operating costs attributable to a cause absolutely beyond the control of those handling these public housing projects and low-income housing projects, and that is this increase which is an absolutely crushing burden attributable to no one except the affairs of the world.

We welcome the performance standards for local housing authorities operating owned units, which is referred to in the committee report. But the fact is that when no performance, no matter how grand and efficient, can help you, only money by the committee is, therefore, very intelligently and understandingly has provided some additional money. So I hope very much, and I appreciate very much what the committee has done so much. It will be supported in the Senate.

On another matter, very briefly, we are very glad to see the Government National Mortgage Association, the so-called Ginnie Mae, referred to by the committee in the following language:

"The Department is urged to make these funds available for all programs covered, both conventionally and federally insured single and multifamily units.

We especially emphasize the latter because that has not been the ongoing policy of Ginnie Mae. They have tended to favor single family units. Obviously this is now almost a completely urban country with about 75 percent of our people living in cities.

Hence, the recognition of the committee that multifamily units need to be covered because critically important, especially at a time when it is so very difficult to get money for the multifamily projects or the multifamily mortgage that's that.

So we appreciate very much this thoughtfulness by the committee, and I would sort of like to know here on the floor, as well as in the committee report, the extent of the strength of the conviction of the Housing Subcommittee on that particular subject.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We feel very strongly that it is necessary. That is why we wrote this bill to do just that. The restriction to single family housing has been a mistake. The housing start figures now indicate that multifamily housing is one of the problems we now have in home construction.

I might say to the Senator from New York that I intend to do all I can to sustain this position, and I hope we can persuade the administration to recognize the importance of providing this for multifamily housing.

As the Senator points out so well, in all of our big cities, particularly in New York, but also in Milwaukee, Baltimore, and Cleveland, and so forth, this is particularly essential.

Mr. JAVITS. Very good. As a matter of fact, the homebuilders, as the Senator knows much better than I, think we are too low on this figure; that it ought to be $10 billion. But I am expressing my confidence, in answering them, in the Senate that it has enough flexibility for Senator from Maryland and their judgment and their understanding of the situation, and the fact that they show themselves willing and they have a share—and $5 billion is no small change—and, therefore, it is an assurance that really it is needed, and it will be available.

I gather they argue the fact that it is not spent, in particular, on new construction. But, be that as it may, I have faith and confidence in my colleagues, who have already done so well, and I mention them to the Senate.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to commend the committee for the additional $100 million provided for, earmarked for the, so-called balanced community, the standard metropolitan statistical areas, which are under 50,000 population, and where a formula has not worked out very well because of the extent of the demand which was un anticipatory.

It is not often realized, because I am from such a big state, where we have big cities, where we have the so-called big six, New York, Buffalo, Syracuse, Rochester, Albany, and so forth, but I also have a lot of people in a lot of other places that are under definitions of this kind.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. May I have 1 other minute?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Indeed, my State is one of the great dairy States of the country, so we are deeply interested in this.

Also, it recognizes the principle that we are under a formula which was called Ginnie Mae, and we have so many of them in housing, health and education, and in so many other fields, and it simply does not work, and it is important that Congress understand that so we have enough flexibility to earmark money or work out a hold harmless or do something which is necessary to do equity among the States and areas of the country.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I might call the attention of the Senator to the very unequivocal and express language we have in the bill. On page 8, lines 15 to 20, I read:

For grants to States and units of general local government, to be used only for expenses necessary for carrying out a community development grant program authorized—

It gives the section which referred to the smaller cities—$100,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1978.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague very much.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I would just like to welcome the participation of the Senator from New York in this matter because he not only represents the greatest urban community in the world, but his advocacy in an issue of this sort is very important.
I hope he will be persistent and consistent in urging that we solve this problem.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for purposes of inquiry?

Mr. MAHON. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator and I just want to comment on the remarks expressed his distinguished colleague from New York with regard to the operation of GNMA.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, last March I submitted legislation to the Congress which would expand the coverage of the Government National Mortgage Association's emergency mortgage credit program to conventionally financed condominium units and apartment projects. This proposal was included in the Emergency Housing Act of 1975. I was endorsed by the President soon after I had first introduced it.

The bill has expanded the program to include condominium units but not apartment projects. While I welcome the expansion of the program which already has been made, I feel that more can be done in using the full authority authorized by the new law. The housing depression is far worse in the apartment sector than in the single family sector. Apartments serve many persons for whom the homeownership option simply is not available. They are also desirable from a land use and energy conservation concept.

I am pleased to see that on page 21 of the committee report, HUD is directed to make funds available under the 1975 act for all the programs covered. This would mean that FHA and VA mortgages and conventionally financed apartments would become eligible, as well as the conventional single family and condominium units now eligible.

I hope that HUD will move in this direction. To do so would be consistent with the President's expressed support for the expansions Congress made in the program, including the coverage of conventional apartments.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. STEVENSON was recognized.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I urge the Senator to yield to me?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I have cleared this request with the distinguished Senator from Illinois, with the manager of the bill, the ranking member, the ranking member on the committee, and the leadership.

I ask unanimous consent that time on any amendment on this bill be reduced to 30 minutes to be equally divided in accordance with the usual form.

The Acting President pro tempore objected.

Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk and I ask for a 5 minute extension.

The Acting President pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 6, line 4, strike "$195,116,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"$196,116,000"

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, this amendment restores $14 million of the approximately $62 million cut from the administration's request for funds to administer HUD's housing programs. The amendment would expand the coverage of the section 518(b) reimbursement for defects program. It would help provide the resources needed for more effective implementation of all FHA's mortgage guarantee programs.

Hearings of the Banking Committee, of which the distinguished member of this bill is the chairman, which were held recently in Chicago revealed HUD and FHA's inability to inspect property adequately before it was insured.

Those hearings revealed as similar inquiries have in other parts of the country the inability of HUD and FHA to inspect property adequately before it was insured.

Money spent to correct these deficiencies in FHA administration would be money well spent. Nationally, HUD now owns 74,000 single family homes which cost the Government $20 million a year in rentals and maintenance. HUD has done the job she wanted to do which in the long run will, in effect, cut deep and reduce delays, and it will save us money in the long run.

So I think this $4.5 million will be money well spent and I think it will better facilitate the implementation of our housing programs.

So I urge the Senate to adopt the amendment that was offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. STEVENSON. I thank the Senator from Texas and I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, have joined as a cosponsor and strongly urge this amendment upon the Senate, for this reason:

Secretary Hills, who is new, is a very bright woman, very deeply involved, and has her heart really in this work, appeared before the Joint Economic Committee of which I have the Senator from Illinois as a member. Senator Proxmire was there. She made a very strong point about many things in the housing bill which she felt should have been granted to the Department.

But in the final analysis, she came down hard on the fact that she was simply being stripped of the means to do the job she wanted to do which involved so much personal service, as the Senator has outlined, in the appraisal of properties, the consideration of properties, the enormous amount of detail. I know of no department, by the way, in which you get into the nitty-gritty as you do in HUD. Her feeling about the matter was so sincere, so expert, and so persuasive that I really think it gives us a special dimension within the consciousness and hearing of the manager of the bill himself, because he was there and challenged her very sharply. She stuck to her guns, and I really think it was very impressive.

I join Senator Stevenson in the hope that in view of the fact that she is a new Secretary, she has a monumental job, that this is one of the biggest challenges—housing. It is in very bad shape in this country, and the Government has a lot to do with it, as we all know.

Mr. TOWER. Will the Senator yield?

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

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois. I think it is wise of him to offer this amendment. I appreciate his including me as a cosponsor. I agree with him, it would be penny-wise and pound-foolish to do otherwise.

Mr. President, I am not one who has ever supported or advocated the proliferation of the bureaucracy. I have been one of those who has advocated reductions in Government personnel. But I think we have to be selective about this matter and I think we have to look into areas where use of adequate numbers of personnel to administer and implement will, in effect, cut deep and reduce delays, and it will save us money in the long run.

So I think this $4.5 million will be money well spent and I think it will better facilitate the implementation of our housing programs.

After all, that is one of the things we are most concerned about in this bill, reducing start-up delays in housing for eligible families, to help those in residential facilities to people who need them.

So I urge the Senate to adopt the amendment that was offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. STEVENSON. I thank the Senator from Texas and I yield to the Senator from New York.
I would hope very much the managers might, in that spirit and for that reason, accept this amendment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I ask the Senator from Illinois if he will grant me the privilege of being a cosponsor and then to comment briefly on this important subject.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from West Virginia be added as cosponsor.

The Acting President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator add me as cosponsor?

The Acting President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) for presenting this amendment.

I think perhaps a brief look back to an action that was forward-looking at a time. I reemphasize what has been said, that we were able to realize the underpinning of the HOLC. In saying them, I want to tell the Senate that they saved insurance companies, banks, and lenders of money which had mortgages on those homes. It was one of the greatest programs that President Roosevelt put into effect among all of the very fine programs that he initiated.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will my colleague yield further?

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, how much time remains to the sponsor of this amendment?

The Acting President pro tempore. The Senator has fewer than 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the Senator yield 1 minute?

Mr. STEVENSON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I hesitate to add to what has been said by the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) except to indicate that in that period of the 1930's, there was a real problem, and we had to act. That, I believe, is a necessary ingredient in these days. We are inclined sometimes to let ourselves bog down with complexities of drafting an amendment or the passage of legislation. There are matters that even though they seem complex, they are in fact really very simple. To build an America on housing, home building and the family unit is sound and we should not deter from moving forward quickly. The opportunity for homeownership and adequate housing can be the strengthening fabric which holds together our society.

Mr. STEVENSON. The Senator is absolutely right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I ask to be added as a cosponsor to the amendment?

Mr. STEVENSON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the Senator from Washington be added as a cosponsor.

The President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I vigorously oppose this amendment. I think it is going exactly the wrong way. I tried to cut this item by more than 3 percent. There is only a 3 percent cut in the productivity that has the worst record of productivity that I have heard of in Government since I have been here. Their productivity has dropped 42 percent since 1972, and these are their figures, not mine. In other words, they have people up there who are just not doing a job. I do not feel we should reward them by providing whatever they ask.

I yield to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development who has done a marvelous lobbying job. She has been on the phone to Senators all morning. A number of Senators have told me that. She is a very charming lady, but I hope in this case there will be a little bit of resistance on the part of the Senate.

After all, when an agency back in 1972 had as many people, virtually, as they had in 1974, and were doing just about twice the work, is any sense to me that we cannot cut them at least 3 percent. It is only a token cut.

I would hope that the Senate would resist the endearing, persuasive arguments of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development from West Virginia, Alabama, Washington, and elsewhere. If we are really going to mean business about these programs, it seems to me that when we have a record of nonperformance we should not respond by letting them go on with the same old bureaucracy.

Let us take a look at what they intend to do. They do not want you to have to have 600,000 Government assisted housing starts, which is our goal, or 500,000 or so, which is about what they had in 1972. They say in the coming year they will have about 290,000 housing starts. What are they going to do with these HUD payrollers?

They say that the reason for the drop in productivity is that when their programs dropped they kept everybody aboard because they anticipated that the program would come back. Well, maybe it will, but they do not even have any plans to have to go on with the HUD. A word to the wise, when you have people up there who are just not doing a job, it would be sound and we should not deter from moving forward quickly. The opportunity for homeownership and adequate housing can be the strengthening fabric which holds together our society.

I yield to the Senator from Illinois.
tion. 8 lower income housing assistance program are expected to increase. An increase of 70,000 loans is expected in the property improvement and mobile home loans program in 1976. A total of $290,000. We are expected to come under annual payment in 1976 under subsidized housing programs.

And I could go on and on.

Mr. President, this amendment restores only $4.5 million of the $6.2 million cut from the management of housing programs. This restores a much smaller part of the other cuts made by this committee in the HUD budget. The result will be not only more housing for people and better neighborhoods, but a saving of hundreds of millions of dollars to the Government.

I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

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

Mr. STEVENSON. How much time do I have remaining now, Mr. President?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has less than a minute.

Mr. STEVENSON. I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. One of the big things Mrs. Hills made a point of—and I hope I am not being charged with discriminating either for or against her—was that she was trying to reach 400,000 lower-income housing units under section 8. The committee has given her back the money she needs to do it in terms of the financing, and she has pleaded for the necessary staff.

I think that is such a desirable objective, and a new program, that we ought to go along with her. That is my reason for my strong support of this amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the chairman of the subcommittee, and to confirm the statement that he has already made that he wanted to cut this bill further. I had to make all the arguments that the Senator from New York has just made, and the comity we owe a new Secretary, and so on, in order to avoid additional cuts.

The Senator from Wisconsin makes a good deal of sense about this. There ought to be further cuts. We are not talking about cutting to the bone. We are talking about a work pool of people on the public payroll of about 9,000 people, and we are suggesting here a reduction of about 300 people—300 out of 9,000.

As the Senator from Wisconsin, the chairman of the subcommittee, has suggested, these 300 people are merely a token reflection of the 42 percent decrease in the efficiency of the Department.

If in fact HUD does begin to crank up section 8, which I hope they do, I will be the first one to support a supplemental budget. But it is discouraging for me to see the House cuts too far and too fast. I have been extremely discouraged with HUD, with the failure of HUD to implement the programs that Congress has mandated.

If they are willing to do the job, I think we can give them the tools, but until there is evidence that they are ready to do the job, I think the committee should be held the level which has been provided in the bill.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield me 2 minutes on the bill?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, if one could save money by rejecting this amendment, it would be a different matter. Mrs. Hills has been referred to as a charming, beautiful woman, and all that. She is also a very tough-minded and efficient woman, who also believes in reducing the Federal deficit to the extent that it can be reduced. For example, she urged the President to veto a housing bill that would cost us additional hundreds of millions of dollars. It seems hardly likely to me that a Secretary would recommend the veto of a bill that would cost us hundreds of millions of dollars to be administered by her own department. Usually when you are empire building, you get all the authorizations and appropriations you can.

Now she wants an immediate $4.5 million to be able to adequately and efficiently administer these programs and serve the people they are designed to serve. I think it would be nit-picking on the part of the Senate if we denied it to her.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. STONE). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON). On this question, the ayes and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMMER), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURCK), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. MORGAN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HARR), is absent because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS) would vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BLAINE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BEL-MON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 37, as follows:

Roll Call Vote No. 335 Leg.

YEAS—42

Baker, Warren (Maine) 31
Beall, Hatfield (Montana) 31
Brock, Hatfield (Oregon) 31
Brooke, Humphrey (New Hampshire) 31
Clark, Hruska (Nebraska) 31
Cranston, Edwards (Rhode Island) 31
Dole, Metcalf (Missouri) 31
Dole, Packwood (Oregon) 31
Fong, McClure (California) 31
Gravel, Moynihane (Alaska) 31

NAYS—37

Abourezk, Hendrick (South Dakota) 22
Allen, Hefner (Tennessee) 22
Byrd, Rusk (Texas) 22
Byrd, Robert C. (West Virginia) 22
Cease, Mansfield (Ohio) 22
Culver, Mathias (Indiana) 22
Culver, McClellan (Indiana) 22
Dole, McGee (North Carolina) 22
Ford, Montgomery (Alabama) 22
Garner, Moss (Texas) 22
Hart, Gary W. (New Mexico) 22

NOT VOTING—20

Bartlett, Ritt (Connecticut) 13
Bartlow, Glenn (North Carolina) 13
Bayh, Brown (Indiana) 13
Bumpers, Hartke (Wisconsin) 13
Bumpers, Hartke (Delaware) 13
Church, Metcalfe (Connecticut) 13

So Mr. STEVENSON's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENSON. I move to lay this motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their seats. Senators will withdraw to the cloakroom if they wish to converse.

TIME-LIMITATION AGREEMENT—VETO MESSAGE ON S. 66

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. MONDALE. I will be glad to.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute without the time being charged.
I am authorized to say that Senator Muskie, the chairman of the Budget Committee, has looked at this amendment and has authorized me to say that it is clearly within the budget resolution that we adopted earlier this year and that he strongly supported this fresh water community lakes program—and of course he did so repeatedly in earlier authorization efforts.

Last year, the Senate appropriated $75 million for this bill was vetoed. Then, under tremendous pressure, we were able to gain only a modest, almost insignificant, appropriation of $4 million. This year, the Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended $10 million.

I am proposing that we compromise with last year's figure and with the administration and come up with a figure that is two-thirds of $50 million—rather than the $75 million that we appropriated a year ago.

This money would help to clean up and help to keep from pollution one of the most cherished resources in America—our freshwater community lakes. There are literally thousands of these lakes which are being destroyed through pollution, siltation, algae growth, sedimentation, and everything else.

This program was enacted 3 years ago and has never been funded adequately. The distinguished manager of this bill has been one of the chief sponsors of this program over the years, because, like Minnesota, Wisconsin is a great freshwater State, and his State is probably further ahead in this program than any other State in the Union. Therefore, I hope that the distinguished floor manager of the bill will accept this amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President—on my time—I wish I could accept this amendment, and I certainly would, if I felt I possibly could, but I cannot do so. I say that although the Senator from Minnesota made an excellent presentation of a Presidential veto, that this program is badly needed and that we should have it.

But let us look at the facts. As of June 30—and that is the latest date for which we have information—the Environmental Protection Agency has not obligated the $4 million provided in fiscal 1975 for the clean lakes program. They are just now proceeding with the first round of the program. Based on applications received from States for use of the $4 million in 1975, it seems that it will be very difficult to expect them to be able to obligate more than the $10 million the Senate has provided.

Furthermore, it is my understanding that we need more time to evaluate the cost effectiveness of the lake restoration programs now under consideration before greatly accelerating the activity.

In his veto message in the 1975 Agriculture, Environmental and Consumer Protection Appropriations Act, the President said:

The feasibility of this cleanup program has not yet been proven. Furthermore, study is essential if we are to avoid ineffective Federal spending for these purposes.

I think the President may well be wrong and the Senator from Minnesota right. The appearance of the Senator from Minnesota was very convincing. However, this is a program that will accelerate more than 100 percent if we simply provide the $10 million in the bill. It is providing only $4 million now. They ask for nothing in the budget, so we would be $50 million over the budget. Even if we put in the $50 million and got it through the House, there would be a few chances a Presidential administration would proceed any faster than they would if we provided $10 million.

For these reasons, I think it would be a mistake to, in part, the Senator to accept the amendment and go another $50 million over the budget. With the adoption of the Stevenson amendment a few minutes ago, we are now well over the $100 million above the budget. There is some prospect that if we put more than $10 million in the budget it might be an additional reason for a veto.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY).

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Senator MONDALE and I are offering an amendment to increase the appropriation for section 314 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act from $10 million to $25 million. We are offering this amendment because of our conviction that our Government must live up to its commitment, enacted in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, to help our States and cities clean up our lakes.

The amendment which we are offering will not provide full funding for the clean lakes programs. It will not enable all of our lakes to exist. But it will be a step in the right direction.

Last year, Congress appropriated $75 million for the clean lakes programs, but the administration pulled back from the $75 million and scaled it down to $4 million. Even that $4 million was not used for the purpose which we intended—cleaning up our lakes—but rather was used for a research program which I found indistinguishable from section 104(h) of the same Pollution Control Act.

This year, the administration made no request for funding of the clean lakes program. The Senate Committee on Appropriations, however, did recommend some funding for this program. I believe the Appropriations Committee should be commended for its wisdom in continuing to provide funds for this program and for increasing the funding above the current level. But I think we should fund this program at an even higher level.

The need certainly is there. My own State of Minnesota estimates that it will need to spend $44.7 million over the next 4 years to clean up our lakes. Other States, I am certain, have similar needs. The national extrapolation survey, in examining 242 lakes in just 10 States, reached the conclusion that 80 percent...
We possess the skills to clean up our lakes. But, if we do not have money available, they will not be cleaned up. It is not enough to say that we have the skills. We must have the money to use these skills. The lakes are in bad condition and we must act now to save this precious resource. We must act now to save this precious resource.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this amendment is that we appropriate $25 million to increase the program. This is a relatively modest amendment and I ask that we proceed to a vote on it.

Mr. MONDALE. Let me modify my amendment first. I modify my amendment to provide for an additional $15 million for the program so that the amendment will read: on page 20, line 13, strike out $370 million and insert in lieu thereof, $385 million.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What we are talking about here is a very small amount. The amendment is so modified. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. I move to proceed with the amendment.

Mr. MONDALE. I yield back my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have not yielded back my time yet.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that this is an amendment which I think can meaningfully be interpreted, under the circumstances the Senate would be better served if I were to table the amendment.

Mr. MONDALE. Will the Senator withhold?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I beg the Senator's pardon. I thought he was through.

Mr. MONDALE. All we are asking for in this modified amendment is that we appropriate $25 million to help the communities around the nation to clean up their fresh water communities. For all the lakes, all the water bodies, we appropriated $775 million, but regrettably, the bill was vetoed. There are already many applications—good applications—from the State of Wisconsin, from Minnesota, from Florida—indeed, from everywhere, from the United States, from everywhere. To ask for a modest $25 million for this national program, when we already know how to deal with this problem, and when the program is finally getting going, seems to me to be the most modest kind of request. As a matter of fact, I had hoped that the distinguished floor manager would accept the amendment.

Mr. MONDALE. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Now we are going to $10 million. We do not get a veto. The total of $10 million, as I say, would be more than a 100-per cent increase. I move to table the amendment, Mr. President, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE). The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. SNYDER), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HARR), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HART), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Montana (Mr. MORGAN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. MORGAN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), are necessarily absent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HAAR) is absent because of illness.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BARTLETT), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDBERGER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from California (Mr. STEVENS) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 40, as follows:

[Roll Call Vote No. 336 Leg.]
The question recurs on the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I was going to object to the distinguished floor manager that the sponsors of the amendment would be willing to compromise further.

The original amendment would have added $4 million. This amendment added $15 million. We would suggest reducing it another $5 million, so we would be adding only $10 million.

I would hope the Senator from Wisconsin, who is one of the Nation's champions on this program, could, on this lovely Saturday afternoon, accede to that request.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to my good friend from Minnesota, the Senator goes more than 100 percent over what we did last year. He wants to go $75 million, this year we are going only $10 million, so I do not know.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In view of the fact that we are subject to a tabling motion, I am perfectly willing to accept this compromise provided we do it by a voice vote and not waste the time of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Great, let it go.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place add the following new section:

"Sec. (1). Prior to December 1, 1975, no part of the provisions of this Act shall be used directly or indirectly to provide Federal financial assistance, including grants, loans, or loan guarantees, to or for the benefit of any Soul City New Community Project in Warren County, North Carolina, which is under investigation by the General Accounting Office."

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, this amendment is directed to the appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It provides that prior to December 1, 1975, none of these funds shall be used directly or indirectly to provide Federal financial assistance, including grants, loans, or loan guarantees, or to or for the benefit of the Soul City new community project in Warren County, North Carolina, which is under investigation and audit by the General Accounting Office.

This amendment is being investigated and audited by the General Accounting Office of the distinguished House Member from the Second District of North Carolina (Mr. Fontaine), I requested such action. Let me emphasize at the outset that while the Senator from Wisconsin has some tentative conclusions about the project which he is about to discuss, I shall withhold final judgment until all of the facts are in. But it is essential, at this time, that some information already available be presented to the Senate.

In 1968 when the plans for the creation of Soul City were first announced, there were reported that the project would indeed. The developer, Floyd McKissick, and others widely advertised that it would be a haven for black people, apparently the idea was that blacks needed to have a city that was all theirs. That was in the air. That project, investigation and audit by the General Accounting Office.

It was to be established in my State, North Carolina, about 50 miles northeast of Raleigh in Warren County. Indeed, travelers along Interstate Highway 85 may see the large sign indicating its proximity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in order. At this time, Senators will withdraw to the cloakroom or take their seats. The Senator from North Carolina will take their seats.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order. At this time, Senators will withdraw to the cloakroom or take their seats. The Senator from North Carolina will take their seats.

The Senator from North Carolina.

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

Mr. HELMS. Yes. I am happy to yield to the able Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Frank Gorham of my staff be granted the privilege of the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

"Sec. (1). Prior to December 1, 1975, no part of the provisions of this Act shall be used directly or indirectly to provide Federal financial assistance, including grants, loans, or loan guarantees, to or for the benefit of any Soul City New Community Project in Warren County, North Carolina, which is under investigation and audit by the General Accounting Office."

