The Senate met at 9 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was ordered to adjourn. Mr. EASTLAND was a Senator from the State of Florida.

PRAYER
The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, ever near to all who call upon Thee, teach us how to pray not only in the reverent and solemn moment of public ceremony, but while we work and wait. May every day be a National Day of Prayer in this Chamber. Strengthen our weakness. Sharpen our thinking. Quiet our fretting. Keep us patient and kind amid little irritations, and major confrontations. For extra duties and prolonged sessions impart to us added grace and strength. And may we ever be guided by Him who is the Light of the World. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE
The PRESIDING OFFICER, the Assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:


To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. Richard B. Sorenson, a Senator from the State of Florida, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND, President pro tempore.

Mr. STONE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

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. 298 and concluding with Calendar No. 319.

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 319?

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 understand 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 committees.

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 "committees" and insert "Vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate."

The amendments were agreed to: Pro tempore, Mr. HANSEN. The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences shall not be required to vote a sum exceeding $500 in any one year for the expenses of individual consultants, or organizations thereof as authorized by section 202(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its rules of the Senate which have been adopted under rule 504(b) of the Rules of the Senate.

The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $37,000, 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.

The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, and shall be reimbursable, and the chair of the committee shall certify the vouchers for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at the rate of $1,000.

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 18, strike out "committee" and insert "committees" and insert "Vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate."

The amendments were agreed to: Pro tempore, Mr. HANSEN. The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry shall not be required to vote a sum exceeding $500 in any one year for the expenses of individual consultants, or organizations thereof as authorized by section 202(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended.

The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $37,000, 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.

The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, and shall be reimbursable, and the chair of the committee shall certify the vouchers for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at the rate of $1,000.
On page 2, in line 6, strike out "$250,000" and insert "$335,000".

On page 2, in line 17, strike out "committee" as a 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 jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, for the purposes stated and within the limitations imposed by the following sections, 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 of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use the services of personnel of any such department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate, but not later than February 29, 1975.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use 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.

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" as a 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 jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, for the purposes stated and within the limitations imposed by the following sections, 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 of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate, but not later than February 29, 1975.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, for the purposes stated and within the limitations imposed by the following sections, 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 of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

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

Sec. 7. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed in the aggregate $533,300, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman or committee.

THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 87) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban 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 10, strike out "$800,000" and insert "$762,300".

On page 2, in line 12, strike out "$415,000" and insert "$838,500".

On page 2, in line 6, strike out "$140,000" and insert "$140,000".

On page 3, beginning with line 12, strike out:

Sec. 6. Not to exceed $90,000 shall be available for oversight activities pertaining to all matters over which the committee has jurisdiction under rule XXX 1(e).

On page 3, in line 16, strike out "" and insert "6".

On page 3, in line 20, strike out "November 29, 1975" and insert "February 29, 1976".

On page 3, in line 21, strike out "$" and insert "$7".

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 jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, for the purposes stated and within the limitations imposed by the following sections, 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 of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, for the purposes stated and within the limitations imposed by the following sections, 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 of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate, but not later than February 29, 1975.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, for the purposes stated and within the limitations imposed by the following sections, 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 of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate, but not later than February 29, 1975.

Sec. 7. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed in the aggregate $533,300, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 87) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban 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 6, strike out "$800,000" and insert "$762,300".

On page 2, in line 12, strike out "$415,000" and insert "$838,500".

On page 2, in line 6, strike out "$140,000" and insert "$140,000".

On page 3, beginning with line 12, strike out:

Sec. 6. Not to exceed $90,000 shall be available for oversight activities pertaining to all matters over which the committee has jurisdiction under rule XXX 1(e).

On page 3, in line 16, strike out "" and insert "6".

On page 3, in line 20, strike out "February 29, 1976" and insert "February 29, 1976".

On page 3, in line 21, strike out "$" and insert "$7".

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 jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, for the purposes stated and within the limitations imposed by the following sections, 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 of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate, but not later than February 29, 1975.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use the services of personnel of any such department or agency.
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 signed 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, in line 1, strike out "$1,892,000" and insert "$2,681,400".

On page 2, in line 7, strike out "$135,500" and insert "$188,500".

On page 9, in 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".

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 the Budget, 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 a non-disbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $1,892,000, 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 Government Operations under this resolution shall not exceed $357,500, of which amount not to exceed $375,000 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).

(b) Expenses of the Committee on Government Operations under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed 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 amendments were agreed to. The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to. The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, reads as follows:

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, in line 4, strike out "chairman of the".

On page 9, in line 5, strike out "Commerce, acting jointly with the ranking minority members of both committees," and insert "Commerce".

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

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

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

On page 10, in line 6, strike out "July 1, 1976," and insert "February 29, 1976".

On page 10, beginning with line 6, 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 preamble was agreed to.

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, in overlapping regulatory jurisdictions, conflicting mandates, and procedures that have hampered the efficient and effective operation of the Government and the economy.

Whereas to consider certain reforms in Federal and State regulatory practices, 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 instrumentalities in the Federal and State governments with substantial economic, health, or safety regulatory authority, activities with which affects 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. (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 decline of competition, regulation as opposed to nonregulated industries, and productivity factors affected by regulation,

(4) the continued appropriateness or applicability of original regulatory purposes and objectives as mandated by statute, 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 priority, including the need for any new legislation which may be needed for or for restructuring of the Federal antitrust effort,

(7) specific recommendations for legislative or regulatory actions to improve the effectiveness, efficiency, and responsiveness to the public of Federal regulatory actions, including but not limited to the following:

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

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

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

(D) elimination, transfer, or separation

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.
out of the subsidy-granting or other forms of indirect economic or social purpose, or the activities performed by 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, but not limited to, an evaluation of proposals—

(A) encouraging the enumeration of broad policies for regulatory activities so as to develop impliedly through a series of regulations or adjudications involving 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;

(C) eliminating collegial commissions altogether or selectively, and replacing the commission system by administrative agencies;

(D) revising procedures for selecting commissioners and reviewing their qualifications, including the designation or establishment of a distinguished Board of Regulatory Review to provide its recommendations or guidance, instead of continuing to permit nuclear agencies to establish a time certain within which they would expire unless Congress specifically reviews their mandates by legislative enactment;

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

b) The study shall also consist of findings, conclusions, and recommendations concerning 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, on the absence of misdirection thereof, have an important inflationary impact.

c) As used herein, the term "Federal regulatory agency" includes any existing independent Federal agency which, as a matter of its principal responsibilities, exercises regulatory functions affecting one or more segments of American Industry, as well as an agency or governmental unit within an agency or department of the Federal Government which exercises such regulatory functions as one of its principal activities.

d) In carrying out their responsibilities under this section, the committees shall utilize, wherever appropriate, all existing studies, investigations, reports, and other existing material relevant to their responsibilities.

Scc. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the Committee on Government Operations and the Committee on Commerce shall be authorized to conduct investigations, hearings, and conferences, and to make recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the extent permitted by the rules of both Committees, to carry out the provisos of the laws administered by them:

(4) revising procedures for selecting and appointment of Federal regulatory agency officials so as to limit the movement of persons from a regulated industry or from a related industry to the agency which regulates that industry, and the movement of persons from the agency back to the regulated industry;

(6) providing for more effective means of ensuring that the evidentiary activities performed by the regulatory agencies and their specific or general impact on the public interest in matters of particular importance or impact;

(7) recommendations for assuring an ongoing review and assessment of the economic costs and benefits and the deficiencies of Federal regulatory activities, including proposals for limiting the growth of bureaucratic, regulatory agency actions by establishing a time certain within which they would expire unless Congress specifically reviews their mandates by legislative enactment;

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

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 30) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on the District of Columbia for investigations and studies, 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 "$180,000".

On page 2, in line 16, 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."

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 jurisdiction under section 202(d) of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any committee 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 at the earliest practicable date, (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.

The 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 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 studies, 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 "$180,000".

On page 2, in line 16, 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."

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 jurisdiction under section 202(d) of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any committee 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 at the earliest practicable date, (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.

The 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 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 studies, 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 "$180,000".

On page 2, in line 16, 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."

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 jurisdiction under section 202(d) of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any committee 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 at the earliest practicable date, (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.

The 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 FOREIGN RELATIONS

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

On page 9, in line 16, strike out "$990,000" and insert "$181,000", 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)."

On page 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 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, to expend not to exceed $1,083,300, of which amount not to exceed $60,000 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. 2. The Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, to expend not to exceed $1,083,300, of which amount not to exceed $60,000 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. 3. The Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, to expend not to exceed $390,000, which amount not to exceed $25,000 may be expended for the procurement of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, and (2) to employ personnel. Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $181,000, 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).

Sec. 5. Not to exceed $25,000 may be expended for a study or investigation of multinational corporations and their effect on United States foreign policy, of which amount not to exceed $20,000 may be expended for the procurement of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Sec. 6. Not to exceed $1,083,300 shall be available for a study or investigation of foreign assistance and economic policy, of which amount not to exceed $60,000 may be expended for the procurement of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Sec. 7. The committee shall report its findings, 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. 8. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed in the aggregate $1,083,300, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

And insert in lieu thereof:

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $1,083,300, of which amount not to exceed $60,000 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).

Res. 49) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Governmental Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, for the purposes stated and within the limitations imposed by the following sections, 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 reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

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 Governmental Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, to expend not to exceed $2,308,000, for the purposes stated and within the limitations imposed by the following sections, 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 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 Governmental Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, for the purposes stated and within the limitations imposed by the following sections, 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 reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.
corrupting influences in violation of the law of the United States or the laws of any State, and further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activities have infiltrated into lawful business enterprise; and to study the adequacy of Federal regulations, policies, procedures, and practices governing the preparation of reports and the publication of the same; and the commission of crimes in connection therewith, the immediate and long-standing causes, the extent and effects of such occurrences and crimes, and measures to prevent their recurrence and for the rapid resolution of national security problems; 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 foreign and governmental activities, and the extent to which: (A) information affecting the policies, procedures, and practices dealing with or affecting that particular branch of the Government; (B) the collection and dissemination of accurate statistics on fuel demand and supply; (C) the appropriate file of energy programs with State and local governments; (D) control of exports of scarce fuels; (E) the allocation of fuels in short supply and the pricing of energy in the United States; (F) energy conservation measures; (G) the Nation’s petroleum industry as a strong competitive force; (H) the allocation of fuels in short supply and the pricing of energy in the United States; (I) the management of energy supplies owned or controlled by the Government; (J) relations with oil producing countries and consuming countries; (K) the monitoring of compliance by governmental agencies with the laws and regulations governing the allocation, conservation, or pricing of energy supplies; and (L) research into the discovery and development of alternative energy supplies.

6. Not to exceed $238,468 shall be available for a study or investigation of the adequacy, economy, and efficiency of operations of the Federal Government with respect to:

(A) the accounting, financial reporting, and auditing of government obligations and expenditures; (B) the oversight of Federal agency and program performance and effectiveness; (C) the development and effectiveness of fiscal, budgetary, and program information systems and controls; and (D) the development and improvement of management capability and efficiency.

7. Not to exceed $222,850 shall be available for study or investigation of the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Federal Government with respect to:

(A) the preparation and submission of Federal regulatory agency budgets to Congress; and (B) data collection and dissemination by Federal regulatory agencies; and (C) review and evaluation of procedures and legislation with respect to Federal advisory committees, Federal reports, questionnaires, interrogatories; of which amount not to exceed $15,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Sec. 5. Not to exceed $383,144 shall be available for a study or investigation of the efficiency, economy, and effectiveness of all branches of the Government with respect to:

(A) the preparation and submission of Federal regulatory agency budgets to Congress; and (B) data collection and dissemination by Federal regulatory agencies; and (C) review and evaluation of procedures and legislation with respect to Federal advisory committees, Federal reports, questionnaires, interrogatories; of which amount not to exceed $15,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Sec. 6. Not to exceed $238,468 shall be available for a study or investigation of the efficiency, economy, and effectiveness of all branches of the Government with respect to:

(A) the accounting, financial reporting, and auditing of government obligations and expenditures; (B) the oversight of Federal agency and program performance and effectiveness; (C) the development and effectiveness of fiscal, budgetary, and program information systems and controls; and (D) the development and improvement of management capability and efficiency.