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, this amendment is directed to the appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It provides that prior to December 1, 1975, none of these funds shall be used directly or indirectly to provide Federal financial assistance, including grants, loans, or loan guarantees, to or for the benefit of the Soul City new community project in Warren County, North Carolina, which is under investigation and audit by the General Accounting Office.

This project is being investigated and audited by the General Accounting Office of the distinguished House Member from the Second District of North Carolina (Mr. Fontaine), I requested such action. Let me emphasize at the outset that while the Senator from Wisconsin has some tentative conclusions about the project which he is about to discuss, I shall withhold final judgment until all of the facts are in. But it is essential, at this time, that some information already available be presented to the Senate.

In 1968 when the plans for the creation of Soul City were first announced, there were reported that the project would indeed. The developer, Floyd McKissick, and others widely advertised that it would be a haven for black people, apparently the idea was that blacks needed to have a city that was all theirs. That was in the air. That project, investigation and audit by the General Accounting Office.

It was to be established in my State, North Carolina, about 50 miles northeast of Raleigh in Warren County. Indeed, travelers along Interstate Highway 85 may see the large sign indicating its proximity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in order. At this time, Senators will withdraw to the cloakroom or take their seats. The Senator from North Carolina will take their seats.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

During the earlier years, Soul City officials assured that the project would be developed by black-controlled corporations. It was to be established in my State, North Carolina, about 50 miles northeast of Raleigh in Warren County. Indeed, travelers along Interstate Highway 85 may see the large sign indicating its proximity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in order. At this time, Senators will withdraw to the cloakroom or take their seats. The Senator from North Carolina will take their seats.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

During the earlier years, Soul City officials assured that the project would house 44,000 residents in 13,000 homes. Of course, that was a long range projection. That was 7 years ago.

The city was to cover some 5,000 acres including a 400-acre industrial park which, it was said, would ultimately employ 8,200 people. To achieve all this, the Soul City foundation and a proliferation of other organizations created by Mr. McKissick for the obvious purpose of applying for Federal funds have been awarded numerous large grants, provided loan guarantees, and the like, to develop plans for industries, education, manpower training, health services and recreation, industrial development, and many other areas.

The level of Federal financial assistance to Soul City, directly or indirectly, has indeed been one of the most prominent manifestations of social engineering, and another unmasking the old concept that enough money thrown helter-skelter at any problem will make it go away, or that the return in social fashion in any proposal, will make it happen. In one form or another over the past 6 years, the Federal Government has thrown millions of dollars from taxpayers' project through the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, the National Endowment of the Arts, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Transportation. No one is certain how much money is involved, but estimates run as high as $10 million.

The operators of this project—which, by the way has the appearance of a family enterprise, of course, wanted the new city to have fine streets, broad swimming pools, water and sewage facilities, adequate housing, and educational opportunities as well as employment training so that individuals can learn how to work. And, of course, there had to be recreational and cultural facilities. Hence, the involvement of all those Federal Departments and agencies at the taxpayers expense. One wonders how many of those taxpayers, footing the bill of $75 million, were taught how to work under some Federal project or spend their evenings absorbing the kind of so-called culture that is supported by the National Endowment of the Arts, but then that is another matter. The point here is that you name it, and it seems that the Soul City developers found some Federal agency with funds to finance it.

The General Accounting Office recently provided me with a list of grants, contracts, agreements, loans, and loan guarantees benefiting Soul City that had been certified as modified as of May 15, a manifestation of social engineering, and another unmasking the old concept that enough money thrown helter-skelter at any problem will make it go away, or that the return in social fashion in any proposal, will make it happen. In one form or another over the past 6 years, the Federal Government has thrown billions of Federal dollars through the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, the National Endowment of the Arts, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Transportation. No one is certain how much money is involved, but estimates run as high as $10 million.

The operators of this project—which, by the way has the appearance of a family enterprise, of course, wanted the new city to have fine streets, broad swimming pools, water and sewage facilities, adequate housing, and educational opportunities as well as employment training so that individuals can learn how to work. And, of course, there had to be recreational and cultural facilities. Hence, the involvement of all those Federal Departments and agencies at the taxpayers expense. One wonders how many of those taxpayers, footing the bill of $75 million, were taught how to work under some Federal project or spend their evenings absorbing the kind of so-called culture that is supported by the National Endowment of the Arts, but then that is another matter. The point here is that you name it, and it seems that the Soul City developers found some Federal agency with funds to finance it.

The General Accounting Office recently provided me with a list of grants, contracts, agreements, loans, and loan guarantees benefiting Soul City that had been certified as modified as of May 15, a manifestation of social engineering, and another unmasking the old concept that enough money thrown helter-skelter at any problem will make it go away, or that the return in social fashion in any proposal, will make it happen. In one form or another over the past 6 years, the Federal Government has thrown billions of Federal dollars through the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, the National Endowment of the Arts, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Transportation. No one is certain how much money is involved, but estimates run as high as $10 million.

The operators of this project—which, by the way has the appearance of a family enterprise, of course, wanted the new city to have fine streets, broad swimming pools, water and sewage facilities, adequate housing, and educational opportunities as well as employment training so that individuals can learn how to work. And, of course, there had to be recreational and cultural facilities. Hence, the involvement of all those Federal Departments and agencies at the taxpayers expense. One wonders how many of those taxpayers, footing the bill of $75 million, were taught how to work under some Federal project or spend their evenings absorbing the kind of so-called culture that is supported by the National Endowment of the Arts, but then that is another matter. The point here is that you name it, and it seems that the Soul City developers found some Federal agency with funds to finance it.
provided grants in the amount of $98,320 to compensate for past cultural and educational disadvantages of minority and low-income whites—learning lab. Between January 1, 1973, and September 30, 1972, the National Endowment for the Arts provided grants in the amount of $12,500 for arts advocate-support planning of a cultural arts program for Soul City.

Moving on down the list, the Department of Labor, between September 1, 1974, and August 30, 1975, has, or will, provide grants in the amount of $34,592 for outreach-recruitment-place ment programs. Between May 1, 1974, and August 30, 1974, the Community Services Administration, previously mentioned, provided $562,675 for economic development demonstration project. On September 28, 1973 HUD handed over to the Soul City Sanitary District a grant in the amount of half a million dollars for water and sewer needs of the community. On the same day, HUD also handed over to the same Soul City Sanitary District another $204,000 grant for the same purpose to supplement the half million dollar grant, making a total of $704,000 that the Soul City Sanitary District received from HUD on that one day.

It is interesting to note that thus far I have mentioned the following organizations directly associated with Soul City: First, the Soul City Co.; second, Soul City Foundation; third, Soul City Sanitary District, fourth, Soul City Utilities Co. Also, there is the Health Co., which has received over a million dollars in GCA funds; and finally, there is the Warren Regional Planning Corp. Between May 26, 1972, and July 25, 1973, the Warren Regional Planning Corporation, which awarded in Soul City in the amount of $833,140 from the Office of Minority Business Enterprises of the Department of Commerce to plan, promote and develop an industrial program for Soul City.

Mr. President, the list goes on and on, but I will not belabor the point further. Millions upon millions of the taxpayers' dollars have been spent for the creation of this so-called "free standing" new community. But, in the years following that announcement back in 1968, and the provision of all this money, there has been no industry at Soul City, no shops, no houses—there is no city, just a sign, a few house trailers, and a little partial construction. In all, six federally assisted organizations, formed by Mr. Floyd McKissick, have received a total of money in one form or another for the benefit of Soul City. Yet, as one reporter noted, the place is appropriately named, because it is the soul that runs there.

Where has all the money gone? A press investigation concluded that the aforementioned health company spent $339,968 in 1972-73 on a regional health clinic for Vance and Warren Counties, the location of Soul City, and most of the money went for salaries. Not one patient was treated before the clinic eventually opened on August 5, 1974, 11 months behind schedule. It is located within the Soul City limits. If there can be such, with no city, in two double-wide trailers rented from one of McKissick's companies, the report stated.

The Warren Regional Planning Corp., also previously mentioned, was given $297,500 in 1972-73—according to the press report figure, a larger proposed one—to plan an industrial program for Soul City and to persuade industries to locate there. That corporation apparently did a lot of planning, but we are told that it recruited no industry. In its report to the Office of Minority Business Enterprises, the corporation conceded that its industry recruiting efforts were "premature." This same story is repeated over and over.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Soul City Needs Thorough Audit" from the Raleigh, N.C., dated March 5, 1975, be printed in the Record at this point.

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

Soul City Needs Thorough Audit

Clearly there is need for a thorough public audit of Floyd B. McKissick's Soul City development in Warren County. And obviously a credible audit is possible only by such a congressional agency as the Government Accounting Office, which is independent of the federal departments and bureaus that are financing this venture.

A series of investigative stories by Reporter Pat Stith discloses numerous federal grants, loans and loan guarantees made to five nonprofit Soul City organizations controlled by McKissick and interlocked with four profit-making organizations also headed or dominated by him.

More than $5 million made possible by 25 programs under six federal agencies has been funneled into Soul City. And another $14 million mostly under federal loan guarantees is still unava­

McKissick's wife serves as chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts. McKissick Enterprises Inc., which he also heads, has a larger annual budget of $1,204,000, a million of which it is not currently directly connected. McKissick's son-in-law, Mr. W., produces a $417,000-a-year director of Soul City Foundation Inc., one of the five groups with which Clay­ton is directly connected. McKissick's son-in-law, Mr. W., produces a $417,000-a-year director of the Soul City Foundation. This foundation has obtained eight federal grants totaling more than $200,000 to plan and implement social and human services programs for the future Soul City, but I will not belabor the point further. Millions upon millions of the taxpayers' dollars have been spent wisely or in an accountable manner. An independent audit that can trace all the sources and expenditures of federally related funds in this project is essential. Without this confidence McKissick will never attract private industry to Soul City. And without job-creating industry there will never be a community there. Some order must be brought to management of the project to save it, or else to prevent further waste of public funds on it. And an accounting is needed of the ethics and legality, or lack of them, that have brought the project to its present status.

Mr. HELMS. Despite the fact that an investigation and audit of the participation of the Federal Government in the so-called "free standing" new community of Soul City, N.C., some time, certain Federal agencies are continuing to provide Soul City with financial assistance. On July 3, 1975, the Office of Minority Business Enterprises of the Commerce Department announced that it had awarded a new 2-year contract in the amount of $330,000 to Warren Regional Planning Corp. for Soul City. And on July 15, 1975, the Community Services Administration, former­ly of OEO—but now I am advised it is part of HEW—awarded to Soul City Foundation, Inc., a grant in the amount of $274,000. The alleged purpose of this contract is to provide assistance to the Soul City Foundation, an educational, cultural and new city help to build it—whatever the close of a previous GSA program conducted by the delegate agency—Soul City Foundation.

Realizing that Federal financial assistance to Soul City is obviously continuing despite the ongoing investiga­tion and audit by the General Account­ing Office, I prepared this amendment to the HUD appropriations bill to pre-
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cluded that Department from providing any further financial assistance for the benefit of Soul City pending the report of that audit and investigation which is expected to be filed sometime in November.

However, yesterday morning, while on the Senate floor about 8 o'clock for the Senate to resume its consideration of pending matters, I decided to call Mrs. Carla Stith, the distinguished Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and inquire about this matter.

The time by then was exactly 8:10. I found her in her office, hard at work, I learned that she had arrived at her office more than an hour before. I was exceedingly impressed by the diligence and dedication of this hardworking public official. We discussed the matter, and subsequently I had a telephone conversation with Dr. Otto Stoltz, general manager of the Community Development Corp. In the course of these conversations, the time started now the report of the audit and investigation with Dr. Stoltz, I shall ask unanimous consent in a moment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, before the Senate withdraws his amendment will he permit a response by the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HELMS. Provided I have time for a response to the Senator from Massachusetts, if needed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina, I believe it will be agreed, does not consume much time in the Senate. I hope I will therefore have the privilege of discussing this situation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would the Senator be willing to have me guarantee I will offer him 5 minutes on the bill if he wants to respond to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HELMS. That will be satisfactory depending on the circumstances, yes. I thank my able friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. PRESIDENT. I would point out that in 1 minute from now, we are going on controlled time on a veto message from the President of the United States.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. As I understood, this amendment was to have 30 minutes, 15 minutes to a side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator will not lose his minutes; but what I am saying is, the Senate has agreed to go under controlled time beginning at 1:15, and if the Senator gave up a pace he would probably have only half a minute.

Mr. HELMS. Could that time be extended, say, for 20 minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time on the veto message starting at 1:15, the time start at 1:30 and continue until 2 o'clock, and that the vote be taken at that time, with the time between to be equally divided between and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader, or their designees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The vote will occur not later than 2 o'clock.

Mr. BROOKE. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. President, we lawyers always say that every case has two sides, and we have heard the side which has been presented by the able Senator from North Carolina on the question of Soul City.

I will not get into what Soul City has done or has not done. I frankly do not know. I think the record will speak for itself as to what Soul City has done, and I am not going to object to a GAO audit of Soul City or of any other agency. Of course, every Senator has a right to make such a request. The Senator from North Carolina having made the request, I am sure GAO will conduct an audit of Soul City, and we will know the result.

But, Mr. President, I think, in all fairness, that the Recons ought to show just what is involved in this case.

An article which appeared in the Raleigh News and Observer yesterday alleged certain allegations against the new town of Soul City, and that is why this audit was requested. However, HUD conducted an investigation of Soul City on its own, and I have a letter which was addressed to Mr. Claude Sitton, the editor of the Raleigh News and Observer, Raleigh, N.C., from a Mr. Melvin Margolies, Assistant Administrator, Office of Finance, of HUD's Office of New Communities. I am going to read a portion of that letter, because I think it is relevant:

DEAR Mr. SITTON: At the time the Mr. Pat Stith the reporter, responsible for the News and Observer's recent series on Soul City, first appeared at our offices, it was apparent to me that Mr. Stith did not present a fair and balanced report on the subject. During the course of discussions, Mr. Stith subjected the Soul City project in any and all positive aspects of the Soul City project. Furthermore, his reporting of the facts and statements was often inaccurate, misleading or unsupported. For example, Mr. Stith attributed the quote to the General Manager that a certain matter could not be researched by the staff because "I just can't take the manpower to do that." In fact, in response to a series of very abrasive comments and questions, the General Manager indicated that he did not have the staff to investigate in detail every unsubstantiated allegation of news reporters, but would clearly do so in response to substantive inquiries or concerns by the appropriate agency.

Furthermore, Mr. Stith's representations with respect to the relationship of pre-development costs, the required equity contribution, the grants from the Minority Business Enterprise of the Commerce Department were inaccurate. Reading from another part of this letter, and I will put the entire text into the Record:

Unlike most of the other Federally sponsored new communities, Soul City has not depleted its initial funds but has, in fact, spent less than the projected budget during its first development year. To proceed cautiously at a time of severe slump in the housing industry is a commendable course of action. Special escrow disbursement controls which were placed on Soul City at the time of its financial closing have insured that the HUD guarantee funds would not be expended too rapidly.

The entire emphasis of the Soul City project, as I have been told to Wayne and Vance Counties, these counties have been losing jobs for 25 years due to a decline in farm income. Overall population in the counties has been static for this period. The desire to reverse these trends led the State of North Carolina, the cities of Oxford and Hendersonville, and Warren County, to support Soul City project. The unique concept of Soul City is to provide experience with rural minority enterprise. This concept has been actively advocated by planners, economists and legislators.

The full text of this letter is in the Record.

On January 31, 1975, the Office of the Inspector General of HUD completed a review of the Soul City Company. This audit was
designed to cover the activities of the Soul City Company, the HUD Area Office, and the local government agencies as they pertained to the handling of Federal grants and loans and the $85 million New Community guarantee. The findings of this audit were as follows:

The general weaknesses in the accounting and reporting systems used in controlling grant funds, we evidenced no mismanagement of grant and loan funds.

Concluding

It is indeed distressing to me to encounter a reporter and a series of articles that so clearly display preconceived personal bias. Unfortunately, there are many publications that convey and difficulties, some of which are included in Mr. Stith's articles. That the Soul City project should experience obstacles and difficulties, some of which are included in my personal knowledge since I did not arrive at HUD until April, 1974. However, these articles investigated by the General Accounting Office and evidence of wrongdoing is found, we will be the first to insist that appropriate remedial action be taken immediately. Federal financial and monitoring control systems instituted upon my arrival will insure that any and all expenditures by Soul City are for appropriate purposes prescribed by the legislation.

Mr. Stith's articles failed to emphasize many of the significant positive accomplishments and prospects for Soul City. For example, the bulk of the grant funds obtained through the efforts of Mr. McKissick, the Soul City Company, and its subsidiaries have benefited the entire region. For example, the Federal Government has provided $6 million to support the construction of a regional water system, 80% of which will meet the needs of Oxford, Henderson, and unincorporated portions of Warren and Vance Counties. Another $8.5 million has been spent to provide health services to the existing residents of the region.

Unlike most of the other Federally sponsored new communities, Soul City has not had the severe slump in the housing industry in the first development year. To proceed cautiously at a time of severe slump in the housing industry is a commendable course of action. Special escrow disbursement controls which were placed on Soul City at the time of its financial closing have insured that the HUD guarantee funds would not be expended too rapidly.

The entire emphasis of the Soul City project has been to bring jobs into Warren and Vance Counties. These counties have been losing population and fact, spent less than the projected budget during its first development year. To proceed cautiously at a time of severe slump in the housing industry is a commendable course of action. Special escrow disbursement controls which were placed on Soul City at the time of its financial closing have insured that the HUD guarantee funds would not be expended too rapidly.

Mr. Mr. Stith's representations with respect to the relationship of pre-development costs, the required equity contribution, and grants from the Office of Minority Business Enterprise of the Commerce Department were inaccurate. Mr. Stith states that the $1.5 million in required equity at the financial closing included $500,000 for documents HUD cannot identify. HUD did not value such documents as part of the required equity contribution. The actual pre-development costs approved by HUD were not for the purchase of, or represented by, documents. These costs were of the normal type incurred in the course of land development and authorized by legislation as eligible to be funded from the proceeds of the HUD guaranteed loans. They included such items as interest, commitment and guarantee fees, real estate taxes, planning, engineering, auditing and legal fees, and overhead salaries and expenses. The total amount of actual costs of pre-development which McKissick Associates had incurred was $1.28 million. Under HUD's normal practice, $1.28 million would have been repaid to the entity who actually paid for these costs. In the case of Soul City, HUD required an equity contribution by the investors of $1.5 million. One million dollars in cash had already been invested in the project. In order to further insure that the other $500 thousand was properly invested in Soul City, HUD insisted that, instead of investing $1.28 million being paid out and accounting for $500 thousand transferred to the Soul City Company account, HUD required that the proceeds of the HUD guaranteed loans be used to purchase $390,000 for 1810 acres. Thereafter, he acquired 250 additional acres for $745,000. In 1974, these parcels were sold to the Soul City Company for $650,000, which represented McKissick's original cost plus the carrying costs during the holding period. Therefore, in fact, the actual transaction was directly contrary to Mr. Stith's implied conclusion resulting from an inaccurate and misleading presentation.

The general allegations of misconduct at the time of the financial closing, which occurred in March, 1974, are not facts within my personal knowledge since I did not arrive at HUD until April, 1974. However, these articles investigated by the General Accounting Office and evidence of wrongdoing is found, we will be the first to insist that appropriate remedial action be taken immediately. Federal financial and monitoring control systems instituted upon my arrival will insure that any and all expenditures by Soul City are for appropriate purposes prescribed by the legislation.

Mr. Stith's articles failed to emphasize many of the significant positive accomplishments and prospects for Soul City. For example, the Federal Government has provided $6 million to support the construction of a regional water system, 80% of which will meet the needs of Oxford, Henderson, and unincorporated portions of Warren and Vance Counties. Another $8.5 million has been spent to provide health services to the existing residents of the region.

Unlike most of the other Federally sponsored new communities, Soul City has not had the severe slump in the housing industry in the first development year. To proceed cautiously at a time of severe slump in the housing industry is a commendable course of action. Special escrow disbursement controls which were placed on Soul City at the time of its financial closing have insured that the HUD guarantee funds would not be expended too rapidly.

The entire emphasis of the Soul City project has been to bring jobs into Warren and Vance Counties. These counties have been losing population and fact, spent less than the projected budget during its first development year. To proceed cautiously at a time of severe slump in the housing industry is a commendable course of action. Special escrow disbursement controls which were placed on Soul City at the time of its financial closing have insured that the HUD guarantee funds would not be expended too rapidly.
Federal grants and loans and the $5 million New Community guarantee. The findings of this audit were as follows:

It is indeed distressing to me to encounter a reporter and a series of articles that so clearly display preconceived personal bias. Without doubt, Soul City has many problems and challenges, which are real. While in Mr. Stith's articles, The Soul City project should experience obstacles and difficulties is not surprising. That the News and Observer should devote 17 articles over 8 days discussing the project and not find a single positive point or offer a single rationale for its problems is a matter for its readers to ponder. One need only read the major financial publications to conclude that most large-scale real estate developments are extremely in serious financial difficulty. It would appear to me that fairness would have required a more balanced attitude, investigation and report.

Sincerely,

MELVIN MAROLES, Assistant Administrator, Office of Finance.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts if I understand him to say that there ought to be a New Soul City built near where the New Soul City was and its bias, to which the Senator from Massachusetts alluded, let me say to the Senate that the News Observer, which is charged by the Senator and Mr. Maroless with being so biased now, was a friendly advocate of Soul City until its fine reporter, Mr. Stith, went over there and looked at it.

So I would say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts if we are going to talk about fairness, great. But I want to be fair to the taxpayers, too. As far as the GAO is concerned and the investigation that Senator Margolies said something about my privilege of asking for one. The Senator is right I have the right, and I did so many weeks ago. In fact, my comments today are based upon the information that came from the GAO.

I know the Senator from Massachusetts, being the able Senator that he is, and certainly being the fair Senator that he always is, wants to be fair to Soul City. But I think he wants to be fair to the taxpayers of this country, and I hope that on one of his trips to or through my State he will drive off of I-95 and per sec so-visited soul city. He will then presen as I have seen, the three house trailers there, the barn, and the tractor, apparently representing $10 million, of the taxpayers' money that we know about as of now, not just the Federal Government over a period of 7 years.

If Soul City cannot get cranked up in 7 years with $19 million, Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina wonders results of the inquiry to take. All this amendment, which I shall withdraw momentarily for reasons already stated, asks is that no more money be sent down there, until the report of the GAO is in. Then we will all see, that is fair to the taxpayers; it is fair to Soul City.

As far as the Senator's explanation that the HUD bureaucrats have investigated themselves approvingly, that is scarcely adequate as far as the Senator from North Carolina is concerned. I do not wish to charge that anyone, and certainly not the members of the cheese factory. That may be precisely what has happened, because the distinguished Secretary of HUD, Mr. Flowers, signed the Maroless letter to Mr. Claude Sitton, which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts put in the record, and it is agreed that the Margolies letter is shot through with errors. Dr. Stolz conceded that they have been incredible abuses in the new communities program.

So all the Senator from North Carolina is saying is let us wait until the facts are before we send any more thousands or millions of dollars to Soul City, N.C. The taxpayers are entitled to this consideration, at least.

Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin refer to page 23 of the report with me for a moment? I just will clarify the $100 million that we have provided in this bill for the community development program.

In the report there is indicated that additional $100 million has been expressly provided for towns of under 50,000 population in metropolitan statistical areas, so-called SMSA balanced communities.

I want the Senator to tell me whether I am right or not on this statement: What we found this far when we began to divide up among the hold-harmless communities and the non-hold-harmless communities is we found that there were many small towns that were non-hold-harmless communities that were applying under the 20 percent formula that were probably not going to get any money. It is my understanding that this money may in fact be used for communities under 50,000 that are not hold-harmless cities. Is that correct or not?

Mr. PROXMIRE, That is exactly correct. As a matter of fact, as I understand it, the so-called hold-harmless cities, big and small, will get their money. What we are concerned about is providing this extra amount in that the other cities that are not hold-harmless cities, those of 50,000 and under, would be able to get community development grant funding, and this would provide for them.