8. Not to exceed $222,850 shall be available for study or investigation of the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Federal Government with respect to:

(A) the preparation and submission of Federal regulatory agency budgets to Congress; and (B) data collection and dissemination by Federal regulatory agencies; and (C) review and evaluation of procedures and legislation with respect to Federal advisory committees, Federal reports, questionnaires, interrogatories; of which amount not to exceed $15,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Sec. 5. Not to exceed $383,144 shall be available for a study or investigation of the efficiency, economy, and effectiveness of all branches of the Government with respect to:

(A) the preparation and submission of Federal regulatory agency budgets to Congress; and (B) data collection and dissemination by Federal regulatory agencies; and (C) review and evaluation of procedures and legislation with respect to Federal advisory committees, Federal reports, questionnaires, interrogatories; of which amount not to exceed $15,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Sec. 6. Not to exceed $238,468 shall be available for a study or investigation of the efficiency, economy, and effectiveness of all branches of the Government with respect to:

(A) the preparation and submission of Federal regulatory agency budgets to Congress; and (B) data collection and dissemination by Federal regulatory agencies; and (C) review and evaluation of procedures and legislation with respect to Federal advisory committees, Federal reports, questionnaires, interrogatories; of which amount not to exceed $15,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants or organizations thereof.
the study of national fuels and energy policy authorized pursuant to S. Res. 45, agreed to on May 3, 1971, to precede 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 May 3, 1971, the chairman and ranking minority member of each committee designated by Sections 26, 1975

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:

Page 2, in line 11, strike out "$817,000" and insert "$624,900".

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

Page 2, beginning with line 16, insert:

Sec. 5. (a) The committee shall continue

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 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXXVIII 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 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 concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis any services rendered by such department or agency, (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 personnel 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 less than $624,900 shall be available for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof, as authorized by section 26, 1975.
ent with achieving other national goals, including the high priorities—national security and environmental protection; and

(i) a full and complete investigation and study of the existing and prospective governmental, military, industrial, and energy industries with the view of determining what, if any, changes and implementation of these policies and laws are necessary to be advised to the Senate by the committee, and to provide effective and reasonable national policy to assure reliable and efficient sources of energy and fuel and energy related production, distribution, transportation, and utilization; as well as to worldwide trends in consumption and supply;

(ii) indicated national requirements for the utilization of these resources for energy production and other purposes, both to meet short-term needs and to provide for future demand in 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, transportation, and utilization, and their impact upon conservation, environmental, and ecological factors, and vice versa;

(v) the need for continued economic and competitive conditions in industry, particularly as taxes and other government policies affect small business enterprises engaged in the production, processing, and distribution of energy and fuels;

(vi) 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 upon other government objectives, goals, and programs; and

(vii) 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 might be necessary to integrate existing laws into an effective long-term fuels and energy program.

In the course of 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 members of said committees designated by such chairman and ranking minority members to serve in their places, and the ranking majority and minority Senators on the Committee on Atomic Energy, or Senate members of such committee designated by such ranking majority and minority members to serve in their places, 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. 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:

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $235,000. Said the committee may make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate 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 Civil Service Retirement Act of 1940, 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 $235,000. Said the committee may make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate 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 "$848,000".

On page 3, in line 18, 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 investigating organizations and authorities, as provided 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 $848,600, 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. 53) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for the staff of the Select Committee on Aging, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

On page 2, in line 7, strike out "$304,000" and insert "$249,300".

On page 2, in line 18, strike out "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 the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by S. Res. 58, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, as amended and supplemented, is authorized to examine, investigate, and study 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, (4) to procure the temporary services (not in excess of one year) to intermittent services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof, in the same manner and under the same conditions as any such standing committee may provide that assistance under section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, (5) to provide assistance to the professional staff of such committee.

Sec. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $321,700, of which amount not to exceed $10,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof, and (2) $263,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee.

Sec. 4. 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. 5. 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. 54), continuing and authorizing additional expenditures by the Select Committee on Nutrition and Special Needs was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

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

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 62) continuing and authorizing additional expenditures by the Special Committee on Aging, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

On page 1, in line 4, strike out "February 6, 1976" and insert "February 29, 1976".

On page 3, in line 15, strike out "$561,600" and insert "$485,100".

On page 4, in 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 amendment were agreed to.

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

Resolved, That the Special Committee on Aging, established by S. Res. 33, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to on February 13, 1961, as amended and supplemented, is hereby extended through February 29, 1976.

Sec. 1. The Committee shall not have power to report by bill, or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

Sec. 2. 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 witnesses or other attendance of witnesses and the production of correspondence, books, papers, and documents, (5) to administer oaths, (6) to take testimony orally or by deposition, (7) to employ personnel, (8) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel, information, and equipment of the Government department or agency, and (9) to procure the temporary services (not in excess of one year) or intermittent services of individuals, organizations or agencies thereof, in the same manner and under the same condition as a staggering condition of the Senate may require such services under section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The number shall be available for the procurement of the services of individual consultants or organizations thereof, in accordance with the procedures, except as provided in section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and (8) 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 departments, for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL EMERGENCIES AND DELEGATED EMERGENCY POWERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 10) continuing and authorizing additional expenditures by the special Committee on National Emergencies and Delegated Emergency Powers, which had been reported from the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

On page 2, in line 18, strike out "February 28, 1970" and insert in lieu thereof "February 29, 1976"

On page 2, in line 20, strike out "$151,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$120,000"

On page 2, in line 22, strike out "$23,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000"

On page 3, in line 7, strike out "two co-chairmen" and insert in lieu thereof "co-chairmen"

On page 3, in line 8, 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 the Special Committee on National Emergencies and Delegated Emergency Powers, established by Senate Resolution 9, Ninety-third Congress, agreed to January 6, 1973, as continued and supplemented by Senate Resolution 242, Ninety-third Congress, agreed to March 1, 1974, is continued and supplemented by

Sec. 2. In carrying out such function, the special committee is authorized from February 28, 1975, to February 29, 1976, not later than February 29, 1976, instead of February 28, 1975, to take and hold hearings, or to call persons to testify or to be examined or to depose or to make statements or to be examined in writing.

Sec. 3. For the period from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, the expenses of the special committee under this resolution shall not exceed $125,000, of which amount not to exceed $5,000 shall be authorized to cover expenses of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Sec. 4. The committee shall make the final report required by section 5 of that Senate Resolution 9, Ninety-third Congress, and modified by Senate Resolution 242, Ninety-third Congress, not later than February 29, 1976, instead of February 28, 1975.

Sec. 5. Expenses of the special committee under this resolution, including contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the special committee and the co-chairmen of the Senate, shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

TURKEY—UNITED STATES AND NATO RELATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am somewhat concerned at the action taken in the other body 2 days ago on the matter of the sale of arms to Turkey. It is not a matter of the legitimacy of the action taken based on the law as it applies, because in that respect, they are absolutely correct. But it is a matter of the strength of NATO and the relationship of NATO to the United States. I have been one of those who have consistently sought and will in the future seek to bring about a decided reduction in the number of deployed American troops and military personnel in Europe, that personnel plus dependents, numbers well over 500,000 at the present time, and if NATO is to have credibility it must be able to maintain that money to pay for those arms; a more active participation in the affairs of the Middle East; a holdback of a settlement to which the United States is committed in that country which, in my opinion, has tended to further weaken the southeastern flank of NATO.

There are questions to ponder because as long as the present situation exists there will be no give on Cyprus. As far as the Greek Government is concerned, with Karamanlis, the premier, and one of the outstanding statesmen in Europe, being buffeted from the right and from the left, and with the Cyprus question in his backyard all the time, his position may well become weakened.

So I reiterate, as I have on other occasions, the extreme significance of the situation which affects Turkish-United States and perhaps, Turkish-NATO relations. The front line of the Soviet Union; the need for arms, where will they get them, and where will they get the money to pay for those arms; a more active participation in the affairs of the Middle East; a holdback of a settlement on Cyprus and, possibly, in the long run because of Cyprus, a weakening of the present Greek Government which, I think, ought to be given all the support it needs. It has at long last—after the overthrow of the colonels' clique, which started the whole thing—they have a government which is democratic. They
have a leader in the person of Premier Karamanlis who 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 reconciliation of these issues before some degree of stability can be maintained in the Aegean and in Southeast Europe, and so that these possibilities which I mentioned will not be lost to pass.

Mr. GRANTFORD. Mr. President, I wish to commend our distinguished majority leader for his statesmanlike remarks he has just delivered, demonstrating once more that he is not only an effective leader of our country, but also has the ability to do that in reference, this morning, to Greek and Turkish relations, but also the fact that he has demonstrated his ability to be a conservator of words. He gets to the point, makes it quickly and eloquently, and that is that. Let my comments and commendation extend beyond the length of his analysis of a very complex issue, I simply congratulate him and express my personal appreciation for his erudite and most practical understanding of this complex problem.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hatfield, one of his secretaries.

RESCISSIONS AND DEFERRALS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. Brown) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States proposing five rescissions and reporting 23 new deferrals of budget authority available for obligation in fiscal year 1976, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, Budget, Agriculture and Forestry, Interior and Insular Affairs, Labor and Public Welfare, Public Works, Government Operations, Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, and Commerce, jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975. The message is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith propose five rescissions and report 23 new deferrals of budget authority available for obligation in fiscal year 1976. The rescissions total $0.2 million and the new deferrals total $541.8 million. In addition, I am reporting an increase of $1.0 million in deferrals previously transmitted.

Rescissions of budget authority are proposed for programs in the Community Services Administration and the Department of Agriculture, and because program objectives can be met with lesser amounts than have been made available.
The majority of the new deferrals I am reporting—14 of 23—defer the obligation of Federal funds provided by the continuing resolution for 1976 (Public Law 94-41). I have proposed that several ongoing programs be reduced, terminated, 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
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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 Columbia 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 DECONTROL OF PRICE 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.

STRIPER 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, the filing of an application for a loan of $920,000 from the Wenatchee Heights Reclamation District, Chelan County, Wash., (with accompanying papers); 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, reports 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 Federal 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. Stacy) restoration of the West Coast waterfront; (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Government Operations.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1976—CONFERENCE REPORT—(REPT. NO. 94-334)
Mr. STENNIS submitted a report from 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 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 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 R. Baldwin, of New York, Vice Irving Kristol, resigned.
Virginia Bauer Duncan, of California, Vice Thomas C. Bresson, resigned.
For the remainder of a term expiring March 26, 1978: Amos H. Rossetter, Jr., of Massachusetts, Vice Theodore W. Braun, resigned.

For a term expiring March 26, 1980: Lucius Perry Gregg, Jr., of Illinois, Vice James B. Kilian, Jr., term expired.
Lillie 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 Olympics 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 competition, which attract visitors 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 conduct the Olympics for the athletes—to provide the finest in competition at the highest international level. Moreover, their commitment to the eco-
The Olympic bobrun, owned by the State of New York, has been in operation for over a year. It is considered to be one of the finest in the world. The bobrun 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 the 1973 world championship. 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 International Skiing Union World Cup events in 1969 and 1970. The only additions required for 1980 would be limited trail improvements, a biathlon range, and lodge expansion.

Alpine skiing

Whiteface Mountain ski area, area 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 two miles of snow making equipment, and several parking lots. The present trails have FIS approval for international alpine competition. Whiteface has frequently been the site of major international alpine events, including the 1971 pre-FISU races, the 1972 world university alpine events, the 1974 Canadian-American slalom and giant slalom alpine races and the U.S. national downhill races.

Ski jump

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 two potential sites for future development: a new 90-meter jump at the adjacent airport and horseshow stadium, all of which are owned and operated by the town of North Elba. The 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 construction for the 1980 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, for each winter for recreational and speed skating competitions. The stadium would require refrigeration of the 400-meter track and temporary spectator bleachers for the 1980 Olympics. A refrigerated 400-meter oval would result in a new modernized track surface for track and field competitions, and assure future ideal speed skating events and recreational skating.

Figure skating, hockey

There are two ice sheets in the present Olympic area that are technically adequate for both figure skating and hockey competitions. Expanded seating capacity for spectators should be provided at the existing Olympic arena without damage to 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 existing Olympic arena or a new site, with very little additional damage to the existing Olympic structure, change in the character of the community or adverse ecological impact. The Olympic arena is located within easy walking distance of 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 meetings and in the housing 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 links 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 faced 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 the units from existing privately owned commercial establishments.