Mr. DOMENICI. So that if the Secretary, in using this $100 million discretionary fund, has applications from non-hold-harmless cities that are under 50,000, is it the Senator's intention that he use this fund for that kind of community development grants application?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct. It would be our intention, as I understand now, to use it exclusively for those who do not have funding otherwise and therefore are not hold-harmless.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator. I commend him for putting it in.
I believe that the Appropriations Committee should have appropriated the full $10 billion authorized in the Emergency Housing Act and approved by the President. However, since this administration and its predecessor have proven to have a unique ability to use housing funds at a rate that blatantly disregards congressional intent, I can understand the Appropriations Committee's unwillingness to provide any more authority at this time, than they expect the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the National Mortgage Association to actually use.

Of course, if the administration recognizes the importance of using these funds rapidly, and a new appropriations of funds appears necessary, I am sure that the Appropriations Committee will be delighted to respond. I will be following the drawdown on this funding very closely and intend to push for the additional funding when the authority provided in the current bill runs out.

Third, I am pleased that the committee has recommended an appropriation of $50 million for the rehabilitation loan fund. I have believed, for a long time, that the rehabilitation program was one of the most important housing programs in which we were engaged. Not only does this program provide the financing needed to salvage housing that has fallen into disrepair, but it is an essential element in the programs of hundreds of communities across the Nation to improve the neighborhoods in which their citizens live. This $50 million, 3 percent loan program will cost the American taxpayer a small fraction of this total amount.

I believe that this program conserves valuable resources, improves the fiscal soundness of our cities, and enhances the quality of life for our people. I am very pleased indeed that the Appropriations Committee has funded this vital program.

Finally, the bill before us appropriates $125 million for the.section 701 comprehensive planning program. As the leader in the successful effort earlier this year to prevent the administration from dumping the HUD college housing program by utilizing the limited funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development under a variety of other agencies for the coming fiscal year, I commend the Appropriations Committee and the subcommittee chaired by the senior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Proxmire) for reporting a bill which seeks to address a large and diverse number of needs. It does so, in the main, with a scrupulous attention to detail and fairness which I believe are worthy of notice.

I would like to note several specific items in the bill which are of concern to me. The first area in which I have major reservations is the appropriation for HUD. I recognize the difficulties of appropriating funds for an administration which seems largely indifferent to the needs of the American people, whether they are of low, middle, or middle income. The record of the past 3 years in the field of housing at the Federal level is not a pretty one, and I hope that we do not lose sight of this during the coming year. Certainly this bill offers cause for hope in many such areas.

First, I would like to commend the committee for deleting the language in the House report setting a ceiling of 10 percent on increases in fair market rental values under the section 8 program. I know that housing officials all over California and all over the country have expressed to me their concern that the initial fair market values established for their areas are insufficient to encourage the private sector to participate in the rental units. The House's language severely circumscribed the opportunity of HUD to adjust those rents in a fair and flexible manner. As a result, I am glad that the report contains no language reducing the discretion of HUD national and regional officials to deal with the problem of fair market rental values under section 8.

I am also happy to note that the committee recommends earmarking of $75 million in authority for conventional public housing. In spite of the failures in many areas which have been experienced with public housing, I think that public housing authorities in my home State of California run efficient and successful conventional public housing programs. Many of these agencies have been stymied in recent months by HUD's refusal to free funds for conventional projects. I am sure that the Senate's language earmarking funds for such housing will be welcomed by many housing officials and tenants throughout California.

Another matter of some concern has been the treatment of both the Senate and the House in the appropriations bills. This is the dormant college housing program. Many colleges in the State of California have experienced severe difficulties in providing housing for students as a result of the dwindling of the HUD college program. The congressional instruction to the Secretary of HUD to resurrect the college housing program by utilizing the repayment of principal on existing loans in order to provide new substantial help in meeting this critical program, I know that colleges in California will greet this change in the law with enthusiasm.

Next, I very pleased that the committee has seen fit to increase the House's recommendation of funding for the section 701 comprehensive planning program by some $75 million. That program has produced first-rate planning and treatment of diverse problems in urban areas throughout California. The House recommendation of $50 million for the program, which was $80 million below the authorized figure for 1976, could have threatened the successful programs which have been established in California and throughout the Nation. The Senate's bill, I am sure, will be a leader in the successful effort earlier this year to prevent the administration from saving our taxpayers many millions more than the House.

Finally, with regard to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, I have mixed feelings about the amounts recommended for community development funding. I am happy to note that the Appropriations Committee took note of the plight of "discretionary balance" communities in this country. As everyone in the Senate must be aware, such communities were denied funding during the last fiscal year and in community development programs. The shortfall resulted from an error in contribution in passages of the community development program. Only as a result of a funding bill passed during the closing days of fiscal year 1975 were such communities allowed to begin the important job of translating their ambitious community development plans into reality. Even then, the amounts provided were only $54 million, far short of the $200 million which had been estimated would be available for such areas at the time of the passage of the Consolidated Community Development Act of 1974.

There are 10 such counties in California—Monterey, Napa, Placer, Sonoma, Santa Joaquin, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Solano, Siskiyou, and Valleymountains, with combined populations in excess of 1.6 million people. Surely those communities are entitled to funding for community development programs as any other group of communities. Such areas should not have to depend on the whims of emergency funding provided by the Congress.

Therefore, I am happy to note that the Senate has recommended that $100
As you undoubtedly aware, the House voted to reduce the FY 1976 appropriation for the Pioneer Venus Program to $57.6 million from $9.2 million. The House Appropriations Committee recommended a $9.2 million appropriation for the program, based on the current level of spending. In my judgment, this is clearly too little. The House Appropriations Committee recommended the program be reduced to $9.2 million, and I urge you to restore this funding level.

I consider the House's action to be the most important issue for Congress this year, given the program's success in providing useful scientific knowledge and enhancing our understanding of the planet Venus. As you know, the Pioneer Venus program would involve two spacecraft to investigate the Venusian atmosphere and its effects on the planet's surface. These probes would invaded Venusian environmental conditions and provide a wealth of comparative data and useful information about weather conditions around the planet.

In light of these considerations, the House action would probably force the program to terminate its present work on Pioneer Venus. Such a decision would require the team assembled to work on the project to be dissolved, and the team would then be reassembled only at a cost of millions of dollars on the project up until the time of its termination would be effectively wasted.

In light of these considerations, the House action would probably force the program to terminate its present work on Pioneer Venus. Such a decision would require the team assembled to work on the project to be dissolved, and the team would then be reassembled only at a cost of millions of dollars on the project up until the time of its termination would be effectively wasted.

In light of these considerations, the House action would probably force the program to terminate its present work on Pioneer Venus. Such a decision would require the team assembled to work on the project to be dissolved, and the team would then be reassembled only at a cost of millions of dollars on the project up until the time of its termination would be effectively wasted.

In light of these considerations, the House action would probably force the program to terminate its present work on Pioneer Venus. Such a decision would require the team assembled to work on the project to be dissolved, and the team would then be reassembled only at a cost of millions of dollars on the project up until the time of its termination would be effectively wasted.

In light of these considerations, the House action would probably force the program to terminate its present work on Pioneer Venus. Such a decision would require the team assembled to work on the project to be dissolved, and the team would then be reassembled only at a cost of millions of dollars on the project up until the time of its termination would be effectively wasted.

In light of these considerations, the House action would probably force the program to terminate its present work on Pioneer Venus. Such a decision would require the team assembled to work on the project to be dissolved, and the team would then be reassembled only at a cost of millions of dollars on the project up until the time of its termination would be effectively wasted.

In light of these considerations, the House action would probably force the program to terminate its present work on Pioneer Venus. Such a decision would require the team assembled to work on the project to be dissolved, and the team would then be reassembled only at a cost of millions of dollars on the project up until the time of its termination would be effectively wasted.

In light of these considerations, the House action would probably force the program to terminate its present work on Pioneer Venus. Such a decision would require the team assembled to work on the project to be dissolved, and the team would then be reassembled only at a cost of millions of dollars on the project up until the time of its termination would be effectively wasted.

In light of these considerations, the House action would probably force the program to terminate its present work on Pioneer Venus. Such a decision would require the team assembled to work on the project to be dissolved, and the team would then be reassembled only at a cost of millions of dollars on the project up until the time of its termination would be effectively wasted.

In light of these considerations, the House action would probably force the program to terminate its present work on Pioneer Venus. Such a decision would require the team assembled to work on the project to be dissolved, and the team would then be reassembled only at a cost of millions of dollars on the project up until the time of its termination would be effectively wasted.

In light of these considerations, the House action would probably force the program to terminate its present work on Pioneer Venus. Such a decision would require the team assembled to work on the project to be dissolved, and the team would then be reassembled only at a cost of millions of dollars on the project up until the time of its termination would be effectively wasted.

In light of these considerations, the House action would probably force the program to terminate its present work on Pioneer Venus. Such a decision would require the team assembled to work on the project to be dissolved, and the team would then be reassembled only at a cost of millions of dollars on the project up until the time of its termination would be effectively wasted.

In light of these considerations, the House action would probably force the program to terminate its present work on Pioneer Venus. Such a decision would require the team assembled to work on the project to be dissolved, and the team would then be reassembled only at a cost of millions of dollars on the project up until the time of its termination would be effectively wasted.

In light of these considerations, the House action would probably force the program to terminate its present work on Pioneer Venus. Such a decision would require the team assembled to work on the project to be dissolved, and the team would then be reassembled only at a cost of millions of dollars on the project up until the time of its termination would be effectively wasted.

In light of these considerations, the House action would probably force the program to terminate its present work on Pioneer Venus. Such a decision would require the team assembled to work on the project to be dissolved, and the team would then be reassembled only at a cost of millions of dollars on the project up until the time of its termination would be effectively wasted.

In light of these considerations, the House action would probably force the program to terminate its present work on Pioneer Venus. Such a decision would require the team assembled to work on the project to be dissolved, and the team would then be reassembled only at a cost of millions of dollars on the project up until the time of its termination would be effectively wasted.
passage of H.R. 8070. That concerns the modifi-
cation of the subsonic wind tunnel located at the Ames Research Center in Mountain View, California. The House Appropriations Committee directed in its report that funds be made available for modifying the 40x40 wind tunnel at the Ames Research Center until the Committee has had an opportunity to review the necessary funding in a amended budget request."

This directive will preclude the use of any NASA funds to begin work on modifying that facility until the close of 1976.

As you are undoubtedly aware, the House Committee on Science and Technology has conducted extensive investigations into the need for such modifications. The Committee included $2.5 million in authorization for modification of the Ames facility in H.R. 4760, the FY 1976 authorization bill. That money was deleted in the Senate, but the money was included in the conference version of H.R. 4760.

Modification of the Ames wind tunnel would give this country its only facility capable of full-scale testing of advanced rotorcraft and vertical and short take-off and landing aircraft. NASA and the Department of Defense are in agreement that such a facility is needed for our nation to retain its leadership in aeronautical research and development. A study initiated by the Aeronautics and Space Board in 1967 has included in the recommendations for modification of the Ames facility.

The 40x40 wind tunnel would permit testing of advanced rotorcraft at cruise speeds and allow full-scale testing of VTOL-STOL craft for the first time. The economic rationale for making this change is compelling. For example, the ill-fated AH 56A Cheyenne helicopter program cost $800 million before it was abandoned. That program did not include full-scale wind tunnel evaluation, which might have saved a considerable amount of time and money if such tests had been available. Other rotorcraft have been successfully modified following such testing, saving millions of Federal dollars, and this facility would expand the capability for making such savings.

The House Committee's reason for limiting full-scale testing on the Ames facility was that no formal budget request had been received. The absence of such a request was the fault of both the Senate and the Appropriations Committee. I would therefore suggest that the Senate Committee not include limiting language in its report and that the Senate Conference H.R. 8070 be instructed to seek the deletion of the language circumscribing NASA's discretion to be the primary body necessary to permit NASA desired flexibility in its planning. In view of the continuing governmental commitment to the development of relevant aircraft research and development, and considering the three year lead time required for the modification, such flexibility is essential.

In summary, I would urge the Subcommittee to give its closest attention to the importance of full-scale testing of advanced aircraft and the critical need for having the Ames wind tunnel operational before 1978.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, for the reasons stated above, I feel that the decision to proceed with the Pioneer Venus program can well be justified on the basis of economy. The 1-year delay envisioned by the House would have cost 2 years in deployment of the probe, and perhaps an extra $80 million in cost. I am also gratified that the Senate has restored the funding for the large space telescope, which promises to offer a wealth of new scientific knowledge previously unavailable through the utilization of earlier instruments.

In short, I believe that the appropriation of full funding for NASA is amply justified. The recent ending of the Apollo program must remind us all of the tremendous benefits, both tangible and intangible, which the space program has brought us. I look forward to many more of such benefits, and I believe the prudent decision of the Senate to fund NASA at its requested level is a giant step in assuring the continuation of our space science efforts.

VETERANS' READINGSHIP BENEFITS

Mr. President, I am delighted that the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to increase the amount appropriated for the payment of readjustment benefits of veterans by $1,200,000,000 over the sums designated in the House of Representatives for the GI bill.

These additional funds should go a long way to assure those veterans and dependents who qualify, that will impossibility of making ends meet in the future, continuing their education which are interrupted or not begun as a result of military duty.

The additional sums should adequately protect the veterans of this Nation from the situation they faced during the closing months of this past fiscal year when the funds ran out for their education. At the end of the fiscal year the Senate appropriation bill was held up, many in-school veterans did not receive their monthly checks, and were faced with the bleak prospect of making ends meet on little or no financial resources. I received calls from countless numbers of the three-quarters of a million Vietnam-era veterans residing in California, pleading for the release of their badly needed checks, without which their rents, bills, and other expenses could not be paid.

Between efforts by the Veterans' Administration and the General Accounting Office to end the problem of overpayments, and through the addition of $1.2 billion which the committee has proposed, I am hopeful that we will be able to prevent a similar situation from occurring this coming fiscal year. I know, Mr. President, that the veteran population in my State, for one, is grateful for the sage decision of the Appropriations Committee.

HUD NOISE ABATEMENT

Mr. President, I am pleased that the Committee on Appropriations has seen fit to restore the funds inadvertently deleted from the Environmental Protection Agency's budget for the purpose of controlling noise pollution as the result of an amendment accepted by the House of Representatives.

The intent of this amendment by Congressman Sisk, as I understand it, was not to delete all funds for noise control contained in the bill, but to delete such funds from the HUD and VA sections. This was done in an effort to cause HUD to use existing funds to allow FHA to use its existing funds to aiding FHA loans to noise-impacted areas based on computerized data, rather than on clear, site noise level readings. Under the control Act, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has the responsibility for the control of noise pollution as it impacts the housing market, but only in consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency, which has checkoff authority, and after the development and acceptance of an adequate environmental impact statement. The Environmental Protection Agency has, in fact, been responsible for ensuring HUD and other Federal agencies to adopt uniform noise measurement systems in order to improve cooperation among the agencies and facilitate decisions concerning noise pollution control. Unfortunately, HUD has not indicated their cooperation in this effort.

The specific problem which precipitated this introduction was the inability of the Senate Appropriations Committee to pass the Senate appropriations bill, which I am glad to say, caused the committee in the Senate to adopt strong report language to curtail such problems in the future, an indication of the impact of the Air Force Base in California on the Merced-Atwater area. Under the Noise Control Act, the EPA and FAA are empowered with the authority to control noise from commercial aircraft and airports. Military air base noise is to be controlled by the Department of Defense with Environmental Protection Agency advise and recommendation.

Based on a computerized noise map given it by the Air Force, the Department of Housing and Urban Development unilaterally prohibited the granting of FHA loans for low income projects in the Merced-Atwater area. This decision was based on hypothetical rather than site noise readings of the ostensibly impacted area. Subsequently, HUD reassessed the decision and freed eight subdivisions from this restriction, sufficient housing, they said, to see Merced-Atwater through next fiscal year. This En-
Now it is not at all unreasonable for HUD to attempt to insist that hospitals are not constructed in areas which prove to be acoustically unsound or dangerous to the public health and welfare. What is unreasonable is that this decision was made without the mandated consultation with EPA, and further without the appropriate environmental impact statement. Further, it is unjustified to base such a decision on admittedly hypothetical information. While we clearly do not want to establish acoustical ghettos, where the normal lifestyle of citizens is hampered because their homes and land are bombarded by grotesque levels of noise, it is, at the same time, unjustifiable to make de facto decisions which may not hold up once the data are finally amassed.

I applaud the committee's strong posture to express dissatisfaction with the way HUD has conducted this and other similar matters, and hope that HUD will rapidly ameliorate this situation and again work with Federal intent under the Noise Act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator yield? As I understand it the bill we have before us today is only one of the $10 billion authorized in the Emergency Housing Act of 1975 for emergency mortgage purchase assistance. Frankly, on the basis of the testimony before the Joint Economic Committee it seems clear we could and should use the full $10 billion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that the administration believes the $5 billion was at the outer limit of this year's potential. As you know, they have requested borrowing authority of $5 billion for the purchase of mortgages with the authority to be used in the event that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development finds that economic conditions warrant. I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from Minnesota. The economy needs thousands of thousands of units, the full $10 billion would provide. As chairman of the HUD subcommittee, I will do my best to assure that we will provide the remainder of the $10 billion in supplemental funding to the full extent the full $10 billion would provide.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION ITEMS

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, the committee's action in accepting for the most part the Administration budget request for the Veterans' Administration hospital and medical program is one which deserves the full support of the Senate.

The administration budget request reflected the need to correct the serious deficiencies in staffing and in physical plant safety which were identified by the VA Chief Medical Director's special survey report submitted last July of the "Quality of Patient Care at VA Hospitals and Clinics." The budget request was fully supported by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs (Mr. Hartke) and myself in a letter to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on HUD-Space-Science-Veterans Appropriations (Mr. Proxmire) recommending that the budget request be adopted by the Appropriations Committee. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that letter and attachments to it be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Hospitals of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I find it a rather unusual situation to be able to state that a budget recommendation for the VA hospital and medical program is adequate. Over the past 5 years, I have consistently found it necessary to seek additional funding over the administration request for these important VA medical programs. This year, however, I am glad to say, the importance of the deficiencies cited by the Chief Medical Director is very evident to the VA and to the OMB, and was apparent in contacts I made with those agencies last summer, fall, and winter to urge that adequate funding be provided to carry out the recommendations made by the survey. I found the VA most cooperative and agreeable, and, by and large, the informal understandings I reached have been adequately fiscal year 1975 supplemental and fiscal year 1976 budget requests for the VA medical and hospital program were kept when the President submitted his fiscal year 1976 budget. Chairman Hartke and I were in the unusual position of being able to support the budget request amounts for VA hospital and medical care.

I wish to point out, Mr. President, that part of our understanding with OMB and the Department of Medicine and Surgery is that the remainder of the survey report's recommendations will be met in the budget requests for medical care and construction. I shall be looking forward to this commitment being kept as well. We agreed to this postponement because there is just so much which can be undertaken and accomplished effectively in one fiscal year in the way of hiring, renovation, repair, and construction.

However, Mr. President, as we recommended to the Appropriations Committee, we believe that the additional 1,757 in average core staff employment not covered in the budget request but called for in the Special Survey Report continued to be of the highest priority and that recruitment should begin at the end of fiscal year 1976. We will, therefore, seek a reduced amount of funds to meet this need. It is based on an annualized basis—probably $2.8 million will be adequate in supplemental funding next spring.

MEDICAL CARE

In the medical care item, an increase of $349,191,000 is approved. This fiscal year 1975 appropriation will enable the VA to move strongly towards meeting approximately 6,200 of the deficiency of 7,963 hospital core staffing identified in the survey report. I have already spoken on our intention to work with the VA in meeting the rest of this necessary staffing deficiency through the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act.

I would like, however, Mr. President, to inject another word of caution here. The VA budget estimates of the number of outpatient care visits appear to be underestimated by 670,000 visits and the contracted hospital census by 1,228 average daily patients, with respective dollar amounts potentially short of $20 million and $33,888,000. In addition, with the high rate of unemployment, there may be an overall increased demand for inpatient and outpatient treatment, resulting from the loss of health insurance coverage by veterans who have become unemployed in the last year. If these tentative projections prove to be accurate, and a supplemental request is submitted, I hope the committee will consider such a request favorably.

Mr. President, the increase in the medical care item will enable the VA to activate additional specialized medical services which the survey report found essential. That report found that 24 hospitals lacked specialized medical care units; 22 hospitals lacked surgical intensive care units; 4 hospitals lacked coronary care units; 32 hospitals lacked respiratory care centers; and 14 hospitals lacked pulmonary function laboratories.

The report noted that "good medical care calls for such a unit in every hospital today" and they are "considered by all qualified sources to be absolutely required for the provision of high quality care."

The amount appropriated for medical care will also permit the activation of 32 new outpatient mental hygiene clinics.

One cautionary note, Mr. President, I concur in the concerns expressed by Chairman Proxmire at the Appropriations Subcommittee hearings and in the Appropriations Committee's report regarding underutilization of VA specialized medical units. Our subcommittee will be working with the Department of Medicine and Surgery in inspecting this situation as well as to develop a coordinated nursing home/domiciliary care policy and program for the future that will meet the increasing demands of the veteran population for long-term care.

CONSTRUCTION

In addition, Mr. President, serious safety hazards which were identified by the survey report will be corrected by the VA. The VA is submitting an amendment to meet fire protection standards at 28 VA hospitals, and to support maintenance and repair to correct structural and safety deficiencies identified in the report.

Mr. President, we are grateful that the committee has responded to the concerns Chairman Hartke and I expressed in our budget submission of April 21, with respect to the request for construction of research and education facilities by concurring in the House action including in the bill under major construction $6,359,000 earmarked for the long-deferred Houston, Tex., research and
education facility and by adding an earmark of $6,700,000 for construction of the
likewise long-deferred research and education facility at Jackson, Miss. The
committee action leaves it to the VA to figure out where best to find this $13
million for these two unbudgeted proj­
ects.

Cemeteries
In this connection, Mr. President, the
committee has also indicated that certain
repetitive legal and administrative costs
funds requested for national cemetery
development might be reprogrammed.
Mr. President, the Veterans' Administra-
tion is in the process of developing
sites for four new regional VA cemeteries.
It was the Appropriations Committee's
understanding, however, that sites were
not yet chosen, and the committee there­
fore concluded that it was not likely that
sites would be developed in fiscal year
1976 and directed that the $8,000,000
proposed in the budget for such site de-
velopment be reprogrammed into other
programs. I urge VA to use VA hospitals
or VA cemeteries to reprogram from one
or more of the cemeteries makes sub­
stantial construction progress possible.
I have been advised, Mr. President, that
March Air Force Base is necessary in Cali­
fornia have been requested by the VA.
The Department of Defense, with the
approval of the congressional committees
involved, has released this land for a new
national cemetery. The matter is now
pending at the General Services Admin­
istration, I urge GSA to act quickly so
that this land can be released to the VA
and site development can proceed.
Mr. President, this information leads me
to conclude that the VA is much more ad­
vanced in site selection than had previ­
ously been thought. Given the commit­
tee report language concerning this mat­
ter and my discussions with Chairmen
Proxmire and Hatfield, I anticipate that
plans and site development for a national
cemetery at March Air Force Base will
move ahead in fiscal year 1976. There are
also indications that planning is well ad­
vanced on a New England site so that the
VA should clearly be able to proceed in
fiscal year 1976 with significant construc­
tion of its new national cemeteries, and
certainly a reprogramming of most of the $8
million will not be called for.

Medical and Prosthetic Research
In the medical and prosthetic research
item, the Appropriations Committee will
permit the VA to maintain its present level of re­
search, which, given increases in research
funding over the last several years, is
reasonable. However, Mr. Presi­
dent, I have reservations about the im­
 pact of a standalone budget on continuing
research efforts of the VA and believe
that a budget that does not allow for
growth could not be sustained for more
than 1 year. I hope that in fiscal year
1977 an appreciable increase will be al­
lowed for research.