A second alternative would be to establish a small college dormitory on one of several available locations in the area. This would involve the construction of dormitory facilities, cafeteria and fieldhouse stadium that could be used as an Olympic campus and for college purposes following the Olympic Winter Games.
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 Montgomery—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 biatlon 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, financing, and the operation of the necessary facilities and equipment.

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

The commitment must not be delayed. It is in the interest of the United States. It will provide the entire Nation with the sense of pride that comes from witnessing an exciting event of vision and potential. The United States is known to the world—its achievements in the fields of music, art, and science are known to the world—as being a great sporting nation. The Winter Olympics, held in Lake Placid, will enhance for future generations the quality of our winter athletic facilities.

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 Winter Olympics 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 discipline, the Olympic Games may be considered the same today as they were in 1924.

The financing of a modern Winter Olympics must begin this year if the successful fulfillment of the games is to provide the entire Nation with the support and assistance, particularly since the construction of the games themselves.

The total cost for the construction of all necessary facilities was approximately $100 million. In 1964, the total cost was approximately $20 million. The low cost of the Olympic facilities is mainly due to the fact that they were built in the existing facilities.

The Olympic facilities required, related public projects, and “related public projects” were approximately $50 million. In 1968, the total cost was approximately $150 million.

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

By Mr. MONToya; 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. That is the road to disaster.

If we had intentionally set out to disrupt economic recovery, we could not 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 United States at any time 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 congressional majorities 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; second, 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. My 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 ensure that the Federal Energy Administration will be able to provide only arable wells and from unitized properties as new 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 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 exploration, drilling, 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. Deduction of 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 over the last 2 years. As a result, 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.

An immediate increase of $1.50 in the price of old oil would immediately increase our domestic oil production. By tying the increase in the price of old oil to reflect a $1.50 increase in the last 2 years of inflation, we provide a一笔compromise between the President's higher prices for increased domestic production and the Congress' desire to keep prices low.

The ceiling price of $9 falls approximately midway between the controlled price and the current market price of $13 per barrel. In this sense it is a compromise. In the sense that it is a moderate increase which will turn out to be a workable compromise. The price freeze on new oil is essentially that we are to reduce the influence of OPEC on our price. 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 OPEC prices.

The fear of $16 per barrel of old 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 not justified by any 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 will not be competitive with OPEC oil.

Any oil produced from properties unitized for the purpose of pressure maintenance or on which secondary or tertiary recovery processes are used would be considered as old oil. Also, the oil produced by these processes comes from already existing wells but it is also true that it is produced only by using expensive techniques. In order to increase the yield of oil they have been forced to cap wells or use water or gas injection. This oil is, therefore, produced at an expensive price which necessitates it being considered new oil. If we are to provide the Nation with the oil it needs in order to limit the OPEC's influence on our economy we must secure maximum production from this type of well. By allowing these wells the classification of new oil we will assure our independence from OPEC. Thus, by compromising in the definition of new and old oil we 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.

By Mr. FONG (by request): S. 2186. A bill to ban the importation, manufacture, sale, and transfer of firearms, and to authorize certain measures 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. The bill is a compromise between the President's request for phasing over a 39 month period and the majority position that a phased increase still would be too great a burden.

The ceiling price of $9 falls approximately midway between the controlled price and the current market price of $13 per barrel. In this sense it is a compromise. In the sense that it is a moderate increase which will turn out to be a workable compromise. The price freeze on new oil is essentially that we are to reduce the influence of OPEC on our price. 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 OPEC prices.

The fear of $16 per barrel of old 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 not justified by any 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 will not be competitive with OPEC oil.

Any oil produced from properties unitized for the purpose of pressure maintenance or on which secondary or tertiary recovery processes are used would be considered as old oil. Also, the oil produced by these processes comes from already existing wells but it is also true that it is produced only by using expensive techniques. In order to increase the yield of oil they have been forced to cap wells or use water or gas injection. This oil is, therefore, produced at an expensive price which necessitates it being considered new oil. If we are to provide the Nation with the oil it needs in order to limit the OPEC's influence on our economy we must secure maximum production from this type of well. By allowing these wells the classification of new oil we will assure our independence from OPEC. Thus, by compromising in the definition of new and old oil we 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.

By Mr. FONG (by request): S. 2186. A bill to ban the importation, manufacture, sale, and transfer of firearms, and to authorize certain measures 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. The bill is a compromise between the President's request for phasing over a 39 month period and the majority position that a phased increase still would be too great a burden.

The ceiling price of $9 falls approximately midway between the controlled price and the current market price of $13 per barrel. In this sense it is a compromise. In the sense that it is a moderate increase which will turn out to be a workable compromise. The price freeze on new oil is essentially that we are to reduce the influence of OPEC on our price. 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 OPEC prices.

The fear of $16 per barrel of old 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 not justified by any 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 will not be competitive with OPEC oil.

Any oil produced from properties unitized for the purpose of pressure maintenance or on which secondary or tertiary recovery processes are used would be considered as old oil. Also, the oil produced by these processes comes from already existing wells but it is also true that it is produced only by using expensive techniques. In order to increase the yield of oil they have been forced to cap wells or use water or gas injection. This oil is, therefore, produced at an expensive price which necessitates it being considered new oil. If we are to provide the Nation with the oil it needs in order to limit the OPEC's influence on our economy we must secure maximum production from this type of well. By allowing these wells the classification of new oil we will assure our independence from OPEC. Thus, by compromising in the definition of new and old oil we 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.

By Mr. FONG (by request): S. 2186. A bill to ban the importation, manufacture, sale, and transfer of firearms, and to authorize certain measures 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. The bill is a compromise between the President's request for phasing over a 39 month period and the majority position that a phased increase still would be too great a burden.

The ceiling price of $9 falls approximately midway between the controlled price and the current market price of $13 per barrel. In this sense it is a compromise. In the sense that it is a moderate increase which will turn out to be a workable compromise. The price freeze on new oil is essentially that we are to reduce the influence of OPEC on our price. 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 OPEC prices.