Medical Administration and Miscellaneous
Operating Expenses
While the medical administration and
miscellaneous operating expense item
appropriation is slightly increased over the
fiscal year 1975 appropriation, Mr. Presi­
dent, the budget for health person­
nel education and training, has remained
at the same level as the fiscal year 1975
budget. I believe, given the major role
the VA system of hospitals and clinics
plays in the training of health care per­
sonnel for the Nation, this budget item
cannot be sustained for more than 1 year.
Mr. President, but I do want to say that
this program is of such great value, not
only to the beneficiaries of the Veterans' Admin­
istration, but also to the medical com­

Of the $19 million which is avail­
able for support of expanded and new
training programs at affiliated medical schools or other health train­
ings will, of course, continue to be
considered, every consideration
is given to handle the extra
benefits payment workload created by
the economic recession.

I am concerned, however, with the
temporary nature of the committee's recom­
endations in respect to these posi­
tions. If the economic situation does
not improve and if the economic situa­
tion allows to fund these positions.

I urge the committee to evaluate care­
fully this situation, and if necessary, to
approve a supplemental appropriation for
this purpose.

Compensation, Pensions and Readjust­
ment Benefits
Mr. President, I also am pleased that the
committee has approved a last minute
supplemental budget request to pay for
1,100 additional VA regional office tempo­
rary positions. These positions are ur­
ently needed to handle the extra
benefits payment workload created by
the economic recession.

I would like to express my full sup­
port for the action taken by the Appropri­
DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN:

As indicated in the March 15, 1975, report by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to the Senate, pursuant to section 301(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-344), a print of which is enclosed for your information, we have identified four basic weaknesses in the FY 1976 supplemental budget request which we believe must be addressed in the deliberations on that request. These weaknesses are (1) the budget for research (taking into account a transfer-in of $2,685,000 in health services research funds), which at $65,000,000 is less than the authorization of $91,377,000 for FY 1975. Given increases in research funding over the last several years, we believe that the VA research program can temporarily be sustained within this standstill budget. We urge, however, that your Committee recommend for full funding of the total $4.22 billion amount requested by the Administration for the VA medical and hospital programs in the seven pertinent appropriation items; the inclusion of the three portions of report language we have recommended; and adoption of one of the two alternative solutions we have suggested to resolve the short fall. We and our staff will be available to answer any questions you or your staff members might have with respect to these matters.

We also wish to point out that we anticipate enactment of one piece of major medical legislation this year, the omnibus veterans' legislation in FY 1976. This omnibus medical legislation will, among other things, provide for pay increases for veterans' hospital physicians in order to make their overall remuneration more competitive with that in other Federal services and in the community. This legislation is currently being drafted and is outlined on page 5 of the enclosed report to the Budget Committee. We intend to introduce this legislation at the next few weeks. Estimated FY 1976 expenditures which would be occasioned by enactment of this measure or about January 1, 1976, will be $53 million. The Senate Budget Committee specifically provided for such outlays and budget authority in its deliberations and decisions on the First Concurrent Resolution. It has been reported to the Senate.

We know that this recruitment and retention problem is one which is uppermost in your Subcommittee's hearings this past fall and last month and is of considerable concern. Our effort is to be in contact with you as we develop this important legislation and proceed through the legislative process with it.

We note that we expect to be writing to you further with respect to other pending Veterans Administration appropriation bills covered by your letter.

Sincerely,

VANCE HARTKE
Chairman, Subcommittee on Health and Hospitals

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
WASHINGTON, D.C., March 15, 1975,

Hon. EDMUND S. BUSKEK,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 301(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Pub. L. 93-344), the following report containing views and recommendations of this Subcommittee with regard to the FY 1976 budget request submitted by the Administration is transmitted herewith.

This omnibus medical legislation will, among other things, provide for pay increases for veterans' hospital physicians in order to make their overall remuneration more competitive with that in other Federal services and in the community. This legislation is currently being drafted and is outlined on page 5 of the enclosed report to the Budget Committee. We intend to introduce this legislation at the next few weeks. Estimated FY 1976 expenditures which would be occasioned by enactment of this measure or about January 1, 1976, will be $53 million.

The Senate Budget Committee specifically provided for such outlays and budget authority in its deliberations and decisions on the First Concurrent Resolution. It has been reported to the Senate.

We know that this recruitment and retention problem is one which is uppermost in your Subcommittee's hearings this past fall and last month and is of considerable concern. Our effort is to be in contact with you as we develop this important legislation and proceed through the legislative process with it.

We note that we expect to be writing to you further with respect to other pending Veterans Administration appropriation bills covered by your letter.

Sincerely,

VANCE HARTKE
Chairman, Subcommittee on Health and Hospitals
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future years. Further, because of the time constraints inherent in this year's tight schedule, all such estimates and views do not necessarily reflect the views of each member of the Committee as to each particular subject area.

1. The Committee staff may be of further assistance in your consideration of veterans' programs, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Sincerely,

VANCE HARTKE, Chairman.

BUDGET VIEWS AND ESTIMATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976

I. COMMENTS ON THE GENERAL ECONOMIC SETTING FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1976 BUDGET

The general economic setting of high unemployment and the continued rate of inflation projected for fiscal year 1976 will affect the veterans' programs in a number of ways. With respect to inflation it should be remembered that 72 percent of the VA budget represents transfer payments. Thus, veterans' income security programs, such as compensation and pensions, will have to be adjusted to reflect cost-of-living increases, currently estimated to reach 14 percent by the end of fiscal year 1976, since enactment of Public Law 93-295. Similarly, the effect of inflation on non-service-connected pensioners will also have to be considered by the Congress in deliberations this year concerning pension restructuring, discussed infra. Further, it is anticipated that Cost of Living inflation also will affect the Veterans' Administration in the acquisition of food, fuel, and medical supplies as well as in carrying out major and minor construction projects identified in the fiscal year 1976 $463.9 million budget request for these purposes. Consequently, projected inflation will require wage increases—and a concomitant supplemental appropriation—for the Veterans' Administration's 205,766 employees. Thus, all of the foregoing could require additional spending if the original program scope is to be maintained.

The continued economic recession and high unemployment rates experienced by veterans should also have a significant impact on the use of certain veterans' entitlement programs, which can in part be considered counter-cyclical in nature. In February, the VA was reporting a 17.3 percent unemployment rate among veterans, well above the national average. Thus, lack of employment prospects and readily available jobs, coupled with more adequate educational assistance benefits, should result in an increase in the number of veterans entering training than originally estimated by the Veterans' Administration over 12 months ago. The continued depressed state of the economy may also have a significant impact on the number of veterans or survivors applying and qualifying for pension benefits or for VA hospital, nursing home, or domiciliary care. Potential VA liability in the housing programs it administers may be affected if mortgage interest rates increase sharply in the coming months.

II. THE BUDGETARY IMPACT OF MAJOR NEW PROGRAMS OR PROGRAM CHANGES

A. Compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation.

Compensation is an entitlement program providing monthly payments to veterans who are "compensated" for impaired earning capacity resulting from service-connected disabilities. The fiscal year 1976 budget projects payments of $3,744 million for 2,215,310 veterans and survivors. Reasons for the rapid growth in compensation costs are anticipated under either the administration's proposal or variations being considered. The tentative cost estimates for the administration's fiscal year 1977 budget for the first full year are for $516 million in additional expenditures. This figure does not represent the federal government's total costs. Projected pension beneficiaries. Prospects for Senate passage of pension restructuring legislation during fiscal year 1976 at some point are considered good, but subject to the uncertainties of obtaining adequate information from the VA. The cost estimate, as well as the admissibility of the administration's position, which requested "deferred" consideration of the proposal last fall and which did not include it in the fiscal year 1976 budget submission.

B. Disability Compensation

The Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974 (Pub. L. 93-509), among other things, provided for up to an additional 9 months of educational assistance benefits eligibility for those veterans entitled to the maximum eligibility of 36 months. This additional 9 months can only be used in the pursuit of an undergraduate degree. As originally passed by the Senate on February 24, 1974, by a vote of 94 to 0, and subsequently unamended by the Senate in the first conference report, the additional entitlement was not so restricted. Legislation has been introduced in both bodies to remove this restriction, and congressional approval is anticipated although the administration has expressed continued opposition. The Veterans' Administration estimates the first full-year cost of this amendment to be $4,448 million.

III. PROJECTIONS OF HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION EXPENDITURES

The VA medical and hospital system (171 hospitals, 212 outpatient clinics, 85 nursing homes, and 18 domiciliary facilities) is estimated to require, in the fiscal year 1976, to provide 14,743,000 outpatient visits (1,929,000 on a fee basis) and maintain an inpatient average daily census of 119,152 veterans and non-veterans. For the fiscal year 1976 medical care budget request is $3,667,966,000, up from $3,343,346,000 for fiscal year 1975. This will provide an increase of 9.4 percent in average employment of health care personnel.

The construction (major and minor) budget projection of $463.9 million budget request for the fiscal year 1976 will provide a $34,908,000, equal to 7 percent of the fiscal year 1976 construction costs identified in the fiscal year 1977 supplemental appropriation, and one million dollars short of the amount needed to construct 4 million square feet of space. The VA expects to continue its investigation of proposals to restructure the current system. Proposals to restructure the system are modeled on the supplemental security income program and would be applicable to all new beneficiaries; existing pensioners could elect coverage under the new system or continue under the current medical care system. Consideration of the administration's special study projects submitted in fiscal years 1974 and 1976, if not already adopted, have been delayed by the lack of reliable, available data requested of the Veterans' Administration during the past 2 years. We are advised that the "special study proposal--reconstruction model", under development by the Veterans' Administration, will be completed in 30 to 60 days. Therefore, the Committee expects consideration of these proposals to go forward. In addition, the Committee also expects to be aided by a study of the economic needs of older veterans and survivors, currently being submitted by the Veterans' Administration, pursuant to section 207 of Public Law 93-295, shortly after commencement of the coming fiscal year.

Although long-range savings are projected, immediate construction costs are anticipated under either the administration's proposal or variations being considered. The tentative cost estimates for the administration's fiscal year 1976 budget for the first full year are for $516 million in additional expenditures. This figure does not represent the federal government's total costs. Projected pension beneficiaries. Prospects for Senate passage of pension restructuring legislation during fiscal year 1976 at some point are considered good, but subject to the uncertainties of obtaining adequate information from the VA. The cost estimate, as well as the admissibility of the administration's position, which requested "deferred" consideration of the proposal last fall and which did not include it in the fiscal year 1976 budget submission.

C. Readjustment assistance benefits

The Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974 (Pub. L. 93-509), among other things, provided for up to an additional 9 months of educational assistance benefits eligibility for those veterans entitled to the maximum eligibility of 36 months. This additional 9 months can only be used in the pursuit of an undergraduate degree. As originally passed by the Senate on February 24, 1974, by a vote of 94 to 0, and subsequently unamended by the Senate in the first conference report, the additional entitlement was not so restricted. Legislation has been introduced in both bodies to remove this restriction, and congressional approval is anticipated although the administration has expressed continued opposition. The Veterans' Administration estimates the first full-year cost of this amendment to be $4,448 million.
of the Office of Construction; $16.6 million for cemetery work; $85 million to correct seismic deficiencies; and funds necessary to complete construction.

For the first time, the administration has requested funding for the new chapter 82 added to title 38 by Public Law 92-541, the Veterans' Administration Medical School Assistance and Health Manpower Training Act of 1972. Previously, Congress has appropriated $55 million to carry out this new health manpower training program. Thus far, 4 medical schools have submitted applications for funding under chapter 82; $16.6 million has been obligated for the first year. This legislation should be enacted as quickly as possible.

The overall VA medical care, administration, research, and health manpower assistance, and construction budgets are generally consistent with amounts provided in prior years. The requested budget for 1976 is $21 million. The budget levels established in the Senate's evidence program's authorization of $20 million for VA education and research facilities and budgetary actions affecting VA doctors, dentists, nurses, and other health care personnel in view of the slowing Federal government's Federal programs and 1976 spending levels. (The administration has requested a reduction of $61 million in outlays for the year.) The administration also requested legislation to effect reimbursement to the VA by private insurers for the cost of inpatient hospital and medical care and treatment provided for the non-service-connected disabilities of veterans. The administration has requested a reduction of $6 million in outlays for this year. In the Senate, $166 million is provided for the fiscal year 1976. This legislation should be enacted as quickly as possible.

The administration has also requested legislation to effect reimbursement to the VA by private insurers for the cost of inpatient hospital and medical care and treatment provided for the non-service-connected disabilities of veterans. The administration has requested a reduction of $6 million in outlays for this year. In the Senate, $166 million is provided for the fiscal year 1976. This legislation should be enacted as quickly as possible.

The administration has requested legislation to effect reimbursement to the VA by private insurers for the cost of inpatient hospital and medical care and treatment provided for the non-service-connected disabilities of veterans. The administration has requested an additional $6 million in outlays for this year. In the Senate, $166 million is provided for the fiscal year 1976. This legislation should be enacted as quickly as possible.

The administration has requested legislation to effect reimbursement to the VA by private insurers for the cost of inpatient hospital and medical care and treatment provided for the non-service-connected disabilities of veterans. The administration has requested an additional $6 million in outlays for this year. In the Senate, $166 million is provided for the fiscal year 1976. This legislation should be enacted as quickly as possible.

The administration has requested legislation to effect reimbursement to the VA by private insurers for the cost of inpatient hospital and medical care and treatment provided for the non-service-connected disabilities of veterans. The administration has requested an additional $6 million in outlays for this year. In the Senate, $166 million is provided for the fiscal year 1976. This legislation should be enacted as quickly as possible.

The administration has requested legislation to effect reimbursement to the VA by private insurers for the cost of inpatient hospital and medical care and treatment provided for the non-service-connected disabilities of veterans. The administration has requested an additional $6 million in outlays for this year. In the Senate, $166 million is provided for the fiscal year 1976. This legislation should be enacted as quickly as possible.
budget request, recent experience would indicate that this is low. For example, the increase projected by the budget is considerably less than the percentage increase, than the utmost 13 percent increase originally projected for fiscal year 1975, but that has actually been experienced in fiscal year 1974. In this connection, it must be noted that 1974 was the first fiscal year during which the irrevocable commitment was made in the Veterans Health Care Expansion Act of 1974 (Pub. L. 93-82) began to impact on outpatients and inpatients. It would appear that the fiscal year 1975 estimate is about 5 percent too low and that the additional work generated by Public Law 93-82 will be greater than we had anticipated. Using an average of $80 per outpatient visit, the medical budget in fiscal year 1975 is thus underestimated in fiscal year 1975 by $15.8 million. For fiscal year 1976, it would appear to be underestimated by $707,000 or $820,000.

Second, the budget includes an estimate of $75 in average daily patient census (ADPC) for fiscal year 1975, the equivalent of $727,468,000. This seems to be underestimated by 58 percent; fiscal year 1976 requirements will be of the order of 2,298 ADPC, with a backlog of costs of $5,667,000.

A less certain area of possible underestimate is in the reserve for copayment. The increased demand for inpatient and outpatient treatment which could be generated by the high unemployment rate and the consequences of the health insurance plan which by previously covered workers. Congress now has before it both Houses legislation to provide for federal employment for workers whose health benefits have lapsed by virtue of their job loss, and enactment of such legislation would likely obviate this potential area of increase in demand on VA medical facilities. Since the administration has strongly opposed this legislation, however, if its losses of health insurance be presumed, and, hence, the VA system may well experience an increase in demand for health services brought about by the lapse of health insurance coverage due to unemployment.

Mr. WECKER. Mr. President, I rise to commend the Senate Appropriations Committee for appropriating $38 million to implement the section 802 program. The program, enacted as part of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, is designed to assist State housing and development agencies in raising funds for the construction of low- and moderate-income housing through the issuance of taxable bonds.

To meet our housing goals will require a strong and active commitment by both the Federal and State governments, as well as the private sector. The States can and must play a major role in providing a suitable living environment for all Americans. To date, 33 States have created housing agencies, which mandate is to finance and assist the construction and rehabilitation of housing for low- and moderate-income Americans.

By implementing section 802 program, these agencies will be able to finance these essential housing projects, not only in the tax exempt market, but also in the large corporate money market. The section 802 program, enacted as part of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, is designed to assist State housing and development agencies in raising funds for the construction of low- and moderate-income housing.

Mr. President, during the consideration of the first supplemental appropriations bill, the Senate adopted an amendment which appropriated $5 million for the section 802 program. Unfortunately, this provision was dropped in conference.

At that time, HUD stated that they needed more time to study this program. Well, now nearly 1 year has passed, and HUD is still reviewing this program.

The Council of State Housing Agencies have strongly urged HUD to implement the section 802 program. The Council of State Housing Agencies have and do support the section 802 program. The Council of State Housing Agencies believe that the section 802 program is an important step in revitalizing the largely untapped taxable market.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This program, enacted as part of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1974, is designed to assist State housing and development agencies in raising funds for the construction of low- and moderate-income housing. The section 802 program, enacted as part of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, is designed to assist State housing and development agencies in raising funds for the construction of low- and moderate-income housing. The section 802 program is an important step in revitalizing the largely untapped taxable market.

Mr. WILSON. The section 802 program is an important step in revitalizing the largely untapped taxable market.
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have already been ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. Is the Acting President pro tempore.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in order. In 1 minute the Senate will proceed to consideration of the veto.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Chair consider using that 1 minute so we may finish it 1 minute sooner?

I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the unfinished business, the HUD appropriation bill, follow immediately the vote on the veto.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And I ask unanimous consent that the second vote take 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL HEALTH REVENUE SHARING ACT OF 1975—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The veto message from the President of the United States is laid before the Senate.

The Senate having been read a third time, there be no amendments to be made in the Senate to the bill, and that the Senate do agree to the Senate amendments and amendments by the House of Representatives to the bill, and that the bill be passed to the House of Representatives for further amendment.

I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The Senate proceeded to a consideration of the veto message from the President of the United States, and the Senate amendments and amendments by the House of Representatives to the bill, and that the bill be passed to the House of Representatives for further amendment.

I move that the Senate do now adjourn.
provide assistance generally available to those most in need, such as the poor and the aged. S. 66, on the other hand, would have the Federal Government select individuals in communities and groups for special funding assistance. In my view, this is clearly an inequitable approach to health problems and an unwise attempt to judge the needs and judgments made in Washington for those of responsible persons in State and local governments and the private sector.

Concerning the registered nurse training authorities, S. 66 inappropriately proposes continuation of large amounts of capitation and construction support. These support mechanisms have outcomes of training opportunities. They were introduced to stimulate nursing schools to educate more general-duty nurses because of an overall shortage. The schools responded, with enrollments in baccalaureate and associate degree programs rising by more than 90 percent during the period 1970–74. As a result, with no further Federal stimulation, we can expect the supply of active registered nurses to increase more than 90 percent during this decade.

With these increases, the employment market for general duty nurses already is in doubt areas. As a matter of fact, in January 1973, the American Nurses' Association stated that "... it appears that the shortage of staff nurses is disappearing." Our failure to limit growth now indicates a trainining surplus in the number of nurses, creating the same kind of oversupply that has left thousands of elementary and secondary school teachers disillusioned with the lack of teaching opportunities.

The general nursing student assistance provisions contained in this bill are largely duplicative of existing under-graduate student aid programs offered by Federal support for education in other health professions. Nurse training should be considered as part of that debate to inter-relate health manpower education programs rather than to perpetuate a fragmented Federal health professions policy.

Finally, S. 66 provides for a one-year extension of the National Health Service Corps. I support this fine program, and the Administration has supported legislation to the Congress for its extension. I believe, however, that the authorization level proposed in S. 66 of $30 million for fiscal year 1976 is excessive.

Good health care and the availability of health personnel to administer that care are obviously of great importance. I share with the Congress the desire to improve the Nation's health care. I am convinced that legislation can be devised to accomplish our common objectives which does not adversely affect our efforts to restrain the budget or appropriate structure our health care system. I urge the Congress to pass such legislation, using the bills I have endorsed as the starting point in such deliberations.

GERALD R. FORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 26, 1975.

The Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield my 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Kennedy).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the measure we are now considering is one which is of great importance to millions of Americans, and I hope this body will override the President's veto.

The President of the United States has vetoed S. 66, which includes the nurse training and health services programs. In the last Congress he pocket vetoed this legislation.

Earlier this year, in an attempt to try to work with the administration, the Senate fully funded the combined health programs, brought them to the floor of the Senate, where they were passed overwhelmingly.

In the conference with the House of Representatives, we settled on a figure with the House of Representatives which was lower by $500 million than the bill passed by the Senate and actually a lower figure than the bill passed by the House of Representatives.

So that the bill we are considering now, in the amount that is being authorized, contains a lower authorized figure than that which was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives or which was passed by the Senate.

We have attempted to provide legislation which is realistic and fiscally responsible. We hope to do so, and if the President, Essentially, Mr. President, 96 percent of the money that we are authorizing here will be used for continuing existing programs. Only 4 percent of the moneys we are authorizing in these programs are for any new initiatives.

One initiative is a home health service program, to find innovative and creative ways of bringing health services to people in their homes, so that elderly people, if they wish, can remain in their homes, rather than going to nursing homes and other institutions, and to try to provide initial seed money to find ways by which we will be able to save the Federal Government hundreds of millions of dollars in the program.

S. 66 is basically a continuation of existing programs, but with real innovation. We are providing a degree of flexibility for the Committee on Appropriations so that they may be able to adjust and raise some programs and to decrease others, if that is the wish of the Chairman. Why are these programs so important, and what basically are the programs about which we are talking? We are talking about programs to train nurses in this country— including nurse practitioners. This portion of the bill also includes the capitation, special project, and construction program for nursing schools and their students.

One of the key problems we are facing in the health care crisis in this country is in trying to find sufficient manpower, appropriately trained in the right places. This program is directed to attempt to meet that challenge.

Besides the nursing aspect of the program, we have the health service delivery system in mind, including health centers, one of the most imaginative and creative programs, to try to deliver health care to communities where people are in the greatest need.

We have a neighborhood health center program and the community and mental health program in this proposal. In view of the kinds of problems we are facing generally in the health area, community mental health is one of the most important. These programs are extremely important. This authorization provides for a continuation of the community mental health program. Those programs are providing extraordinary kinds of value today to the citizens and the communities in which they live.

Finally, we have the National Health Service Corps. To date, we have trained 118,000 nurses, who are highly educated, and motivated young people to go into the underserved areas of this country—young people, who because of the lack of teaching opportunities for providing decent health care in many of the underserved communities, whether rural or urban, are going to provide this kind of training. It is an expanding program. The President is appealing to more and more of the medical school graduates in this country.

These are some of the programs: nurse training, delivery of health home programs, very limited number of new programs, as I mentioned earlier. These are the backbone of our health care system.

These programs essentially have been vetoed on a previous occasion. They are now under a continuing resolution. I believe that unless we are able to override the President's veto, we are sound programs, bringing health to the people who are being hardest hit by the problems of inflation and recession in our country.

I am very hopeful that this body will override the President. I say, the measure we bring to the Senate today is fiscally sound, a modest increase as to the total number appropriated last year.

Ninety-six percent of the authorization goes to continuing existing programs, not new, untied programs—existing programs that are benefiting millions of American people. This veto must be overridden.

In reviewing the Budget Committee's recommendations, we find that for the one fiscal year, the program provides $82 billion for health resources administration, full funding of new legislation for the extension of health teaching facilities and construction programs. This is a $2 billion program for 2 years. I daresay that we may try to provide within the guidelines of the Budget Committee.

I had the opportunity to testify before the Committee on Appropriations on the whole range of health and the Health Appropriations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations came in with a recommendation of $140 mil-
lion less than the budget recommended. So I think we have been sincere in attempts to live within the Budget Committee's recommendations. We have drafted a program that will be effective in dealing with these particular areas of health concern for the American people.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time. How much time remains?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts has 6 minutes remaining. The minority leader, Mr.elder, has 15 minutes remaining.

Who yields time?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senate yield 6 minutes?

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield my time to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

I believe that the President's veto should be overridden, and I shall so vote. I should like to explain to the Senate why.

Let us remember, first and foremost, that this is an authorization bill. It is not an appropriation bill. Therefore, it does not engage in any budget busting until the money is put out.

In the meantime, it tied together so many of the past programs, in the absence of a national health insurance program, as to be indispensable, in my judgment, to the health care of the people of the United States.

Let us remember that, essentially, this is a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act. It relates to health services nurses' training, and the National Health Training and Health Revenue Act. About the latter, let us see what the President himself says in his veto message:

"I support this fine program," he says.