The fear of $16 per barrel of old 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 not justified by any 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 will not be competitive with OPEC oil.

Any oil produced from properties unitized for the purpose of pressure maintenance or on which secondary or tertiary recovery processes are used would be considered as old oil. Also, the oil produced by these processes comes from already existing wells but it is also true that it is produced only by using expensive techniques. In order to increase the yield of oil they have been forced to cap wells or use water or gas injection. This oil is, therefore, produced at an expensive price which necessitates it being considered new oil. If we are to provide the Nation with the oil it needs in order to limit the OPEC's influence on our economy we must secure maximum production from this type of well. By allowing these wells the classification of new oil we will assure our independence from OPEC. Thus, by compromising in the definition of new and old oil we 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.
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 as bazookas and mortars—machineguns—strictly prohibited. Unless, with the prior approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, this good as it would prevent multiple sales to persons who then redistribute the handguns illegally.

Additionally, the Secretary of the Treasury is given additional authority to deny a license unless the person meets the age and criminal record requirements and has 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, that 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 violation of the provisions 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 the offense 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 aimed at making America a safer place in which to live.

At the request of the Administration, I am introducing an amendment to Sec. 1, 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.

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 criminal misuse of these handguns is a significant factor in the prevalence of lawlessness and violent crime in the United States, and is constantly subverting the integrity of the Nation’s law enforcement problems;
(b) that the existing ban on importation of certain handguns and firearm parts constitutes a major shortcoming in existing law, in that it does not restrict the importation of parts and the domestic assembly and manufacture of the weapons the Congress banned from importation; and
(c) that the absence of effective controls on domestic manufacture and sale of small, easily concealable handguns known as Saturday Night Specials constitutes a major threat to the safety of our streets and cities.

I am also introducing an amendment to the Severe Criminal Justice Reform Act where firearms are used would, in my opinion, hopefully deter the use of such firearms.

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 receipt or possession of firearms prohibited by federal law from such receipt or possession constitutes:
(1) a burden on commerce within and among the States; and
(2) a threat to the domestic tranquility; and
(b) that a person obtaining a federal license to import, manufacture, or distribute firearms or ammunition therein shall be required to keep the records prescribed by Federal law and shall provide the material therein shall be printed in the Domestic Assembly Official Gazette or in such other manner as the Secretary of the Treasury shall specify.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, as amended, be passed without delay. If the House agrees to the Senate amendment, it is my intention to move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions that it be reported with the amendment which I am introducing.

Furthermore, it would make it unlawful to sell or transfer an unapproved handgun by an individual, chief law enforcement officer, or any other person, if he knows that the handgun model has not been approved. This is good as it would prohibit Saturday night special transfers.

Reservation or transfers of handguns must be in accordance with Federal and State law and any applicable published ordinances. However, this is not applicable to transactions between licensed importers, licensed manufacturers, licensed dealers, and licensed collectors. See Sec. 922(f) of the Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1968. This also authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to prohibit the importation of firearms known as Saturday Night Specials, machineguns, and short-barreled guns and rifles into the United States.

The further finds and declares:

(a) that the receipt or possession of firearms prohibited by federal law from such receipt or possession constitutes:
(1) a burden on commerce within and among the States; and
(2) a threat to the domestic tranquility; and
(b) that a person obtaining a federal license to import, manufacture, or distribute firearms or ammunition therein shall be required to keep the records prescribed by Federal law and shall provide the material therein shall be printed in the Domestic Assembly Official Gazette or in such other manner as the Secretary of the Treasury shall specify.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, as amended, be passed without delay. If the House agrees to the Senate amendment, it is my intention to move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions that it be reported with the amendment which I am introducing.

Furthermore, it would make it unlawful to sell or transfer an unapproved handgun by an individual, chief law enforcement officer, or any other person, if he knows that the handgun model has not been approved. This is good as it would prohibit Saturday night special transfers.

Reservation or transfers of handguns must be in accordance with Federal and State law and any applicable published ordinances. However, this is not applicable to transactions between licensed importers, licensed manufacturers, licensed dealers, and licensed collectors. See Sec. 922(f) of the Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1968. This also authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to prohibit the importation of firearms known as Saturday Night Specials, machineguns, and short-barreled guns and rifles into the United States.
(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:

(d) (1) The Secretary may revoke a license or permit upon allegations of the Secretary that a person holding the license or permit is ineligible to acquire explosive materials under section 922(d).

(2) A person who has a license or permit issued under this section and who violates a provision of this section or a rule or regulation prescribed by the Secretary under this chapter shall be subject to a civil penalty, to be imposed by the Secretary, of up to $10,000 for each violation, or to suspension or revocation of his license or permit, or to both the civil penalty and revocation or suspension for a period not to exceed ninety days.

(15) The term "handgun" means a firearm which has a short stock and which is designed or manufactured for the use of single hand.

(16) The term "pistol" means a handgun having a chamber or chambers as an integral part or parts of, or permanently aligned with, the bore of a model which has not been approved by the Secretary under section 923(k).

(17) The term "revolver" means a handgun having a breechlocking chambered cylinder so arranged that the cocking of the hammer or movement of the trigger rotates the cylinder to bring the next cartridge in line with the barrel for firing.

Sec. 6. Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended:

(a) by adding after the words "replacement firearm" in subsection (a) the words ", other than a handgun of a model which has not been approved by the Secretary under section 923(k),";

(b) by adding after the words "mailing a firearm" in subsection (a) (2) (A) the words ", other than a handgun of a model which has not been approved by the Secretary under section 923(k),";

(c) by deleting "resides in any State other than this State," in subsection (a) (3) inserting in lieu thereof "does not reside in the States,";

(d) by adding after the words "rental of a firearm" in subsection (a) (5) the words ", other than a handgun of a model which has not been approved by the Secretary under section 923(k),";

(e) by adding after the words "loan or rental of a firearm" in subsection (b) (3) (B) the words ", other than a handgun of a model which has not been approved by the Secretary under section 923(k),";

(f) by adding after the words "may sell a firearm" in subsection (c) the words ", other than a handgun of a model which has not been approved by the Secretary under section 923(k),";

(g) by deleting ", in the case of any firearm other than a shotgun or a rifle, I am not going to be in a position, only if:

(1) the transferee resides in a State other than this State, or
(2) he provides identification to a law enforcement officer of the place of the transferee's residence or other place where the handgun will be kept, and that he does not intend to resell or transfer the handgun to a person who will not reside in this State, or
(3) the transferee is a licensed dealer, and, in order to assure that purchase and possession of the handgun by the transferee would be in accordance with Federal law and with State law or any published ordinance applicable at the place of sale, delivery, or other disposition, only if:

(g) by deleting "(11) The term 'dealer' means any person who is engaged in the business of selling firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail," and inserting in lieu thereof "(11) The term 'dealer' means any person who is engaged in the business of selling firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail, or who is a manufacturer of destructive devices, or who is engaged in business as a firearms dealer, or who is a pawnbroker."

(12) The term 'ammunition retailer' means any person who is not otherwise a dealer who is engaged in the business of selling ammunition at retail, other than ammunition for destructive devices.

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

(14) The term 'firearms dealer' means any person who is engaged in the business of selling firearms or ammunition at wholesale or retail.

(15) The term 'handgun' means a firearm which has a short stock and which is designed or manufactured for the use of single hand.

(16) The term 'pistol' means a handgun having a chamber or chambers as an integral part or parts of, or permanently aligned with, the bore of a model which has not been approved by the Secretary under section 923(k).

(17) The term 'revolver' means a handgun having a breechlocking chambered cylinder so arranged that the cocking of the hammer or movement of the trigger rotates the cylinder to bring the next cartridge in line with the barrel for firing.

Sec. 7. This Act shall be effective on approval by the President."
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Senator Jerman of Oklahoma asks the Secretary of the Treasury to report on the results of such checks, determination, and questionnaire.

(4) the transferor has received a return receipt evidencing delivery of the statement or request; and

(5) the transferee is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(6) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(7) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(8) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(9) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(10) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(11) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(12) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(13) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(14) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(15) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(16) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(17) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(18) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(19) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(20) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(21) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(22) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(23) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(24) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(25) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(26) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(27) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.

(28) the transferor is not prohibited from possessing, selling, furnishing, or transferring a firearm or ammunition under subsection (b) or (1) of this section. This subsection shall not apply to any shipment or transportation of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector if the Secretary, in exercising his discretion under subsection (a) of this section, decides not to revoke the importation or transportation of the firearm or ammunition to which such subsection applies.
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 determination of noncompliance with this section. Such petition shall be filed within 90 days after the expiration of the period for a determination of noncompliance by the Secretary. If the court finds that the aggrieved party is entitled to a determination of noncompliance, it shall promptly notify the Secretary and the aggrieved party that a determination of noncompliance has been made. If the aggrieved party in his petition requests a review of the determination of noncompliance by the Secretary, the court shall promptly notify the Secretary of such request.

The Secretary of the Treasury, the court, or the aggrieved party may within sixty days after the date of the Secretary's notice of such finding file a petition in the United States district court for the district in which the aggrieved party resides or has his principal place of business in the United States for a determination of noncompliance with this section. Such petition shall be filed within 90 days after the expiration of the period for a determination of noncompliance by the Secretary.

The court, upon a showing 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 ten inches (measured from the top of the weapon, excluding sights, at a right-angle measurement to the horizontal plane of the muzzle to the cylinder face) of at least ten inches; and
   (c) has an overall frame (with any integral or integral to the frame or strap component, or equivalent or greater projectile size or power);
   (d) has a loaded chamber indicator, a cocked position indicator, or holds the pistol to a target trigger.

"(2) In the case of a revolver, the handgun model:
   (a) has an overall frame (with conventional grips) length of four and one-half inches (measured from the end of the frame nearest the muzzle, parallel to the line of the bore to the back of the part of the weapon which is furthest to the rear of the weapon);
   (b) has a barrel length (measured from the muzzle to the cylinder face) of at least four inches; and
   (c) has a safety device which, either by automatic operation in the case of a double action firing mechanism or (ii) by manual operation in the case of a single action firing mechanism, retracts to a point where the firing pin does not rest upon the trigger, and which, once activated, except for the purpose of readjusting the mechanism, prevents the impact of a weight, equal to the weight of the revolver, dropped a total of five times from a height of 36 inches above the rear of the hammer spur onto the rear of the hammer spur with the revolver in a position such that the line of the barrel is perpendicular to the place of the horizon; and
   (d) attains a total of at least 60 points under the following criteria:
      (i) Barrel length (measured from the muzzle to the cylinder face): one-half point for each one-fourth inch over six inches;
      (ii) Frame construction: (a) 25 points if the frame is investment cast steel or forged steel, (b) 30 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 accepts .22 caliber long rifle ammunition, (b) three points if the revolver accepts .22 caliber long rifle ammunition within the range delimited by .22 caliber ACP and .22 long rifle ammunition, (c) five points if the revolver accepts .22 caliber long rifle ammunition or ammunition within the range delimited by .22 caliber ACP and .22 long rifle ammunition, (d) five points if the revolver accepts .357 Magnum ammunition or ammunition of an equivalent or greater projectile size or power;
      (v) Safety features: three points if the revolver has a grip safety;
      (vi) Other features: (a) two points if the revolver has a front sight, (b) two points if the revolver has a rear sight, (c) three points if the handgun model for such evaluation and testing and thereafter notify the aggrieved party of the results, if he determines sufficient evidence of retesting exists. Should he determine that retesting is not warranted, the Secretary shall promptly notify the aggrieved party as to such determination. In the event that upon retesting the Secretary's finding remains adverse, or if the decision of the court finds retesting is not warranted, the aggrieved party may within sixty days after the date of the Secretary's notice of such finding file a petition in the United States district of the United States for a determination of noncompliance with this section.

The Federal Register at least semiannually a list of handgun models which have been tested and the results of those tests. Handgun models:

"(A) not in manufacture on or after the effective date of this Act, shall be listed in the Federal Register or other similar publication as notice of their disapproval has been published in the Federal Register, or such publications shall also be included with the published ordinances required under section 921(a)(26) be furnished to each licensee under this chapter.