"The administration has submitted legislation to Congress for its extension. I believe, however, that the authorization level proposed in S. 66 of $30 million is excessive."

Well, the Committee on Appropriations has taken care of that. The President has shown that he does not hesitate to veto an appropriation bill. He just vetoed one.

Second, Mr. President, this bill contains legislation for rape prevention and control, Senator Mathias' very gifted bill, a critically important crime problem, and in the spirit of our relationship in our country in terms of law as to the rights of women, we would not feel an absolutely indispensable program. With this veto, down the drain it goes.

Finally, Mr. President, I have spent a lifetime of legislative activity in connection with nurses' education, nurses' training, to provide enough nurses. The President says that we already have enough nurses, and he quotes the American Nurses' Association.

It appears that the shortage of staff nurses is disappearing.

Note the emphasis and the fine point—staff nurses is disappearing.

The committee report acknowledges that. We say, "While the absolute number of registered nurses has increased in recent years..."

This is page 17—

the committee recognizes that there are serious shortages of nursing services in a number of communities requiring advanced preparation.

Then we proceeded to detail our views as to the health maintenance organizations and many other advances in health care, clinical nurse specialists, and so on—why I will override this veto.

In short, nobody is denying what the President says, but it simply is not meeting the issue which is raised by this bill. The bill deals with a type of nursing education in which we are presently short, and in which we need the buttressing and support which this bill will give us.

Mr. President, the time for debate is short. I shall not try to detain the Senate with all of the individual details, but the essence of the argument is this: It is an authorization, not an appropriation bill. There is no raid on the Treasury, there is no busting of the budget or any of those labels which are sought to be affixed to bills in order to defeat them. This holds together quite a number of programs indispensable to the health of our people. The President himself recognizes that, because he says in here what we ought to do:

The Federal role in overcoming barriers to needed health care should emphasize not just militarily expendable programs. With this veto, down the drain it goes.

Mr. President, of course it is. But that is by no means, and everybody knows it, the total health package the country not only ought to have, but urgently needs. The fact that we spent $22 billion does not throw me, because we just approved $31 billion for military hardware in the conference committee, and nobody says, "You have to stop at $22 billion if the cost is $31 billion if that is essential to the security of the country." This is just as essential to the security of the country.

Fifteen of us have just been to the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is not an outstanding country, except in its military establishment, Mr. President. They are not 10 feet tall, by a long sight, in terms of the development of the country. I speak with the deepest respect. We hope very much to work out many things with them, and I think we will. But it is a country which, compared to the United States, leaves a great deal to be desired.

Mr. President, one thing they do have, and every person in the Soviet Union brags about it, is medical care. That is the one thing they can point to and pin their hopes and aspirations on. We do not have that; they do. We do not in the universal measure that they do, in terms of equity to the poor and those who can least afford it. When we try, as in this country, to still hold in terms of tying together the help for many health needs, to do the job, it is knocked down.

We shall come back with another bill; I know that. What is the need for it? Why go through all the gyrations and the risks and pain and anguish all over again, when the Committee on Appropriations can, in an afternoon, do everything the President wants done and if he does not like it, can veto it?

For all of these reasons, Mr. President, I feel that I must vote to override the veto and hope that the President will pass the measure.

Mr. President, a recent letter from the American Nurses Association and other interested health organizations to the President, urged him to sign S. 66. For the reasons set forth in the letter and its enclosures, I shall be voting in support of this bill. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the ANA letter and its enclosures be printed in the Record to assist my colleagues in their decision on this measure.

The President reserves authority for the following programs: Nurse Training, Grants to States for Health Services, Family Planning, Minority Health, Malaria, Noise Prevention and Control, Migrant Health Centers, Community Health Centers, Home Health Services, Mental Health, Care of Epilepsy, Control of Huntington's Disease, Hemophilia Programs, National Health Service Corps.

Previously, you voted two separate bills providing for these programs.

The undersigned organizations strongly urge you to sign S. 66. The reasons are many, but central to the position of all organizations are the following:

1. S. 66, for the most part, continues existing programs. With few exceptions all of the programs in the bill, either service or training, are presently being operated with crucial federal support. Thus, the bill continues existing federal policy; it does not start major new programs. Also, authorizations in S. 66 are well below those in the expired legislation.

2. All of the programs in S. 66, in one way or another, support the delivery of health services to people who would otherwise not have access to care.

3. In a period of economic crisis, such as that which we are facing, the delivery of services to prevent the development of health problems now experienced dramatic increases in demands for services in recent months.

For these reasons, as well as many others, we ask that you sign S. 66 into law.

Sincerely,

American Academy of Child Psychiatry,
American Association of Colleges of Nursing,
American Association of Deans of Colleges of Nursing,
American Association of Nurse Anesthetists,
American Association of Psychiatrists for Children,
American Nurses' Association,
American Parents Committee,
American Psychological Association,
Association for the Advancement of Psychology,
Epilepsy Foundation of America,
Friends of the Earth,
Health Security Action Council,
National Abortion Rights Action League,

[From the American Nurses' Association, Inc., Kansas City, Mo.]

REASONS TO SUPPORT OVERRIDE IF PRESIDENT VETOES S. 66—HEALTH SERVICES AND NURSE TRAINING BILL

1. Bill is $60.4 billion under the previously vetoed bills (Dec. 1974).

2. Authorizations for S. 66 are very close to last year's funding (and that is based on FY '74 appropriations so does not even include the inflation factor cost escalations).

3. Conference report figures are $8 million less than the House Bill for Nurse Training Act.

4. Senate Conferences conceded on all their funding levels.

5. Outside groups have really been cooperative in working to get S. 66 signed or veto overridden.

6. Some 35 interest groups are interested in looking at how S. 66 signed or veto overridden.

7. Misdistribution of health personnel is dealt with in the Community Health Centers, Community Mental Health Centers and Health Services Corps sections of S. 66. The Nurse Training Act does promote better geographic distribution of RN's in the project grants and nurse practitioner sections and in the eligibility requirements for capitation grants.

8. There is not an oversupply of RN's. An American Hospital Association Survey showed 38 states reported continuing shortage. Nursing homes in south (Ark. and Texas especially) still seek waiver from HEW requirement that one RN be on staff of every skilled nursing facility because they say they cannot find RN's.


Please show your recognition that health programs are important—we need your vote.

FACT SHEET

S. 66—NURSE TRAINING AND HEALTH REVENUE SHARING AND HEALTH SERVICES ACT OF 1976

Congress is clearing and sending to the President legislation combining several health programs that were pocket vetoed last December. The bill provides authority through fiscal 1977 for the following programs: Nurse Training, Grants to States for Health Services, Part B, and nursing community mental health centers, Migrant Health Centers, Community Health Centers, Home Health Services, Mental Health for the Elderly, Child Health Block Grants, National Center for Prevention and Control of Rape, Control of Huntington's Disease, Hemophilia Programs, National Health Service Corps.

Here's what the various aspects of the bill do:

Nurse Training—Provides federal support to schools of nursing and nursing students.

Grants to States for Health Services—Extends 314(d) authorizations of the Public Health Service Act to provide medical care to medically underserved populations.

Community Mental Health Centers—Extends and revises the Community Mental Health Centers Act; encourages fiscal self-sufficiency by centers; and establishes a National Center for the Prevention and Control of Rape.

Migrant Health Centers—Authorizes planning and development, and operation grant to migrant health centers to provide extended health service to migrant workers.

Community Health Centers—Authorizes two year planning and development, and operating grants for community health centers to provide extended health care services to medically underserved populations.

Home Health Services—Creates a demonstration program of grants to create home health care agencies and to train personnel to provide home health care via a institutionalized care.

Mental Health for the Elderly—Establishes a Committee to study Mental Health and Illness for the Elderly for a period of one year to study and recommend policy for the care and treatment of the mentally ill aged person.

Commission for the Control of Epilepsy—Creates a temporary commission to advise the President and Congress as to a comprehensive plan for the control of Epilepsy.

National Center for the Prevention and Control of Rape—Creates within NIH a national center to study the causes and the effects of rape and disseminate such information to the public.

Commission for the Control of Huntington's Disease—Establishes a temporary commission to advise the President and Congress on a national plan for the control of Huntington's Disease.

Hemophilia Program—Establishes a hemophilia diagnosis and treatment program under the Public Health Service Act.

National Health Service Corps—Extends the Corps program providing personnel to be utilized to improve health service delivery to medically underserved populations.

Health revenue sharing, health services, and nurse training—total funding by individual states for S. 66 programs.

(Totals are for the last year for which information is available.)

Alabama $9,091,335
Alaska 3,152,447
Arizona 6,926,903
Arkansas 7,614,244
California 325,215,735
Colorado 8,770,774
Connecticut 4,578,549
Delaware 2,312,299
District of Columbia 4,647,227
Florida 18,113,084
Georgia 10,375,279
Hawaii 1,591,140
Idaho 3,695,022
Illinois 16,656,905
Indiana 10,040,103
Iowa 8,678,055
Kansas 5,349,219
Kentucky 18,670,937
Louisiana 4,489,736
Maine 4,066,187
Maryland 8,687,098
Massachusetts 13,421,146
Michigan 16,269,146
Minnesota 7,781,356
Mississippi 6,182,859
Missouri 6,191,988
Montana 2,595,988
Nebraska 4,203,556
Nevada 7,51,861
New Hampshire 1,405,300
New Jersey 18,687,977
New Mexico 4,796,065
New York 37,813,955
North Carolina 9,449,119
North Dakota 509,000
Ohio 17,810,359
Oklahoma 7,884,688
Oregon 4,840,777
Pennsylvania 23,452,198
Puerto Rico 4,766,822
Rhode Island 3,516,782
South Carolina 7,312,620
South Dakota 1,092,349
Tennessee 10,386,828
Texas 25,486,770
Utah 2,518,009
Vermont 2,187,932
Virginia 5,275,009
Washington 1,645,654
Wisconsin 8,162,267
Wyoming 119,000
Wyoming 3,624,092
Guam 40,000
Virgin Islands 286,000
Outlying Area U.S. 5,583,012

S. 66 COMPARED TO PREVIOUS BILLS AND EXPENDED PUBLIC LAWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[In millions of dollars]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th-year authorized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S. 66 compared to previous bills and expired public laws.

1 Continuing resolution means actual funding level based on fiscal year 1973 or 1974 depending on program expiration date. No appropriation—bills expired.

2 Hypertension.

3 Includes carryover funds.
Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 3 minutes?

Mr. JAVITIS. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I rise also to urge the override of the President's veto of Senate bill 66 for the reasons given by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and by the distinguished Senator from New York, and a couple more.

As has been explained by them, Senate bill 66 authorizes the extension of various highly successful programs including community mental health, community health centers, migrant health, and the National Health Service Corps. The bill also authorizes several new programs including the one sponsored and offered by my distinguished colleague from Maryland (Mr. Mathias) and cosponsored by me relating to rape prevention.

Regrettably, the President, I wrote to the President urging that he sign S. 66. I thought that was good advice, because the programs contained in S. 66 are needed and important to the citizens of this country, and the extension and the creation of these programs are vital to the health and the people of this country. So it seems to me that an important priority for the Government of the United States is to make sure that the tremendous advances in medical science that we have achieved are delivered to the people of this country, health and, at a price that they can afford. It seems to me that it makes very good sense to continue the kind of programs that are now being authorized and to fund those that are new authorizations.

The President has made some interesting points. For example, it is generally recognized that the community mental health programs have been successful, but the administration seems to be saying that the Federal role in these types of programs, after all, have been successful, should abate. I point out to the administration that there is probably no time when it is more difficult for local and State governments to pick up the cost of these programs. Hence, if one of the major obstac­les is the price, we need to find out the manner in which, by geography and by specialty, the people of this country are served. For example, it is generally recognized that the community mental health programs are needed. I think we are concerned about the distribution of health personnel by geography and by specialty.

We have recognized the need for nurses and the shortage of nurses and the need for them in delivering health care to our citizens. Therefore, it seems to me we ought to be upgrading and expanding the Federal role in these programs. In brief, the bill is a valid measure to the delivery of health services in this country.

Under the bill the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta will now include a program of startup grants to home health agencies, a Committee on Mental Health and Illness of the Elderly, a center within the National Institute of Mental Health to deal with rape prevention and control, temporary commissions to draw up a national plan for the control of epilepsy and Huntington's disease, and a new hemophilia diagnosis and treatment program.

Mr. President, this is an essential bill. It covers a very large segment of the whole health and mental health effort. I regret very much that the President has vetoed this bill. I think, in all good conscience, we should override the veto and make it clear that health legislation, health care and mental health, is a top priority in this Nation, and I think a vote to override the veto will do exactly that.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.
Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to Senator STAFFORD.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for yielding to me.

Earlier this week I took the floor in the Chamber to urge that the President sign the bill, S. 66, and I regret, as others do, that he has not done so. Instead, I would like to be associated with what my distinguished colleague, Senator SCHWUKER of Pennsylvania, said just before I got the floor. It is with a rather heavy heart that I find myself in opposition to what the President has done here, but I feel it my duty on behalf of all of these important programs that are in S. 66 to urge the Senate to override the President's veto.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this morning, the President once again has put the ax to legislation that is vital to the well-being of the people of our Nation.

Hard as it may be to believe, the President vetoed S. 66, the Nurse Training and Health Services and Mental Health Sharing Act. This legislation had been passed by the Senate by a vote of 77 to 14, and the House had passed its version of this bill by an unanimous vote. My colleagues will recall that this bill passed by the 95th Congress were pocket-vetoed.

This leaves our health care system in pretty shoddy shape, and, frankly, I find this veto unconscionable.

Virtually all of the programs to which this legislation relates expired on June 30, 1974—more than a year ago. Since then, the Congress has expended tremendous amounts in efforts to revive and extend these vital programs and to seek an accommodation with the administration on the appropriate level of funding.

That is not to say that there are no new initiatives contained in this bill. There are, but they are important initiatives, limited in scope and hurriedly funded, for coping with rape, epilepsy, Huntington's disease, hemophilia and for developing new approaches to home health services and mental illness among the aged.

Nevertheless, the vast majority of the body of this legislation is addressed to long-standing programs to improve public health services; to strengthen family planning services; to support community mental health centers, community health centers, and migrant health projects.

Furthermore, this bill includes vital authorization to continue the National Health Service Corps program, which has been so successful in recruiting physicians for medically underserved rural and minority communities. And it includes vital support for the nursing profession. The Nurse Training Act makes it possible for disadvantaged nursing students to make their way into the health-care field, where their assistance is so urgently needed.

A very modest amount, some $73 million, is devoted to new programs which would provide support in the areas of hemophilia treatment, rape prevention and control, hypertension screening, and home health services.

Mr. President, I just cannot for the life of me understand what is on the President's mind. Last year he pocket-vetoed similar legislation, so Congress went back to the drawing boards to try to come up with a compromise he would accept. This time the bill was vetoed last December were too high from his point of view. The pending bill has been reduced by $50.5 billion. But even our reduction is not sufficient to satisfy the executive branch. Despite the careful and fully considered response to the national health problems identified in S. 66, the White House focuses on their "categorical" nature as if that, in and of itself, is sufficient justification for a veto.

Mr. President, the Congress heeded the President's suggestion that the authorization levels in the bill which he pocket-vetoed last December were too high from his point of view. The pending bill has been reduced by $50.5 billion. But even our reduction is not sufficient to satisfy the executive branch. Despite the careful and fully considered response to the national health problems identified in S. 66, the White House focuses on their "categorical" nature as if that, in and of itself, is sufficient justification for a veto.

Mr. President, now is the time for the Congress to assert its concern for the health status of the American people. We must do this by overriding the President's veto.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the veto of S. 66 today by the President of the United States suggests a sensitivity in the administration not for the poor, the ill, the disabled, or the medically underserved, but for its own narrow view of our fractured economy and what to do about it.

In the name of fiscal responsibility, the President has overlooked social responsibility.

The President he has done so in the face of exceptional congressional efforts to scale down the authorizations for the vital programs contained in S. 66, efforts to accommodate the President's wishes to scale down the authorizations for these programs. But the President has refused to seek some grounds of cooperation with the President on essential domestic legislation.

We have gone the last mile to find common ground; we have reduced the authorizations by $538 million from the levels of previous bills for these purposes to which the President objected and exercised a pocket veto late last year. We have reduced the authorized spending by 22 percent from the levels he found unacceptable last December.

Yet, this bill is vetoed, and the Senate now has to be faced with the decision of whether the President was wrong in vetoing it. In my mind, there is no scintilla of a doubt that he is wrong.

Mr. President, S. 66 is not an omnibus catchall of new programs. Virtually all of the programs to which this legislation relates expired on June 30, 1974—more than a year ago. Since then, the Congress has expended tremendous amounts in efforts to revive and extend these vital programs and to seek an accommodation with the administration on the appropriate level of funding.

Besides, the vast majority of the body of this legislation is addressed to long-standing programs to improve public health services; to strengthen family planning services; to support community mental health centers, community health centers, and migrant health projects; to strengthen nurse training programs; and to extend the compassionate contributions of the National Health Service Corps to medically underserved communities in inner cities and rural areas.

If it is the President's intention to terminate any of these vital programs, such as the National Health Service Corps programs which have become absolutely essential to the well-being of so many Americans, then he is wrong to persist in his intention at this time. To do so, he contends, the Government can no longer afford to provide financial support. In these instances, the States and local communities are in far worse position than the Federal Government to provide the new financial burden. They are fiscal captives of a national economic strategy that has drained away their revenues in the recession and refuses either to stimu-
late economic activity with job-creating programs or to consider providing the Federal assistance without which these programs will surely collapse.

Mr. President, it is true that these are difficult times for millions of Americans, particularly the 9 million jobless persons searching in vain for productive employment and facing the prospect of bankruptcy. But we must also be mindful of the difficulties of the least fortunate among us who look to their Government to provide them with essential services they could not otherwise afford.

To present them now in this time of greatest need would be tragic, and our decision here on the motion to override the President's veto of these vital programs will say much to them about what they can expect in the difficult days ahead from their National Government.

Let the message be one of compassion and understanding that goes forth from the Senate today. Let us vote to enact S. 669 notwithstanding the President's veto.

Mr. JAVITTS. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, shall the bill pass, the objection of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the Constitution.

All time has been yielded back, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. JAVITTS. Mr. President, to vote "aye" is to override?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. To vote "aye" is to override the veto.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we have order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senators will please take their seats, clear the aisles. The Senators will carry their conversations to the cloakrooms.

The clerk will resume.

The assistant legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, may we have order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order. The clerk will resume.

The assistant legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, may we have order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order. The clerk will resume.

The assistant legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senators clear the way. The Senators will take their seats. The clerk will proceed.

The assistant legislative clerk resumed and concluded calling the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDBERG), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. NIXON) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Hart) is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BIDEN) would vote "aye."

Mr. GRiffIN. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDBERG), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Fracy), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. Stevens) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Hart) is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITTS) would vote "aye."

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 7, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 337 Leg.]
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the majority whip yield?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I yield.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT-INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1976—APPROVAL OF CONFERREES

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent to have the Senate that the Senate be authorized to make technical and clerical corrections in the engrossment of the Senate amendments to H.R. 8070.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I move that the Senate insists on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferences on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. BEALL) appointed Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. SCHUMACHER, Mr. BAYH, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. BAYH, Mr. CHILES, Mr. HUDLESTON, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. CASE, Mr. FONG, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. BELLMON conferences on the part of the Senate.

HOME MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1975

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL). Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 1281, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1281) to improve public understanding of the role of depository institutions in home financing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to its consideration.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the “Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975”.

FINDING AND PURPOSE

Sec. 2. (a) The Congress finds and declares that depository institutions have sometimes failed to provide adequate home mortgage information to customers on a nondiscriminatory basis for all neighborhoods within the communities and neighborhoods from which the institutions receive deposits.

The purpose of this Act is to provide the citizens and public officials of the United States who are in the business of making federally related mortgage loans with sufficient information to enable them to determine which depository institutions are filling their obligations to serve the housing needs of the communities and neighborhoods in which they are located.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "mortgage loan" means a federally related mortgage loan as defined under section 2 of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974.
section 6. (a) This Act does not annul, alter, or affect, or exempt any person subject to the provisions of this Act from any of the laws of any State or subdivision thereof with respect to public disclosure and recordkeeping by depository institutions, except that the laws are inconsistent with any provision of this Act, and then only to the extent of the inconsistency. The Board may not determine that any such law is inconsistent with any provision of this Act if the Board determines that such law requires the maintenance of records with greater geographic or other detail than is required under this Act, or that such law otherwise provides greater disclosure than is required under this Act.

(b) The Board shall be regulation exempt from the requirements of this Act any depository institution within any State or subdivision thereof that it determines that, under the law of such State or subdivision, that institution is subject to requirements substantially similar to those imposed under this Act.}

STUDIES

Sec. 7. (a) The Board, with the consultation of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, is authorized and directed to carry out a study to determine—

(1) the feasibility, cost, and usefulness of requiring depository institutions located outside standard metropolitan statistical areas, as defined by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, to make disclosures comparable to those required by this Act;

(2) the feasibility, cost, and usefulness of requiring all institutions covered by this Act to disclose by geographical location the source of savings deposits;

(3) the effect of requiring disclosure of the average terms and downpayment ratios of mortgage loans by geographical location;

(4) the feasibility and usefulness of requiring disclosure of other types of lending data, such as mortgage business and home improvement loans.

(b) The Board shall also study and analyze, in a sample of standard metropolitan statistical areas of differing characteristics selected by the Board, the use to which the data disclosed under this Act is put by local government agencies, any community groups, and other interested parties in such areas. The Board shall also analyze the impact of the availability of lending data in the selected standard metropolitan statistical areas, including such questions as whether and to what extent mortgage lending in older neighborhoods increased as a result of disclosure, and whether any lending institutions altered their lending patterns, and any change in default or foreclosure rates.

(c) A report on the studies under this section shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than three years after the date of enactment of this Act.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for debate on this measure is limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided between the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Proxmire) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower), with 1 hour on any amendment and 20 minutes on any debatable motion, appeal, or point of order.

Who yields time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine will suspend until the Senator is in order.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators who are standing in the aisles will please take their seats or remove themselves to the cloakroom. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Maine will proceed.

BUDGET COMMITTEE COMMENTS ON S. 66 AND H.R. 8070

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I sought recognition between the two rollcall votes just taken for the purpose of giving my colleagues information bearing upon the second of those two votes, but unfortunately, I had not been sufficiently alert to assure that I would have the time to provide the information when it might have been most useful. As the Senator knows, I have tried to give the perspective of the Budget Committee on spending bills, and I think that there are some points that ought to be made with respect to S. 66 and H.R. 8070 which we have just taken that may be useful in the future.

First of all, with respect to the vote overriding the President's veto of the Nurse Training Act: As was brought out in the debate S. 66 is authorizing legislation. As such, it is difficult to evaluate its impact on the first concurrent budget resolution. Furthermore, it has implications for future expenditures which I think the Senate might do well to bear in mind as we act upon the various appropriations bills which provide for the health function.

The budget resolution did provide some leeway in the health function for new legislative health initiatives. If it is the will of the Appropriations Committee, supported by the Senate as a whole, to utilize a portion of those funds toward S. 66, then, of course, that is the privilege of the Senate and of the Congress. But the Senate cannot fully fund that legislation and all other health legislation which is pending and underway. At some point, each Senator will have to make choices between health priorities. Further we will have to make a decision about whether or not we should stay under the target set in the budget resolution. I want to give the Senate some indication of what the order of magnitude are.

The total of spending legislation which has not yet been reported in the Senate and the authorizing legislation, which includes S. 66, is found on page 35 of this Senate budget's scorekeeping report. I ask unanimous consent that the applicable page be printed in the Record at this point.

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

FUNCTION 550: HEALTH

TABLE C-SELECTED ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION [in billions of dollars]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>New authorizing legislation</th>
<th>Estimated outlays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total, spending legislation (to table A, line 1)</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spending legislation not yet reported to the Senate and not requested by the President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|             | National health insurance (S. 3, S. 600, S. 1438, H.R. 1, H.R. 11, H.R. 3596, H.R. 6227, Finance Committee, Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Dollar amount requires 1st-year start-up costs only) | .0 | .1
|             | Total, spending legislation (to table A, line 11F) | .1 | .1 |

Authorization legislation:

A. Through Congress or passed Senate:

Nurse Training Act of 1975 (S. 66, H.R. 8070, H.R. 8290); Labor and Public Welfare Committee; Dollar amounts represent increase over President's budget request.

B. Report not requested in Senate:

Note...

C. Not yet reported in Senate:

Programs now being considered by Labor and Public Welfare Committee (no bills yet introduced): heart and lung research... .5 .5

-Biomedical research...

-Communicable diseases...

-General health/education/medical education.

Health Planner Act of 1975 (H.R. 5543); Labor and Public Welfare Committee; Dollar amounts which we hope to get over President's budget request...

Total, authorizing legislation (to table A, line 11F)...

1.6

1.9


Mr. MUSKIE. The total estimated budget authority for both spending and authorizing legislation which would have
to be funded if finally enacted into law is $1.7 billion. Of that, S. 66 if fully funded would use $600 million.

The second subject on which I would like to make some comments is with respect to H.R. 8070 the HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations bill, which we have just approved.

H.R. 8070 appropriates funds for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Commerce and Transportation, the National Science Foundation, and the Environmental Protection Agency. These programs are among the largest in the federal budget.

The bill appropriates $17.8 billion for veterans' spending. This includes $1.2 billion for reestimates of the target, as well as other congressional initiatives.

Today's bill contains $17.8 billion for veterans, leaving $0.3 billion which is covered by other appropriation bills. If we assume that the $0.3 billion will be appropriated, we will reach a new figure for budget authority of $18.1 billion, which exceeds our target by $0.1 billion.

In the budget resolution accepted in May, we have received $18.1 billion in Presidential requests to date, which include $1.4 billion in recent budget amendments—reates of $1.2 billion for readjustment benefits, $3 billion for compensation and pensions.

Today's bill contains $17.8 billion for veterans, leaving $0.3 billion which is covered by other appropriation bills. If we assume that the $0.3 billion will be appropriated, we will reach a new figure for budget authority of $18.1 billion, which exceeds our target by $0.1 billion.

In the budget resolution accepted in May, we have received $18.1 billion in Presidential requests to date, which include $1.4 billion in recent budget amendments—reates of $1.2 billion for readjustment benefits, $3 billion for compensation and pensions.

The point is, as I understand the President's budget, which we provided is only what is required for the next fiscal year. The President's budget includes $18.1 billion in budget authority, which exceeds our target by $0.1 billion.

In the budget resolution accepted in May, we have received $18.1 billion in Presidential requests to date, which include $1.4 billion in recent budget amendments—reates of $1.2 billion for readjustment benefits, $3 billion for compensation and pensions.

The point is, as I understand the President's budget, which we provided is only what is required for the next fiscal year. The President's budget includes $18.1 billion in budget authority, which exceeds our target by $0.1 billion.

In the budget resolution accepted in May, we have received $18.1 billion in Presidential requests to date, which include $1.4 billion in recent budget amendments—reates of $1.2 billion for readjustment benefits, $3 billion for compensation and pensions.

The point is, as I understand the President's budget, which we provided is only what is required for the next fiscal year. The President's budget includes $18.1 billion in budget authority, which exceeds our target by $0.1 billion.

In the budget resolution accepted in May, we have received $18.1 billion in Presidential requests to date, which include $1.4 billion in recent budget amendments—reates of $1.2 billion for readjustment benefits, $3 billion for compensation and pensions.

The point is, as I understand the President's budget, which we provided is only what is required for the next fiscal year. The President's budget includes $18.1 billion in budget authority, which exceeds our target by $0.1 billion.

In the budget resolution accepted in May, we have received $18.1 billion in Presidential requests to date, which include $1.4 billion in recent budget amendments—reates of $1.2 billion for readjustment benefits, $3 billion for compensation and pensions.
the support and the confidence of the Senate.

HOME MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE ACT
OF 1975

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (S. 1281) to improve public understanding of the role of depository institutions in home financing.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I was not aware that S. 1281 was going to be laid before the Senate this quickly. As the ranking minority member of the committee, I think I have a right to expect to be informed more than a minute or two ahead of time when a bill for which I have some responsibility is going to be laid before the Senate. I was not so informed.

I do not like the idea that the Senate was going to take up S. 391 and then S. 2173, and then, if there were any time remaining in the legislative day, to lay before the Senate S. 1281. Somehow, S. 391 and S. 2173 dropped through the cracks; and while I was in my office, I was informed that S. 1281 had been laid before the Senate.

I feel that we can take any constructive action on S. 1281 at this moment. I have not had the opportunity to consult with the leadership on an appropriate time for taking up this measure. It was my understanding, original­ly, that it would be put over until Monday, that there were a number of amend­ments to it, that there were some abs­ent Senators who had an interest. Sen­ator Moss, who has an amendment of particular significance, is here, but I believe he expected that the matter would be carried over until Monday. Staff members stayed around for a while, in ex­pectation that the bill might be taken up; but when it became apparent that it would not be, according to what we under­stood the schedule to be, they de­parted.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think we probably will have to have a little discussion for a while. I do not see how we can move to any kind of real deliberative action on this measure this afternoon.

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

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas makes a very good point. He certainly should have been in­formed of the situation. He certainly should have been in­formed of the bill number and date.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may require to the Senator from Alabama.

TURKISH REACTION TO REFUSAL TO RESUME AMERICAN ARMS SHIPMENTS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate this courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend until the Senate is in order. The Senators take their seats and refrain from audible conversa­tion.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be able to read, Mr. President, a news item that everyone may have read already. Of course, we know the action that the House took on the matter of removing the arms em­bargo against Turkey, and this is a re­action to that. It says:

The Turkish Government declared today that bilateral defense treaties with the United States would not be renewed and ordered activity halted at the 20 American military installations in Turkey beginning Saturday.

The Cabinet took the step in reaction to the 232–206 vote by the U.S. House of Represent­atives on Thursday against resuming American arms shipments to this NATO country. The Ford administration had sought a partial lifting of the arms ban imposed in February because of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus.

The Decision, broadcast by the state radio and tele­vision, continued to be heard. It said, in part, that the United States had to meet, said all U.S. military installations on Turkish soil would be placed under the control of the Turkish armed forces.

A special status was designed for the strategic air base with nuclear bombers at Incirlik and the Incirlik air base, the bipolar defense treaty that was not renewed. The announce­ment said all activity at Incirlik not related to joint defense of the North Atlantic Alliance would be halted. It did not elaborate.

The United States has about 7,000 military men stationed in Turkey. Besides the Incirlik base, the U.S. installations consist of intel­ligence gathering radar stations which pro­vide surveillance of the Soviet Union. Some are small stations with five or six men.

The statement that bilateral defense treaties between Turkey and the United States, under which the installations were set up, were no longer valid.

Mr. President, I consider this a serious matter and one that should be referred to the Senate.

Mr. President, I consider this a serious matter and one that should be referred to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I seek unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may require to the Senator from Alabama.

Unfortunately, the House would not follow suit, and so we are in this pitiable state of having one of the key North Atlantic Alliance members, located in the most strategic position of any of the nations in the Alliance, suddenly out of that alliance and refusing even to let the American installations—and we have installations on the soil of Turkey—remain there.

I do hope it can be worked out. The North Atlantic Alliance may be enabled to remain strong, but this is a very seri­ous matter to which we ought to give serious attention.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, gladly.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator.

In my view, the action in the other body on this matter is perhaps the most unfortunate decision made in the long years I have been in the Congress. I think it represents a misconception of the issue and I do not rise to speak in defense of any other nation whatsoever.

There is a question, of course, that the original aggression was on the part of Turkey. There is no question that the positions of the Prime Ministers of each country have, in public at least, been very far apart. There is no question about the clamor that has been raised in this country by thoroughly concerned and reputable citizens under the belief there would be action proposed by the President somehow harmful to Greece. If I thought so, I would certainly have voted other than I did in the Senate. But I cannot see how it can be helpful to Greece or to Greek people for their neighbor, Turkey, to be seized of what is one of the largest nuclear agglom­erations of material, and that means of nu­clear power, in the world.

It is so great, in fact, that if the Gov­ernment of Turkey determines to apply these installations under the Turkish law, I can understand and sympathize with every­thing that may be done in the interest of the United States.

The other body has done this for the security of Israel, and to damage the security of the very people that were most anxious to help, and that is the Greeks.

I have to speak out like this even though I know where the votes are and I know that the votes are responsive, at least by a margin of 16 votes, to those groups who have honestly believed that they could be helpful in this situation by denying the Turks arms and materiel which the Turks have paid for, which were stored in this country, and on which the Turks were paying storage.

It is important for us to under­stand and symbolize with our reason for arriving at these conclu­sions, but very often reasoning of one kind evolves into results of another kind.

If I lived in Greece today, I would be very much concerned about the danger of a
great nuclear power adjoining my frontiers. I would sincerely hope that ways can be found for reconsideration of this action.

It may lead to the withdrawal of Turkey from NATO. It unghinges our anchor in the Mediterranean, at the same time that the other nation, Portugal, is in danger of being unhinged. It weakens the security of the United States. It weakens the security of Greece. It can be found, and I speak as one who has made their fight for settlement and the renewal of the command and control over the eastern Mediterranean, at the same time that the United States has become a great ally. It weakens the security of Greece.

I cannot see how without question, and all of us are of the Congress since I have been here. I do hope that this can be reconsidered, that I am their friend. I think they recognize that I have made their fight for security and safety, and I speak as one who has contributed a great deal to the security of this country. Most of them are my colleagues, and I think this is too bad.

We have been denied an important intelligence-gathering capability. We will be denied the opportunity to monitor Soviet naval movements. We will be denied some foreign bases that are of grave importance to us. We have been denied an important intelligence-gathering capability. We will be denied the opportunity to monitor Soviet naval movements. We will be denied some foreign bases that are of grave importance to us.

We have been denied an important intelligence-gathering capability. We will be denied the opportunity to monitor Soviet naval movements. We will be denied some foreign bases that are of grave importance to us.

I think the primary influence has been domestic politics. Domestic politics, do not worry about the consequences to the country, think about the consequences to our political forces, and I think this is too bad.

The distinguished minority leader was the Convention of Turkey. It produces High Cost, be printed in the Record.

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

**Comment—House Vote on Turkey Produces High Cost**

(By Howard K. Smith; ABC)

The cost of the House's refusal to renew arms shipments to Turkey is being counted up here and it runs high. The main overlooked cost is in intelligence about Russia. Turkey is packed with our equipment for monitoring all developments in Russia including troop movements; now it's estimated 25 percent of our surveillance capacity in the world goes out of action.

Second is the conventional military cost. Last April Russia held the biggest combined naval and air maneuvers ever held, code name Project Arrow. Though maneuvers covered all the seas of the world, fret priority was given to the oil routes from the Persian Gulf, whence free Europe gets nearly all its fuel, the route of the super tankers. And as the Mediterranean, at the same time that the United States has become a great ally. It weakens the security of Greece.

It is that the House did is tragic. I think the long-range consequence for the balance of tates is something that we would rather not contemplate.

The fact of the matter is that the House of Representatives has acted in a manner that is plainly contrary to the national interest. The House of Representatives has thumbed its nose at the national interest, has thumbed its nose at the potential for maintaining the security of the United States, for maintaining our defense parameters as far as our own shores as possible and as close as possible to the bases that we have virtually destroyed the southern flank of NATO, and we have endangered the 6th Fleet.

I do hope that this can be reconsidered, that I am their friend. I think they recognize that I have made their fight for settlement and the renewal of the command and control over the eastern Mediterranean, at the same time that the United States has become a great ally. It weakens the security of Greece.

Let us look to our friends, the Israelis. Anyone who purports to be a friend of Israel that voted against resumption of aid to Turkey is a false friend of Israel. It is Turkey that lays athwart the Soviet Union, Syria, and Iraq. The Turks do not want to be driven in the arms of radical Moslems, but the prospect now that we have acted as we have in this punitive measure toward an old ally is likely to serve that function.

It is that the House did is tragic. I think the long-range consequence for the balance of tates is something that we would rather not contemplate.

The distinguished minority leader was the Convention of Turkey. It produces High Cost, be printed in the Record.

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

**Comment—House Vote on Turkey Produces High Cost**

(By Howard K. Smith; ABC)

The cost of the House's refusal to renew arms shipments to Turkey is being counted up here and it runs high. The main overlooked cost is in intelligence about Russia. Turkey is packed with our equipment for monitoring all developments in Russia including troop movements; now it's estimated 25 percent of our surveillance capacity in the world goes out of action.

Second is the conventional military cost. Last April Russia held the biggest combined naval and air maneuvers ever held, code name Project Arrow. Though maneuvers covered all the seas of the world, fret priority was given to the oil routes from the Persian Gulf, whence free Europe gets nearly all its fuel, the route of the super tankers. And as the Mediterranean, at the same time that the United States has become a great ally. It weakens the security of Greece.

It is that the House did is tragic. I think the long-range consequence for the balance of tates is something that we would rather not contemplate.

The fact of the matter is that the House of Representatives has acted in a manner that is plainly contrary to the national interest. The House of Representatives has thumbed its nose at the national interest, has thumbed its nose at the potential for maintaining the security of the United States, for maintaining our defense parameters as far as our own shores as possible and as close as possible to the bases that we have virtually destroyed the southern flank of NATO, and we have endangered the 6th Fleet.

I do hope that this can be reconsidered, that I am their friend. I think they recognize that I have made their fight for settlement and the renewal of the command and control over the eastern Mediterranean, at the same time that the United States has become a great ally. It weakens the security of Greece.

Let us look to our friends, the Israelis. Anyone who purports to be a friend of Israel that voted against resumption of aid to Turkey is a false friend of Israel. It is Turkey that lays athwart the Soviet Union, Syria, and Iraq. The Turks do not want to be driven in the arms of radical Moslems, but the prospect now that we have acted as we have in this punitive measure toward an old ally is likely to serve that function.

To the Presiding Officer. Who yield time? Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator from Texas yield time? I have run out of all of my time on this bill. Mr. TOWER. I yield time to the Senator from Tennessee, such time as he may require. Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for yielding. I did not hear all of the remarks by the distinguished minority leader. But I did hear the very excellent presentation by the Senator from Texas and the remarks of the Senator from Alabama, in part.

I serve on the Foreign Relations Committee and on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I have long been concerned with America's evolving new foreign policy and the mechanism by which we will maintain the deterrents. We must get rid of this, and I think we are serving to put in place a new and viable foreign policy for this country.
Chamber, well-intentioned although disruptive in its force, the letter of 76 Senators supporting aid to Israel, in light of the debate that is now ongoing in the Foreign Relations Committee and in the public forum on the appropriateness of holding and not holding in supply defensive weapons to Jordan—in light of these developments I begin to wonder whether or not the Congress of the United States fully understands its responsibilities gone about the business of trying to be a responsible partner in that task of reexamining and reestablishing a current and relevant foreign policy.

I am greatly at the time saying that the consequences of the vote in the other body. I would not presume to advise them on the appropriateness of their action, except I would venture to estimate that the consequences will be very real, indeed, and very grave, possibly.

It is hard to overestimate the importance of Turkey as an ally to the United States. The wide variety of facilities and services that we avail ourselves of in Turkey was described very eloquently by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, the Constitution provides that Congress will advise and consent to the formulation of foreign policy. Congress should also be mindful, however, that the Constitution provides that the President is in charge of the formulation and the implementation of American foreign policy. I very much fear that there has not been sufficient advising together between the Congress and the President, or in some cases where Congress has not been in tune with the admonition of the executive department on the consequences of our acts.

Put in the vernacular of the times, I am afraid we have goofed, not just in one or two but in three or four categories of foreign policy.

I believe it is time we got together and stood that respect that the opinions of the President and the Department of State in foreign policy just as I have often counseled that they have a decent respect for our opinion in foreign policy.

It is time the Senate of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the executive department stopped seeing each other in an adversary role in foreign policy. We are all citizens of the same country and we better try to formulate this new foreign policy together and not as antagonists.

Mr. President, and I very much hope, the other body will still rescind their action on the Turkish aid cutoff and that we can repair the damage that has been done. I they can, I voted against the aid cutoff, notwithstanding there are distinguished Tennesseans who counseled me to the contrary; not to inject an undue person into a conversation standing proxy device of my sister's husband—I have a great brother-in-law—and that is not easy, friends. I did it not because I am a moral giant but I did it in terms of the desirable.

We are in no position to pass on the moral integrity, adequacy, or sufficiency of the foreign policy of another country. We are in a position only to judge within general parameters what is best for the United States, within the limitations of general, formal, moral conduct. Beyond that, we cannot judge the foreign policy of another country. We can only attend to the future of this one. Goodness knows, that is enough.

I think the debate and these statements at this time are very important. I hope they will be heeded not only by the other body but by our friends abroad, including the Turks, whom I have cautioned to think carefully on the consequences of their actions. I can understand their anger, their animosity toward us at this time, but there is still hope and I hope they will be cautious. I hope they will think a little. I suggest that there may still be time, then, to repair the damage.

I hope the statements by the Turkish Government are assuming command of American installations there does not mean what it might mean, and that over this weekend and beyond we can find a way to the many problems that confront us, I hope we can salvage our alliances in that part of the world because they are vital.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. I just want to say this: Of course, the Senator is eminently correct in saying that it is not our job to be trying to write policy for Turkey or for any other country. We have a big enough job to take care of our own policy with reference to other nations of the world.

Being for Turkey, to use that language, does not mean being against Greece. As a matter of fact, Greece stands to profit by Turkey being strong. I hope that this situation may ease itself and may even proceed to closure—to a very serious national development.

Of the world because they are vital. We are in a position only to judge within the limitations of another country. We can only attend to a place of nonimportance.

Mr. BROOKE. They were important, not important to the consideration of the pending business.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield myself such time as I may require on the bill.

Mr. President, this measure, S. 1281, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975, provides a very gentle remedy—disclosure—to a very serious national problem, the extreme difficulty of obtaining mortgage credit in older urban neighborhoods. The popular term for this problem is "redlining," but not important to the consideration of this measure.

Who yields time?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
cause of the energy shortage and the high cost of new housing.

Unfortunately, many lenders fall to appreciate the attractiveness of this sort of housing. And obviously, in the long run, maintenance of existing housing is at least as important as new construction, if the goal of a decent, safe, and sanitary home for all Americans is ever to be reached.

But our financial institutions seem to disdain these older communities, especially if they happen to be integrated, or appear to be educational neighborhoods.

The committee has found that a home buyer is likely to confront a dual credit market. He can get very attractive financing—5 or 10 percent down payment and 25 or 30 years to pay—if he buys a new home in a distant suburb; but if he inquires about an older house in a close-in neighborhood, the bank may demand a third down, and a 15-year mortgage. The extreme irony is that often these banks and savings and loan associations located in these older neighborhoods draw their deposits from precisely those communities that cannot get loans. Why do they do this? Well, many lenders seem to think that it is marginally safer to put their loans in the suburbs, even though that judgment is often irrational and arbitrary.

Mr. President, S. 1281 addresses the problem simply by requiring lenders to tell the community where their money is going. If depositors are able to learn, through disclosure, which local lenders are treating the community fairly, lenders will become more accountable.

They will have a kind of competition for responsibility and for community service, community availability.

The lenders will not find it quite so easy to export the community’s savings even while the community is starving for mortgage credit.

Some financial institutions seem to have forgotten that they are chartered to serve localities. But it does mean loan service as well as deposit service. But judging by some of the industry testimony we received and the mountains of mail from the lobbyists, some banks and S. & L’s take the position that they have a perfect right to ignore the credit needs in their own service areas if a higher rate of return or a more attractive deal is available elsewhere. They call that the free flow of capital. S. 1281 would use the power of market competition—competition for the saver’s dollar—to encourage lenders to do a better job elsewhere. The information disclosed under S. 1281 would also provide information to municipal officials concerned with housing, on the effects of local credit flows.

Here is how the legislation works:

Every depository institution—meaning bank or savings and loan association, and so forth—is required to set up a public file that is available for public inspection and copying. The disclosure statement, presumably in the form of a chart, must indicate the number and amount of mortgages made by that lender during the preceding year, broken down by census tract.
true concern is not the minimal cost, but the embarrassment once this data is pub-
lically available. In the committee's study of Washington, D.C., for example, we found
a large bank and loan which draws 50 percent of its deposits from the
City of Washington, D.C., at the loan window. I think it is the potential en-
forcement and the accountability
of that experience, that the cost is mini-
mal.
Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-
sent that the article entitled "California Experience Challenges Anti-
redlining Advocates by Lenders" by
Beau Brouillette) SAN FRANCISCO—Two of the arguments
which have been used by mortgage lenders to oppose anti-redlining measures elsewhere in
the state are being seriously questioned
by California legislators, regulators and con-
sumer advocates after an examination of ex-
isting practices here.

The arguments which have become sus-
cept in their eyes are that a disclosure of
mortgage data is a prohibitive and pro-
hibitively expensive operation, and that a mort-
gage lender cannot profitably lend under such circumstances. Both public and private
arguments can be statistically proven false,
anti-redlining advocates claim, on the basis
of California's experience.

At least two anti-redlining bills are pend-
ing in the state legislature, and it is believed
that increased attention will be drawn to the
subject in the next two weeks by state
officials.

Redlining is the alleged practice of refusal by
mortgage lenders to make real estate or
home improvement loans in high risk dis-
ticts, particularly in inner city areas. Anti-
redlining advocates have elsewhere hung a
call for public disclosure of where finan-
cial institutions make their mortgage loans.

Whatever other arguments mortgage lend-
ers may use against geographic disclosure,
ac-
ting to sources close to the administra-
tion of Gov. Edmund G. Brown Jr., the par-
ticular argument that such disclosure would be prohibitively expensive and force up
mortgage and other lending rates is one that
will be given little creditence by anti-redlining
advocates.

State-chartered California savings and loan
associations, they point out, have for the
past five years been required to make just
such a type of disclosure to the state savings
and loan commissioner, and the savings and loan associations have in-
dicated that the cost is not prohibitive.

One such study, these sources indicate, shows that the multi-billion dollar savings and loan associations in the state could con-
vert all of their existing computerized data into a census tract printout capacity for
a one-time cost of $18,000. Smaller in-
situtions without the computer capacity
might, they contend, have to "put in a lot of
paperwork, but nothing significant" to ac-
complish the same task.

The cost for transmitting monthly census
tract breakdowns on a quarterly basis, the study contends, is $300 annually for the
largest institutions, and about $1800
for a medium-size institution (about $150
million in deposits.)

Although unwilling to comment on spe-
cific figures until they have seen the study
data and this legislation, the California
savings and loan spokesmen say the cost of disclosure would depend upon whether
or not they are making existing
loans or simply loans made in the future.

If S&LS were required to disclose the lo-
cations by census tract breakdowns by
writing their books on
the answer to the prob-
lem of redlining, BofA confirms that the
assertion is essentially true. The program has
been government-insured BofA did not ac-
cede to the request.

The specially trained personnel were not
required to disclose the dollar amount of
future loans by census tract, it is likely the
case the S&LS would not make geographic
disclosure, because they were required to disclose only those loans made after the regulation became effec-
tive and were required to disclose the total dollar amount of loans made in each tract.

The study, which is in the hands of state
officials, is not an exhaustive state study,
but does not answer other arguments
against disclosure raised by lenders, the sources say.

Lenders have argued that a disclosure of
where deposits and loans are made would simply provide activist groups with an addi-
tional means of harassing lending institu-
tions, while not providing the public with
sufficient information about the more com-
mon problem of redlining. Anti-redlining
advocates, in any case, re-
ject the lending institutions' report of
harassment, and contend that such public
disclosure would lead to public indignation
which, in turn, would lead to withdrawal of funds by the public from institutions which
they feel discriminate in making housing
loans.

The general arguments about the difficulty
of conducting mortgage and home improve-
ment lending programs in high risk inner city
areas may run into problems here because of
the existence of a handful of such programs which have been successfully conducted,
including a $200 million program begun in
1968 by the $511 billion deposit Bank of
America, NT&SA, San Francisco, these
sources say.

Bank of America's "New Opportunity Home
Loan Program," although small in propor-
tion to its total real estate lending program, has
resulted in the construction of 1400 homes
which has been operated at a small profit, the
sources say.

Although it does not itself hold up its
NOHL program as the answer to the prob-
lem of redlining, BofA confirms that the
assertion is essentially true. The program has
been government-insured BofA did not ac-
cede to the request.

Since 1968, the bank has loaned $181 mil-
ion to 10,865 families, about 70% in inner
city areas, and the remainder in poverty
areas, for home purchase or improvement.

To qualify as a borrower under the program, a
family must have an income below the poverty
level established by the rental authorities in the areas in which he lives.

NOHL loans have been either conventional
mortgage loans in which the bank has
loosened requirements for minimum square
footage and number of rooms; Veterans Admin-
istration loans, or FHA 236 loans. At its outset, approximately 100 of the
bank's 1,000 California branches were staffed
for this specifically-trained personnel, which has since been increased to about 140.

The specially trained personnel were not
available at the outset with the program,
but were able to give prehome buying

We know of no case where any of the Fed-
eral regulators have moved against a
bank holding company because it has
broken a state law. Banks are not supposed to com-
ply with such state laws as Federal
insurance regulations, the state
laws, and is farthest

Another argument is that disclosure of
mortgage data into home mortgages. And so on. In

In closing, Mr. President, I want to say
that S. 1281 is not credit allocation legis-
lation, though if it fails, credit alloc-
ation might become necessary. All we are
doing is to provide some accountability
by institutions chartered to serve com-
unities, to the neighborhoods they are
supposed to serve.

Financial institutions are not char-
tered simply to make as much money as
they can. Since the Great Depression,
banks have not been permitted to play
the role of a commercial business, and
banks have been separated from investment
banks. Banks are not supposed to com-
pete with their customers, though thanks
to the bank holding company loophole
that is not always so. Thrifts institutions
are supposed to put most of their money
into home mortgages. And so on. In
short, banks are not laissez faire insti-
tutions. They have certain privileges,
such as Federal insurance and a partial
monopoly. In exchange for these privi-
leges, they have obligations. One such
obligation is to serve their service areas.

It is not clear from Wheeling
ston whether a bank is doing this, and I
know of no case where any of the Fed-
eral regulators have moved against a
lender for redlining, even though mort-
gage data into home mortgages is technically illegal
under the 1968 Fair Housing Act and
under regulations issued by the Federal
Home Loan Bank Board.

All we are asking, Mr. President, is for
the facts. We just want disclosure.

Since 1968, the bank has loaned $181 mil-
ion to 10,865 families, about 70% in inner
city areas, and the remainder in poverty
areas, for home purchase or improvement.

To qualify as a borrower under the program, a
family must have an income below the poverty
level established by the rental authorities in the areas in which he lives.

NOHL loans have been either conventional
mortgage loans in which the bank has
loosened requirements for minimum square
footage and number of rooms; Veterans Admin-
istration loans, or FHA 236 loans. At its outset, approximately 100 of the
bank's 1,000 California branches were staffed
for this specifically-trained personnel, which has since been increased to about 140.

The specially trained personnel were not
available at the outset with the program,
but were able to give prehome buying
consultation to potential customers, a step which the bank considers essential to the program's success.

Lending officers are encouraged to take a longer than usual amount of time to work out a loan agreement with each customer, and are careful to explain in detail all of the ramifications of home buying in understandable language, to point out the possible expenses and problems that may be encountered and discuss the responsibilities of home ownership. The lending officers are encouraged to explain to the customer with that will enable them to iron out financial difficulties that may arise in case of unexpected unemployment or other reverses.

The BofA NOHL loans have consistently accounted for only a small portion of the bank's total real estate lending. In 1974, one of the lowest volume years since the program began, $13 million in NOHL loans were made to 700 families, compared to $8 billion in real estate loans of all types, including interim construction financing.

Not unexpectedly, said a Bank of America official, NOHL loan delinquency experience has been poorer than for non-NOHL mortgage loans. In April 1978, he said, NOHL delinquencies were 12.4%, compared to 3.9% for other types of mortgage loans. Foreclosures were 7.4%, compared to about 2% for other types of mortgage loans.

While stating that the NOHL program is not the final answer to redlining, a Bank of America official said that the program itself could be profitably undertaken by other banks as at least an indication of commitment to provide better housing in urban and rural poverty areas. "In fact," said the spokesman, "I suspect that in cases where a lending institution has a more compact geographical area with a short line of communication between branch and parent, a program of this sort might even be operated more successfully."

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, S. 1281, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975, would require institutions engaged in residential mortgage lending to compile data reflecting the geographical areas in which they make mortgage loans and to reveal such information to the public.

While the mechanics of the bill are relatively straightforward, its underlying rationale deserves consideration. In the course of hearings on this bill, the Banking Committee received testimony which indicates that many mortgage lending institutions were not making mortgage loans in older neighborhoods, even though such institutions were located in or had branch offices receiving deposits in such neighborhoods. What emerged from the testimony was a pattern of deliberate disinvestment in certain neighborhoods by some mortgage lending institutions. These institutions were redlining neighborhoods and refusing to make mortgage loans regardless of the quality of the property offered as security or the ability of the buyer to pay for the property.

The Banking Committee has wrestled with the problem of redlining before, and it has not been an easy one to solve. The difficulty of making a mortgage loan must be made on a case-by-case basis taking into account a large number of factors, including the price and condition of the property, the capacity and worthiness of the buyer. No one suggests that mortgage lenders should make bad loans. Nor does any member of our committee urge a system of credit allocation under which mortgage lending institutions are directed to invest a certain percentage of their funds in older neighborhoods.

What the sponsors of S. 1281 do suggest is that so far as the practice of redlining is concerned, the public has a right to more information. Many mortgage lending institutions are getting deposits in urban neighborhoods where moderate income homeowners live. These institutions operate under charters issued by financial regulatory agencies on a state-by-state basis, but such restrictions are based on a geographic basis. They are supposed to serve the area in which they are located, not only to obtain deposits but also to make loans. Under S. 1281, their depositors and the public at large will be given an opportunity to assess the lending policies of these institutions by looking at the areas in which they make mortgage loans.

In some cities, neighborhood groups have organized to persuade their local lending institutions to make more mortgage credits available in their areas. They have been able to make an educated judgment about where they will deposit their savings based on the probability of their being able to get credit from the institutions in which they have made deposits.

S. 1281 does not apply to institutions in rural areas, and under the amendment which Senator Proxmire has offered for himself and me, the disclosure requirements of the bill would only be prospective in their application; that is, institutions would be required to report the location of properties securing all the mortgages in their portfolios. The cost of supplying the information required by the bill will be less than $1 per mortgage.

Some who oppose S. 1281 argue that mortgage lending practices are not the only factors which cause older neighborhoods to decline, and they are right. However, redlining is one of the more important factor, causing neighborhood deterioration, and I do not believe that we should delay taking steps to deal with "redlining" until we can bring forth legislation which will deal with all the causes of neighborhood decline.

The Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 is not a cure-all, but I believe it is a good bill and will discourage the practice of redlining which has developed in some cities. I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Utah such time as he may require on the bill.

Mr. CARMICHAEL (for Mr. Proxmire). Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Banking Committee did quote me correctly where I said, during the committee hearings, that the witnesses opposing this legislation were made aware of my intelligence by saying that redlining does not exist. It does. It existed in my city. As a matter of fact, the director of my planning and zoning commission, who is the highest paid city employee, who made more than I did as mayor, was denied a loan. Obvi­ously, he was qualified. He had the income, he had the job security. He was a young man so there was no problem. But it was simply in an area where they did not loan.

The point that I made very strongly, day after day, in the hearings, that redlining did exist. There is no doubt about that.

What the chairman did not state was that I also made the point very strongly on the other side of the bill to those simplistic testimonies that seemed to indicate that if we passed this bill, that solved all the problems. That simply is not true.

After 7 years in municipal government, I again say that redlining does exist, but it is only a part of the problem and it is not the originator of the problem. It does accelerate the problem after neighborhood deterioration starts.

There are a lot of cities in this country which simply have not owned up to their responsibilities. They have not put in proper curbs and gutters and sewers and water systems and upgraded those city services so that these are desirable neighborhoods to loan in.

I do not think that in my own city, where we were able to do that—get people off septic tanks, get them off wells, put in curbs and gutters and sidewalks and those civic improvements—it was the financial institutions were then willing to loan. So redlining is only one part of the problem, and it is not a panacea to adopt a bill that would impose a great deal of cost on a lot of people and just depend on the voluntary action of the institutions.

I also felt very strongly that the hearings were inadequate. They were very one-sided in favor of this legislation. We had only 4 witnesses in favor of it, 4 or 5 against. Those 4 or 5 against were very strong in their opposition. But we did not have any neutrals. We did not have any urbanologists, any people who would come in who were not on one side or the other, and testify objectively on how they felt about the issue.

My point is that there is someplace in between the two extremes, from those who say that redlining does not exist to those who think that this is the cure-all for all of the problems of urban decay. It simply is not.

I feel that before this bill was brought to the Senate floor, we ought to have more hearings and we ought to have more testimony, bring in more people, third-party types who could testify on how they feel about this problem and what they think the cures are. The bill originally covered the entire country, imposing these rules and regulations and disclosing information for all funds and savings and loan in the country. Fortunately the committee changed this and it was amended to include some 285-odd SMSAs in this country.

Other modifications were made that made it more desirable. Still, in the hearings, where I ask specific questions and wanted factual data on costs, such as what the financial institutions would do under the bill, I did not get any answers as to what the financial institutions would do under the bill, I did not get any answers.
D.C., study that was referred to throughout the committee hearings, has since been discredited by the Washington Post. If they are against it and think it was a bad study, it must really be a bad one.

The chairman proposed that I shut up myself to in more detail to that and why I have proposed a study for 3 years in 20 SMSA’s rather than going nationwide at this stage. I can get the questions put to some of these questions. At the end of those 3 years, we might find out that the distinguished chairman from Wisconsin is correct and I am wrong. On the other hand, we may find out that I am right and he is wrong. At least, we shall be able to base these decisions on a very important piece of legislation on facts and not on someone’s opinion.

Although I fully support the objectives of S. 1281, to halt neighborhood deterioration, I have grave reservations whether the disclosure provision will make a real contribution to that end. The bill is based on the simplistic theory that if community groups and savers are given access to mortgage lending patterns of financial institutions, the groups can then force the institutions to invest the savings deposits in neighborhoods which are declining and thus reverse that process. This fails to recognize the underlying causes of urban decline.

Most urban authorities agree that disinvestment by financial institutions in home mortgages does not initiate the decay of inner city neighborhoods but comes rather at some point after the deterioration sets in. Certainly, disinvestment plays an important role in neighborhood decline and we need to know more of its effect. Unfortunately, the disclosure scheme of S. 1281 does not provide a mechanism for an intelligent analysis of the effects of home mortgage disinvestment.

Even if we have a compulsory federal disclosure law, and even if we then went to a law that says you will allocate home mortgage credit to a particular area, we are not going to solve the basic problems of the neighborhoods.

The chairman mentioned that this was not credit allocation. I agree with him it is not credit allocation. But I would state that it is the first step in the credit allocation, and so testified to by several groups who favored this bill. If they can get their hands on the information they desire, the decay in neighborhood decline and we need to know more of its effect. Unfortunately, the disclosure scheme of S. 1281 does not provide a mechanism for an intelligent analysis of the effects of home mortgage disinvestment.

Even if we have a compulsory federal disclosure law, and even if we then went to a law that says you will allocate home mortgage credit to a particular area, we are not going to solve the basic problems of the neighborhoods.

The chairman mentioned that this was not credit allocation. I agree with him it is not credit allocation. But I would state that it is the first step in the credit allocation, and so testified to by several groups who favored this bill. If they can get their hands on the information they desire, the decay in neighborhood decline and we need to know more of its effect. Unfortunately, the disclosure scheme of S. 1281 does not provide a mechanism for an intelligent analysis of the effects of home mortgage disinvestment.

Even if we have a compulsory federal disclosure law, and even if we then went to a law that says you will allocate home mortgage credit to a particular area, we are not going to solve the basic problems of the neighborhoods.

The chairman mentioned that this was not credit allocation. I agree with him it is not credit allocation. But I would state that it is the first step in the credit allocation, and so testified to by several groups who favored this bill. If they can get their hands on the information they desire, the decay in neighborhood decline and we need to know more of its effect. Unfortunately, the disclosure scheme of S. 1281 does not provide a mechanism for an intelligent analysis of the effects of home mortgage disinvestment.

Even if we have a compulsory federal disclosure law, and even if we then went to a law that says you will allocate home mortgage credit to a particular area, we are not going to solve the basic problems of the neighborhoods.

What is needed are programs by the cities themselves that attack the causes rather than the symptoms; in a spirit of cooperation rather than in an attitude of confrontation.

The cities must go in, like we did when I was mayor of Salt Lake City, and put in more curbs and gutters and sidewalks, as I have already mentioned.

What is needed are programs by the cities themselves that attack the causes rather than the symptoms; in a spirit of cooperation rather than in an attitude of confrontation.

The cities must go in, like we did when I was mayor of Salt Lake City, and put in more curbs and gutters and sidewalks, as I have already mentioned.

What is needed are programs by the cities themselves that attack the causes rather than the symptoms; in a spirit of cooperation rather than in an attitude of confrontation.

The cities must go in, like we did when I was mayor of Salt Lake City, and put in more curbs and gutters and sidewalks, as I have already mentioned.
imaginative programs which address the underlying causes, we will not save the cities.

And in referring back to the hearings that we held, a great deal was said about these mortgage loans and where they were being distributed. There was very little mention made of the responsibility of the Savings and Loan institutions to their depositors, and this No. 1 responsibility is the safety of the funds of their depositors.

It is quite interesting, we have heard a great deal about "redlining" problems in Chicago. But a black minister wrote a letter about this problem, and I will only read part of it and ask unanimous consent that the entire text of his letter be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brock). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GARN. He says:

Why have there been no hard-hitting advertisements about the anti-redlining campaign? Is it because there are no problems of the obvious implications that will endanger the savings of your depositors? And, not the least of that is that the institution from the combined membership of all Savings and Loan associations?

And, of course, the hidden agenda behind this of allegation that in fact Savings and Loan associations are racist, and desire to destroy neighborhoods made up of ethnic minorities or of mixed black-white or latino-white populations.

He goes on:

ABOUT REDLINING SOME HARD AND BASIC FACTS TO CONSIDER

The very first obligation of any Savings and Loan association is to safeguard the savings of the thousands of savers, large and small, who trust it with their money . . .

Don't forget the disaster of financial institutions going bankrupt because of bad loans and investments . . .

Don't forget that even the resources of the Federal Government's protective insurance programs for Savings and Loan associations will be strained if there is a widespread pattern of bad lending and bad investing by these institutions over all the state or nation . . . It is a fact, and every knowledgeable and thoughtful person knows it, is a fact, that houses and other buildings in some areas of a city, lose a large part of their dollar value when the conditions of social decay set in and become serious.

Now, he goes on with several other examples.

Here is a black minister saying that we have got to look at the other side of the coin, to not just those who are borrowing money, but those who deposit the money for borrowing, and these institutions certainly have an obligation to them.

There must be other ways devised for financing what is needed in deteriorating districts, and the Savings and Loan associations cannot arbitrarily refuse to endanger the funds of which they are trustees to accomplish this purpose.

I feel very strongly that we must not adopt H. 1281 as it is now proposed. I am hopeful that when I introduce my amendment that it will be adopted.

It would limit the study to 3 years in 20 standard metropolitan statistical areas and would give the answers to the questions so that we could pass meaning-

ful legislation that would not be a handi-
cap to the savings and loan institutions of this country.

So I urge the defeat of Senate bill 1281 as it is presently written.

EXHIBIT No. 1

ALL SOULS FIRST UNIVERSALIST SOCIETY OF CHICAGO, CHICAGO, III., JULY 5, 1975.

Mr. STANLEY ELNUND, Chairman of the Board, First Federal Sav-
ings and Loan Association of Chicago.

One South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR Mr. Ellund:

As a long time depositor to the care of your Savings and Loan Association, I am much disturbed. It seems to me that this so-called "redlining" is a violation of the trust granted by the F.S.A. and other independent Savings and Loan associations, and have been failing seriously in their obligations to their savers and to the community.

In the face of a serious, organized threat of major proportions to the continued successful management of the loan business, and, by projection, to the savings of the tens of thousands who have trusted you—not personally, but institutionally—the Savings and Loan Associations need to even attempt effective counter measures. Why have there been no hard-hitting advertisements about the anti-redlining campaign? Why has there been no fight to end Loan associations from the obvious implications that will endanger the savings of your depositors? And, not from your own bank, but from the combined membership of all Savings and Loan associations?

I am no ad writer by profession. And there is, of course, the hidden agenda behind this of allegation that in fact Savings and Loan associations are racist, and desire to destroy neighborhoods made up of ethnic minorities or of mixed black-white or latino-white populations.

Mr. GARN. Then I am happy to yield for that purpose and retain my right to the floor.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement of support of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. GARN. Then I am happy to yield for that purpose and retain my right to the floor.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, without unduly taxing the time of the Senate, I wish to support strongly the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

It seems to the Senator from Florida that by having the study conducted in the other metropolitan areas by which the practice of redlining is alleged to occur, that the substance of the bill can be accomplished without need for concern on small thrift institutions in other areas.

When the Senator from Utah calls up his amendment, the Senator from Florida will offer an additional amendment which will have the disclosure take place by ZIP code instead of by census tract.

In that fashion, the practice of redlining can be just as readily determined and the private and public and semipublic institutions will not be unduly taxed in order to gather information that they do not have.

Their computer systems can carry the ZIP code data without the need to be just as readily studied and determined by the use of ZIP codes as by the use of census tracts.

If, for any reason, the amendment of the Senator from Utah fails at all, then the Senator from Florida will offer the equivalent amendment, the ZIP code amendment, to the bill itself.

But the Senator from Florida wishes to commend the Senator from Utah for
assisting in the purposes of the bill without undue expense where the purposes of the bill truly would not be served.

Mr. President, I strongly support the amendment offered by the Junior Senator from Utah. I believe the regulations and reporting requirements contained in S. 1281 would place severe burdens upon many thrift institutions, particularly those without the facilities or personnel to tabulate or computerize the data.

The amendment offered by Senator Garn, which would limit the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act to a 3-year demonstration study in July 1975, would truly be in the best interests of the bill with widespread reporting requirements contained in S. 1281.

The amendment offered by Senator Garn, which would limit the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act to a 3-year demonstration study in July 1975, would truly be in the best interests of the bill with widespread reporting requirements contained in S. 1281.

Another example: There are 141 census tracts within the State of Utah. It would be necessary to manually relate every mortgage using a road map and census tract in combination to develop this information. This would not be a very useful or time-saving job. Only in the city of Tampa is there available a street index relating addresses to census tracts and this is only approximately 60 percent accurate and this is based on the very plan proposed by this bill.

We have no way of estimating just what the cost impact would be in financial institutions if they were required to keep their records according to census tracts rather than by some other criterion such as ZIP codes.

One more problem with census tracts. What happens in 1980 when the Bureau of the Census finds it necessary to revise the census results of the 1970 Census? The entire data base accumulated would be obsolete. The system proposed by the bill seems to assume that the present census will remain valid forever. This would not be the case in several years. For this reason alone, I suggest that ZIP codes be used instead of census tracts and I urge adoption of the amendment by my colleague from Utah to insure that a proper and workable plan will be produced by this body. There is a problem. Let us correct it wisely.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the Director, Bureau of the Census, Vincent Barabba, be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF VINCENT F. BARABBA

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate this opportunity to testify in connection with S. 1281. The measure is to be heard on H.R. 8024, and the questions raised by Title III of the bill concerning proposed disclosures by financial institutions. Primarily, we would like to describe the state of the art regarding the locating and coding of street addresses by geographic areas, particularly by census tract.

I should like to emphasize at the outset that we see our role in this area as technical and not one of dealing with the policy questions as to what the disclosures are, and what their impact would be in terms of the objectives of the legislation.

To simplify somewhat, the Bureau has developed a system for coding street addresses by their geographical location. For the 1970 census, we mailed census report forms to about 27 percent of all households, with the cooperation of the U.S. Postal Service. The address coding system permitted us to determine the geographic area when they were mailed back. The areas covered by the system were roughly equivalent to the city delivery areas (street address areas) of the postal system.

The first step was to develop a series of metropolitan maps, with major assistance from agencies of local government. The maps were supplemented with an inventory of the address ranges between each street intersection. A code was developed to represent the geographic location of each address range. For each address range in this inventory, the information of a census block number the name of the street which the block side faces, the census tract number, the county, the congressional districts, county, municipality, and so forth. This inventory or address reference file means Geographic Base File, and DIME means Dual Independent Map Encoding—a computerized process for checking the internal consistency of the topological features in the file.

For the 1970 census, these files were developed again with major assistance for the urbanized cores of 196 of the then-existing 233 Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's). Now all 311 SMSA's have been designated since the 1970 census by the office of Management and Budget, and there will probably be more areas designated before the 1980 census.

The GBP/DIME files have several important limitations and characteristics. First, the files are limited primarily to urban areas in which city delivery service or its equivalent is maintained by the U.S. Postal Service. This means that the addresses for which the files are available include those for census tracts other than those for which the census tracts are geographically defined for purposes of the 1980 census, the Bureau has already begun the process of correcting, updating, and extending these files. We are now working with local groups in over 130 SMSA's to update existing metropolitan maps and other files, and to develop such resources for all SMSA's just prior to the 1980 census, and if feasible, to include some of the cities outside SMSA's as well.

It is very important to note that this
Some of the witnesses who testified on June 26 apparently commented on the difficulty of obtaining and using material for coding the addresses by census tract. I believe Mr. Waxman is faced with such difficulties with regard to Chicago, because of the rather large volume of tract maps for the city. He stated that up to now the Chicago City Planning Commission has developed a census tract code book, and in any case it is impossible to do unless it can be done in conjunction with the codification of the addresses of the area not now covered, primarily to the outlying portions of the SMSA where unpatterned addresses are found. The United States Census Bureau has outlined the need to extend the files within computing programs to include address reference files for matching files.

From a technical standpoint, it is feasible for any local organization to make use of the GBF/DIME files and related materials to code addresses by census tract, but they would have to be done so in mind, bearing in mind that the files do not exist yet for all SMSA's, some of them require considerable updating, and most of them do not cover the entire area of an SMSA. The utility of the file will thus vary from place to place and will gradually increase between now and 1980.

We have no way of estimating just what the cost impact would be on financial institutions if they would have to take the use of the ZIP code areas is that the ZIP code areas are designed for mailing purposes, and which they represent individuals or households with similar characteristics is incidental to their main purpose. The use of census tracts requires some special coding work.

However, tracts are designed with the purpose of describing the characteristics of local neighborhoods, as opposed to the characteristics of the whole area.

The Bureau has taken full advantage of the computer for coding addresses, to save work, and also for mapping techniques and graphic presentations of data. Using the computer is obviously very expensive in itself. In general the codes are not required for large numbers of addresses, particularly for address matching. It is also possible, however, to follow a manual procedure of classifying and mapping individuals and groups to geographic areas such as census tracts. This would include visual inspection of local maps or census tract maps to produce tract based data if necessary. Several cities and planning agencies have developed a census tract code book for purposes of tract analysis which contains a tabular listing of street names and address ranges for each street.

The Bureau has developed computer programs to be used in conjunction with address reference files for matching addresses to the information already in the file. This provides a way of correcting errors in the file, but also, it permits the assignment of geographic codes to local administrative records which contain addresses. One of these programs, for example, starts addresses which are subject to name variability, and includes a matcher which links geographic base files to local data files.

It also permits the addition to the file of other elements, such as geographic location, land use, or demographic characteristics. To give just one illustration of local use, one community, in planning for the use of community development funds, sent out a questionnaire to its citizens, based on water bills. People were asked to describe the quality of the water, and the reasons for non-compliance with the city's water billing. After the questionnaire responses by the socio-economic community, the city sent back the questionnaire responses by the socio-economic community, the city, and the economic community.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his support and his contribution.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I think the time has come for me to let some sunshine in; to provide information to consumers in these neighborhoods that have been arbitrarily denied credit, and to let the marketplace decide which lenders deserve our business.

I urge that this legislation be adopted.

Mr. President, I will modify my amendment.

I understand the distinguished Senator from Utah will make an opening statement for the minority, but I call up my amendment and modify my amendment No. 594 as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike "mortgage banker." And then as cosponsor, I ask unanimous consent that I may add the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE). Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to amend his amendment to modify his amendment.

The clerk will state the amendment as modified.

The Assistant Legislative Clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) --

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin holdfor just a moment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Certainly.

Mr. TOWER. There is some concern on the part of some Members about their rights in terms of offering amendments. I wonder if we could get a consent agreement that the committee amendments will be considered as original text for the purpose of the amendments so that amendments can be offered in the
second degree. Otherwise, they could not.

They would be precluded by virtue of the fact that they should be amendments in the third degree.

I ask the Chair if I am correct on that assumption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Texas that the proposal will be to strike out and insert committee amendments and that bill in that form would be amendable in the second degree, both the committee amendment to strike out and insert, and the original text.

Mr. TOWER. May I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if that is what he is doing now? He is not changing the text as reported from the committee but is moving to strike out and insert committee amendments so it is amendable in the second degree.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct, that certainly is what I am doing and what I intend to do.

Mr. TOWER. If the Senator from Wisconsin is proposing what he was trying to do is to protect Senators who might want to amend amendments that are offered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct, and it has always been customary for the manager of the bill when he offers committee amendments to ask unanimous consent that it be considered as original text, and I do that so that Senators can amend the bill freely, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is unsure as to whether or not the Senator was proposing to strike out and insert the committee amendments or is proposing an amendment of his own. Is the Senator asking that the committee amendments be considered at this time?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On whose behalf?

Mr. TOWER. I ask unanimous consent that the time be charged to neither side. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the bill in its present form is amendable in two more degrees.

Mr. TOWER. In other words, an amendment to an amendment would not be treated as an amendment in the third degree but to the extent that a point of order would lie against it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Amendment No. 694

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 694, as modified, of which Senator Brooxee is a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Proxmire), for himself and Mr. Baucus, proposes an amendment numbered 694, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 8, line 21, after "loan" insert (other than temporary financing, such as a construction loan).

On page 8, strike out lines 23 through 25 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) the term 'depository institution' means any commercial bank, savings bank, savings and loan association, or credit union, which makes federally related mortgage loans as determined by the Board.".

On page 9, strike out lines 13 through 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"number and total dollar amount of mort­
gages which were, on (A) purchased, or (B) purchased, by that institution during each fiscal year (beginning with the last full fiscal year of that institution which immedi­ately preceded the effective date of this Act)."

On page 10, line 2 strike out "county" and insert in lieu thereof "State".

On page 10, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following: "For the purpose of this paragraph, a depository institution which maintains offices in a standard metropolitan statistical area shall be re­quired to make the information required by this paragraph available at any such office only to the extent that such information relates to mortgage loans which were originated, purchased, or sold by an office of that institution in the standard metropolitan statistical area in which the office making such information available is located.

On page 10, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

Any information required to be com­plied and made available under this section shall be maintained and made available for a period of five years after the close of the first year during which such information..."
is required to be maintained and made available."

On page 13, line 19, strike out "shall" and insert in lieu thereof "may."

On page 13, line 24, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "Such laws shall contain adequate provisions for enforcement."

At the end of the bill add the following:

"EFFECTIVE DATE"

"Sec. 8. The provisions of this Act shall come into effect upon the expiration of ninety days following the date of enactment of this Act."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Senator Brocke and I have a package amendment that makes technical perfecting modifications, and also makes the bill less costly for the financial institutions to comply with.

Let me summarize the provisions.

First, we make it clear that we are applying the disclosure requirement only to permanent mortgage loans, not to temporary construction loans. We were advised by counsel that this is necessary since technically speaking a construction loan which is secured by property may be considered a mortgage, and it was not the committee's intent to cover that sort of loan.

Second, we sharpen up the definition of which institutions are covered. The language in the committee report may be a bit unclear, since we define depositary institution as anybody who makes federally related mortgage loans under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974. That includes insurance companies, and individual investors, whose activities are not significant for the purposes of this legislation. This bill aims at discerning patterns of investing banks, savings and loan associations, and credit unions.

Third, we are modifying the disclosure requirements are essentially prospective. Witnesses from the financial institutions told us that it would be disproportionately costly if they were required to go back over loans and assign census tracts to them. Whereas if they simply assign the census tract at the time a new loan is originated, the cost drops to something less than a dollar per loan, according to industry estimates. We would require reporting of loans made during the year preceding the act so that the act would have some impact next year.

Under this provision, institutions would assign census tracts to loans made during the fiscal year preceding the effective date of the act, and subsequently the reporting requirement would apply to all new loans. We also make clear that the legislation requires an accounting of loans purchased as well as originated, and the intent here is that these be separate categories. If the information broken down separately for each category.

Next, the amendment simplifies the disclosure provisions requiring to loans made outside an institution's own metropolitan area. As reported, the bill requires that those loans be broken down by county. We feel that this degree of specificity is probably not necessary, so "county" is changed to "State."

Similarly, an institution such as Bank of America, which does more than one metropolitan area would be required under the committee report to maintain census-tract disclosure records in its Los Angeles offices for loans made in San Francisco. That would not be useful information. So the amendment limits that the census-tract recording requirement to loans made within a particular branch's home metropolitan area. This amendment also provides that those records must be kept for 5 years. In addition, it gives the Federal Reserve greater flexibility in administering the act where comparable legislation has been enacted at the State level, by making the waiver discretionary. And finally, we provide that the act shall take effect 90 days following enactment.

This amendment will improve the legislation technically and in the substantial area of making the disclosure requirement prospective, I believe it will make it easier for the financial institutions to live with.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, if he is prepared to yield back the remainder of the time which I have left me, I am prepared to yield back mine.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. TOWER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no further time be charged against either side on the pending bill for the remainder of the day.

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

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

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I wonder if the pending business could now be laid aside temporarily for whatever other business the Senator wants to transact, so that we can be finished with our business for today.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Yes.

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 300, and, after that, to Calendar Order No. 322.

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

Mr. ALLEN. The Chair is prepared to yield the remainder of his time, I am prepared to yield back mine.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Calendar Order No. 300 is a resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Commerce, and Calendar Order 322 is a bill related to special pay for nuclear qualified officers.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 63) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Commerce for inquiries and investigations, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

On page 2, in line 17, strike out "$2,347,689.47 and insert "$1,597,009."

On page 3, in line 1, strike out "committee" and insert "committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved. That (a) in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, as amended, in accordance with its jurisdiction under the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, as authorized from March 1, 1976, through February 29, 1976, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate for the use of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, as amended), and (b) such legislative sessions referred to in subsection (a) shall include, but not be limited to, investigations of (1) national ocean policies and transportations; (2) energy and development and regulation; and (3) tourism. The investigations of national ocean policy shall be conducted in accordance with, and subject to the provisions of S. Res. 232, Ninety-third Congress, agreed to February 19, 1974. The investigation of tourism shall be conducted in accordance with S. Res. 347, Ninety-third Congress, agreed to October 10, 1974.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $300,000, of which amount not to exceed $2,000,000 shall be available for the procurement of services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, as amended), to be expended in accordance with, and subject to the provisions of S. Res. 232, Ninety-third Congress, agreed to February 19, 1974. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be charged against the contingent fund of the Senate under vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 94-396), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

EXcerpt

Senate Resolution 63 as referred would authorize the Committee on Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, as authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, to expend not to exceed $2,347,689.47 for a study of the impact within its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, of which amount not to exceed $300,000 would
be available for the procurement of the services of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

During the second session of the 93d Congress the committee was authorized by Senate Resolution 222, agreed to February 19, 1974, to expend not to exceed $1,648,800 for the same or similar purposes. The committee recommended $1,359,100 in a similar manner as to the provisions of Senate Resolution 222, Ninety-third Congress, agreed to February 19, 1974. The investigation of national ocean policy would be conducted in accordance with, and subject to the provisions of Senate Resolution 222, Ninety-third Congress, agreed to February 19, 1974.

The committee takes cognizance of the fact that expenses incurred by the ex-officio members participating with the Committee on Commerce in conducting the National Ocean Policy Study authorized by said Senate Resolution 222, agreed to February 19, 1974, will be paid from the funds contained in the Appropriations Act of 1974. Senate Resolution 222 authorizes the Chairman and ranking Minority Member of the Committee on Commerce in conducting the National Ocean Policy Study to employ ex-officio members participating with the committee, without regard to Senate Resolution 237, Ninety-first Congress, agreed to by unanimous consent on February 19, 1974.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 94-328), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

EXCERPTS
PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION
Authority for special pay for nuclear-trained naval officers expired on June 30, 1975. The bill provides for one payment of $18,000 to each nuclear officer qualified for duty in connection with the supervision, operation and maintenance of naval nuclear propulsion plants who, prior to completion of 10 years of active service, agrees to remain on active duty for 4 years in addition to any other period of obligated active service.

The legislative proposal recommended by the Defense Department was not received by the Senate until June 9, 1976. This allowed inadequate time for the committee to fully consider this proposal. However, the naval officers who work in this legislative area and who perform some of the most vital and important jobs in the entire Defense Department, expressed concern that the operations of our ballistic missile submarines, our nuclear attack submarines and the nuclear surface ship fleet, might not receive this incentive pay. The committee, however, believes that this pay should be able to do so.

The Defense Department proposed legislation would not have created an entirely new system of incentive pay for these officers. Preliminary investigations revealed little evidence that the proposed system would insure the retention of sufficient nuclear-qualified officers. In addition, the proposed system would have institutionalized a permanent system of general incentive pay, rather than the more flexible and controllable system of special pay aimed at specific problems.

To solve the loss of nuclear officers, in 1969 Congress enacted Public Law 91-20 authorizing Nuclear Submarine Officer Continuation Pay. This pay was a $15,000 bonus over one 4-year period. The bonus paid is in addition to the initial service obligation and before completing 10 years of commissioned service. Authority for this program was to expire in 1975.

This bonus pay succeeded in slowing the resignation rate for nuclear submarine officers. In Public Law 92-581 in 1972, Congress authorized to grant the bonus to nuclear officers until June 30, 1975. This law also extended the nuclear officer bonus to the surface nuclear fleet. The authority to grant this bonus to officers not currently receiving it expired June 30, 1978.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I seek unanimous consent that the Senate extend the authority to grant the bonus to nuclear officers until June 30, 1978, as authorized by the above-cited measure.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 72
Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 194(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with the investigation and report thereof, as directed by the Standing Rules of the Senate so far as applicable, the Committee on the Judiciary, on the Judiciary Committee, may spend not to exceed $5,347,000, the Committee on Rules and Administration, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3)
with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a nonreimbursable basis the services of any individuals or organizations not otherwise concerned in such study or investigation, in the manner as to be determined by said Committee.

Sec. 2. The Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, to expend $4,493,157 to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to each of the following subjects, including, but not limited to, the succeeding sections of this resolution, said funds to be allocated to the respective specific inquiries and investigations as approved by the Committee:

The funds requested by the committee that not to exceed $381,100 would be available for a study or investigation of administrative practice and procedure, of which amount not to exceed $10,000 could be expended for the procurement of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Section 11 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $168,000 would be available for a study or investigation of national security, and procedure, of which amount not to exceed $4,000 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.

Section 12 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $428,000 would be available for a study or investigation of antitrust and monopoly, of which amount not to exceed $14,000 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.

Section 13 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $168,000 would be available for a study or investigation of national security, and procedure, of which amount not to exceed $428,000 would be available for the procurement of consultants or organizations thereof.

Section 14 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $300,000 would be available for a study or investigation of national security, and procedure, of which amount not to exceed $10,000 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.

Section 15 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $20,000 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.

Section 17 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $14,500 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.

Section 18 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $168,000 would be available for a study or investigation of internal security, and procedure, of which amount not to exceed $428,000 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.

Section 19 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $381,100 would be available for a study or investigation of national security, and procedure, of which amount not to exceed $168,000 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.

Section 20 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $300,000 would be available for a study or investigation of national security, and procedure, of which amount not to exceed $10,000 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.

Section 21 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $20,000 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.

Section 22 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $14,500 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.

Section 23 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $168,000 would be available for a study or investigation of national security, and procedure, of which amount not to exceed $428,000 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.

Section 24 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $20,000 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.

Section 25 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $14,500 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.

Section 26 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $168,000 would be available for a study or investigation of national security, and procedure, of which amount not to exceed $428,000 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.

Section 27 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $300,000 would be available for a study or investigation of national security, and procedure, of which amount not to exceed $10,000 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.

Section 28 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $20,000 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.

Section 29 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $14,500 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.

Section 30 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $168,000 would be available for a study or investigation of national security, and procedure, of which amount not to exceed $428,000 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.

Section 31 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $300,000 would be available for a study or investigation of national security, and procedure, of which amount not to exceed $10,000 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.

Section 32 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $20,000 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.

Section 33 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $14,500 could be expended for the procurement of consultants.
At the request of Chairman Eastland, the Committee on Rules and Administration has amended Senate Resolution 72 by deleting section 16 (providing funds for the Subcommittee on Revision and Codification), and, consequently, by redesignating sections 17, 18, 19, and 20 as sections 16, 17, and 19, respectively. (See letter dated Mar. 6, 1976, to Chairman Cannon from Chairman Eastland, which letter may be found on p. 4 of this report.) The Committee also is reporting the resolution with a technical amendment.

The Committee also has amended Senate Resolution 72 by reducing the total requested amounts from $4,931,400 to $4,677,700, a reduction of $383,700. The distribution of the reduction among the respective purposes is shown in the following tabulation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
<th>Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Administrative practice and procedure</td>
<td>$429,500</td>
<td>($6,900)</td>
<td>$422,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Antitrust and monopoly</td>
<td>815,100</td>
<td>-17,000</td>
<td>892,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Constitutional rights</td>
<td>121,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>121,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Criminal law and procedure</td>
<td>338,600</td>
<td>-17,300</td>
<td>321,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Immigration and naturalization</td>
<td>223,500</td>
<td>-6,200</td>
<td>217,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Improvements in judicial machinery</td>
<td>272,000</td>
<td>-12,300</td>
<td>259,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL
10 A.M. MONDAY, JULY 28, 1975

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today it stand in adjournment until the hour of 10 a.m. on Monday.

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

REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT FOR TRANS­
ACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS ON MONDAY OBJECTED TO

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, after the Members or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, there be a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business of not to exceed 10 minutes, with statements limited therein to 2 minutes each.

Mr. ALLEN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

DISAPPROVAL OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS ON THE ISLAND OF DIEGO GARCIA

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, the resolution Senate Resolution 160, disapproving construction projects on the island of Diego Garcia, be made the pending business.

Mr. TOWER. Reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, this bill is out of the Appropriations Committee, is that correct?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. The Armed Services Committee.

Mr. TOWER. The authorization bill out of Armed Services?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is a resolution of disapproval.

Mr. TOWER. The resolution of disapproval, right.

Have the appropriate Members on this side been contacted?

Mr. MANSFIELD. They have, the chairman of the committee and the ranking member have both been contacted, and also Mr. Culver, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Hart, and Mr. Mansfield, among others, have been notified.

Mr. TOWER. I do not object.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Besides, may I say it is the last day upon which the resolution of disapproval could be brought up?

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

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Was the request granted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, it was.

On whose time does the Senator suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. TOWER. I ask unanimous consent that the time be charged to neither side.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does the Senator contemplate proceeding with the bill? What does he have in mind with the quorum call?

Mr. TOWER. The Senator from Texas has in mind a little caucus of some of the people on this side, to determine what we should do next. We have to get our parliamentary sequence sorted out here.

Mr. President, it is not going to take long.

Mr. President, I withdraw my request for the quorum call, and yield to the Senator from West Virginia for a question.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I wanted to talk to the Senator privately. Will the Chair tolerate a private conversation for no longer than 30 seconds?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time for the quorum call to be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HOME MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1975

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (S. 1281) to improve public understanding of the role of depository institutions in home financing.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 160) disapproving construction projects on the island of Diego Garcia.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 160) disapproving construction projects on the island of Diego Garcia.

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

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

SENEGAL RESOLUTION 222—RESOLUTION CONGRATULATING THE APOLLO-SOYUZ SPACE PROJECT

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, now that both the American and Soviet space teams have safely returned to their homelands, I would like to comment on the Apollo-Soyuz test project.

From the early 1960's and the advent of space activity, international cooperation in space has been endorsed by both the United States and the Soviet Union. This mission is the culmination of years of negotiating, careful planning, and extensive testing.

In 1963, after the successful Glenn mission, Nikita Khrushchev sent a congratulatory telegram to the late President Kennedy, and initially expressed the desirability of cooperation in space. The Outer Space Treaty of 1967, signed by both the United States and the U.S.S.R., further guaranteed that "space exploration shall be carried out for the benefit of all humanity." Discussions from 1969
to 1971 between the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Soviet Academy of Sciences produced the agreement that the United States and the Soviet Union would each design a manned spacecraft with a compatible docking mechanism. The fabrication of such a standardized docking system was an essential first step in the process of international space exploration. These talks were formalized by the 1972 U.S.-U.S.S.R. Space Agreement which provided for the docking system and, more importantly, authorized this 1975.

The mere fact that such a mission could be designed and so successfully implemented is testimony of the level of cooperation which has been cultivated by both the United States and the Soviet Union. I believe the nature of this occasion warrants official action by the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution congratulating the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Soviet Academy of Sciences on an outstanding international effort.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a Senate resolution congratulating the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Soviet Academy of Sciences on the joint Apollo-Soyuz space project, and ask for its immediate consideration.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 222) to offer congratulations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Soviet Academy of Sciences on the joint Apollo-Soyuz Test Project.

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

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., Mr. President, I have no objection to the consideration of the resolution. That is the kind of détente of which I approve. I do not approve of a lot of agreements that have been made in the name of détente. But I do approve of this one. I think it was a very desirable maneuver, and I am glad to see both countries cooperate in this endeavor.

I commend the Senator from Pennsylvania on this resolution.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

I can take some pride in the resolution in that I have been told by persons in a position to know that I had something to do with the acceptance of the project in talks with certain officials with both countries in 1971.

The Handshake in Space

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, before the resolution is agreed to, I would like to make one statement at this point.

Whereas, the mere fact that such a project could be designed and so successfully implemented is testimony of the level of cooperation which has been cultivated by the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Whereas, it is our hope that both nations will continue to work together to assure that future space exploration shall be carried out for the benefit of all humanity; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That on behalf of the people of the United States of America, the Senate hereby expresses congratulations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Soviet Academy of Sciences on an outstanding international effort.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 223) declaring a vacancy in the office of United States Senator for the State of New Hampshire for the term beginning January 3, 1975, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I object to the consideration of this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The resolution will go over under the rules.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the senatorial election contest from the State of New Hampshire is so close that it appears impossible to determine the outcome with accuracy and certainty, and

Whereas the State of New Hampshire has been without its constitutional representation in the United States Senate for almost seven months, and

Whereas both contestants have been subject to large expense and great personal sacrifice while this matter has been before the Senate, and

Whereas the State of New Hampshire has a municipal primary election scheduled for October 7 and a special runoff election for that date to effect a savings in election expense, now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the contested seat in the United States Senate from the State of New Hampshire for the term commencing January 3, 1975, is hereby declared vacant as of September 25, 1975.

Sec. 2. That the contestants for the seat who have applied to the United States Senate for seating, John A. Durkin and Louis C. Wyman, shall each receive one half of the annual salary of a United States Senator from January 3, 1975, through the date of possession of this resolution, such salaries to be paid from the Contingent Fund of the United States Senate.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, if I could make one statement at this point.
Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, I sent a resolution to the desk asking that the Senate decide to send the contest between Messrs. Wyman and Durkin back to New Hampshire, and I have included in that resolution a payment to both of these contestants of the proportionate part of their salary up to the date of the adoption of the resolution.

Those of us who believe that the people of New Hampshire have a right to determine this matter for themselves in common with the general editorial and newspaper opinion of the country, so far as I am aware, are anxious that the Senate shall do something before it recesses for the month of August.

I do not want us to go home facing the charges that we have been unable to solve this and we are not willing to solve it by sending it back to New Hampshire.

I recognize the different differences of opinion but during the coming week I think it is only fair to say that from time to time I will repeat this statement so that the public may become fully aware that we believe this matter should be returned to the people of New Hampshire, and I intend to continue making the point until the recess arrives.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, on Monday the Senate will come in at 10 a.m.

After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order on Monday, the Senate will proceed under rules VII and VIII, and there could be rollcall votes during the morning hour. I think that Senators ought to be alerted to that fact. This would mean that there could be rollcall votes between the hours of 9 and 11.

The unfinished business on Monday will be Senate Resolution 160. There is a time limitation on that resolution, I believe, of 5 hours, with an additional 30 minutes to each of two Senators, which would make a total of 6 hours. I ask the Chair, am I correct?

Mr. PRICE (Mr. GARN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

I cannot outline at this time all of the measures that remain to be acted upon next week before the Senate goes out at the close of business on Friday, under the law, for the August recess, but among those that will be coming up next week are the following measures—necessarily in the order stated, nor do they constitute the entire list of measures which remain to be acted upon:

The mineral leasing bill, S. 391.
S. 2173, naval petroleum reserves.

At some point during next week, the Senate will resume its consideration of S. 1261, public understanding of depository institutions in home financing.
S. 963, diethylstilbestrol.
S. 521, the Outer Continental Shelf.
S. 1587, public works and EDA.
S. 506, ERDA authorization.
H.R. 8121, the State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill.

The HEW appropriation bill.
H.R. 2559, an act to amend title 39, United States Code, to apply to the U.S. Postal Service certain provisions of law providing for Federal agency safety programs and responsibilities and for other purposes.
S. 1466, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and revise the program of assistance for the control and prevention of communicable diseases.

By the way, I think I should state—I believe I am correct in this—that H.R. 2559, which I mentioned earlier, is a bill which, as I understand, contains an amendment which provides for the executive, judicial, and legislative branches to be included under the automatic cost-of-living pay increases. I think Senators ought to be on notice as to what is involved in that measure.

Now, to continue with my statement of certain measures that will likely be continued up next week, S. 1783, a bill to provide special pay and other improvements designed to enhance the recruitment and retention of physicians, dentists, nursing personnel, and other health care personnel.

Senate Resolution 145, the resolution to express the disapproval of the Senate of the President’s proposed amendment to the trade bills dealing with price controls on domestic crude oil, residual oil, and so forth.
S. 354, the no-fault insurance bill may come up.

And possibly H.R. 7710, an act to amend the tariff schedules to provide duty-free treatment to watches and so on.

Of course, there may also be other measures taken up which are not now on the calendar.

Conference reports, being privileged, may be called up at any time, and rollcall votes may occur then.

And the New Hampshire election dispute, of course, is a matter yet to be resolved.

That is a pretty full plate to chew on next week.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. MONDAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate—after 7 hours and 58 minutes of told today, five rollcall votes, an override of a Presidential veto, passage of two appropriation bills and several other bills and resolutions—stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. on Monday morning.

The motion was agreed to; and at 4:58 p.m., the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 28, 1975, at 10 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Saturday, July 26, 1975

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE 25173

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6674

Mr. PRICE (pursuant to an order of the House on July 25) filed the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 6674) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1976, and the period beginning July 1, 1976, and ending September 30, 1976, for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Select Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and of civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, and to authorize the military training student loads and for other purposes:
CONFERENCE REPORT (H. Rept. No. 94-413)
The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6674) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1976, and the period beginning July 1, 1976, and ending September 30, 1976, for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

AIRCRAFT
For aircraft: for the Army, $337,500,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $2,907,800,000; for the Air Force, $4,224,000,000, of which amount not to exceed $94,000,000 is authorized for the procurement of only long-range lead items for the B-1 bomber aircraft. None of the funds authorized by this Act may be obligated or expended for the purpose of entering into any production contract or any other contractual arrangement for production of the B-1 bomber aircraft; unless the production of such aircraft is hereafter authorized by law. The funds authorized in this Act for long-range lead items for the B-1 bomber aircraft do not constitute a production decision or a commitment on the part of Congress for the future production of such aircraft.

MISSILES
For missiles: for the Army, $313,000,000; for the Air Force, $620,000,000; for the Marine Corps, $52,900,000; for the Air Force, $1,765,000,000, of which $265,500,000 shall be used only for the procurement of Minuteman III missiles.