"(B) in manufacture on or after the effective date of this Act, shall be listed in the Federal Register or other similar publication as notice of their disapproval has been published in the Federal Register as provided for the commission of such felony, be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of not less than one year nor more than five years for a third or subsequent offense. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the court shall not suspend any sentence or reduce any term of imprisonment imposed for the commission of such felony.

"(1) In the case of a firearm, other than a handgun of a model which has not been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 922(k) of this chapter.

The Secretary shall, in addition to the punishment provided for the commission of such felony, be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of not less than one year nor more than ten years in the case of the first offense, and to a term of imprisonment of not more than twenty-five years for a second or subsequent offense. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the court shall not suspend any sentence or reduce any term of imprisonment imposed for the commission of such felony, but shall order the defendant to receive a "firearm" in subsection (a)(3) the

"(A) by adding after the word "firearm" in subsection (a)(3) the words "in violation of this chapter", or

"(B) by amending subsection (a) of such section to read as follows:

"(A) (26) Any provision of this chapter shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and

"(C) Whoever—

"(1) uses a firearm to commit any felony for which he may be prosecuted in a court of the United States, or

"(2) carries a firearm during the commission of any felony for which he may be prosecuted in a court of the United States, or

"(3) carries a firearm in violation of this chapter shall be fined not more than ten years for a second or subsequent offense.
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section 923 of title 18, United States Code, shall be valid until it expires according to its terms unless it is sooner suspended, revoked or terminated pursuant to applicable provisions of law; and

(d) the first publication of the list required under section 923(1)(3) shall be on or before the date of expiration of the sixty-day period following the date of enactment.

SECTION 5 — CONCLUSION

The draft bill would accomplish several major objectives. First, the bill would ban the importation, manufacture, assembly, sale, or transfer of sales or transfers of handguns under section 922(d) (3) of title 18, United States Code, those engaged in business as "ammunition retailers," defined in proposed section 921(a)(12) as persons who are not otherwise dealers and who are engaged in the business of selling ammunition other than ammunition for destructive devices, at retail;

(1) those engaged in business as "gunsmiths", defined in proposed section 921(a)(13) as persons who are not otherwise dealers who are engaged in the business of assembling firearms or making or fitting special barrels, stocks, or trigger mechanisms to firearms;

(2) 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 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 section 5(c) of the draft bill.

In addition to adding to section 921(a) the definitions of "ammunition retailer," "gunsmith," and "firearms dealer" discussed in connection with the definition of dealer," section 5(c) adds definitions of "handgun," "handgun model," "pistol," and "revolver.

Proposed section 922(d)(3) of title 18 defines "handgun" as a firearm which has a short stock and is designed to be held and fired by a single hand.

The term "handgun" is also defined to include any combination of parts from which a handgun can be assembled. As discussed in connection with the proposed amendment to section 925(d)(3) of title 18, the definition of "handgun" includes a combination of parts of a handgun in order to assure that restrictions on importation of certain handguns cannot be circumvented by importing parts of the handgun and assembling the handgun in the United States.

The term "handgun model" is defined in proposed section 922(d)(3) of title 18 as "a particular design and specification of a handgun.

The term "pistol" is defined in proposed section 922(d)(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 922(a)(18) defines a "revolver" as a handgun with a breechloading chamber or chambers. The cocking of the hammer or movement of the trigger rotates the cylinder to bring the leading cartridge in line with the barrel for firing.

Section 6 of the draft bill would amend section 921(a) of title 18 to add various firearms offenses, in several respects.

Section 6 of the draft bill would amend section 921(a) of title 18 to add various firearms offenses, in several respects.
Section 922(a)(2)(A) of title 18 presently provides as exceptions to the bar against licenses' shipment of firearms and ammunition, the return of a firearm or replacement firearm to a person from whom it was the mailing by the individual of a firearm to a licensee for repair or customizing. Sections 6(a) and (b) of the other than a curio or relm would make the exception inapplicable to the easily concealable weapons whose manufacture, assembly, sale, and transfer would be barred under proposed section 922(d)(1) of title 18. However, section 18(a) of the draft bill would permit the return of a firearm to a licensee who had received 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 reason to believe lives in another State is made unlawful, except in the case of certain 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 reference to persons living in another State to persons residing in another State and would invalidate the clauses regarding succession under section 922(d)(1) of title 18. Section 922(c) of title 18, relating to sale of firearms to persons who do 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 submitted by a mail-order purchaser under section 922(e) with the amendment making the provision inapplicable to handguns.

Section 6(h) of the bill would repeal subsections (d) and (h) of section 922(e) and redesignate subsections (l) through (m) as subsections (h), (i), and (j). Section 6(l) of the draft bill redesignates existing subsections (a) and (d) as subsections (m) and (n), respectively, and redesignates subsections (l) through (m) as subsections (g), (h), and (i), in order to permit the addition of proposed subsections (d) through (l). The subsection would also redesignate subsection (g) as subsection (b).

Section 6(j)(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 relm, unless the handgun model has not been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to proposed section 922(d)(2) of title 18. It is not intended that the Secretary of the Treasury would be obligated to publish the list of approved handgun models had not been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury for the Secretary to disapprove·

Under the provisions of section 922(d), the persons who purchased the handgun models had not been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury for the Secretary to disapprove these models. Since the lists would not be as readily available to non-licensees, sale or transfer of a handgun to a non-licensee by a non-licensee would be covered only if the person knew the handgun model had not been approved.

The exception contained in existing section 922(a)(1) permitting transportation, shipment, receipt, or importation for, or sale or transfer of, a handgun to a non-licensee would be in accordance with Federal and local ordinances at the place of sale, delivery, or other disposition. The sale or transfer of a handgun to a non-licensee would be unlawful if it was done under present law.

The determination of the Secretary concerning the individual which is not intended that the Secretary of the Treasury would be obligated to publish the list of approved handgun models had not been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury would be unlawful if it was done under present law.

Proposed section 922(d)(2) 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 handgun model had not been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to proposed section 922(d)(2) of title 18. It is not intended that the Secretary of the Treasury would be obligated to publish the list of approved handgun models had not been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury for the Secretary to disapprove·

Under the provisions of section 922(d), the persons who purchased the handgun models had not been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury for the Secretary to disapprove·

The determination of the Secretary concerning the individual which is not intended that the Secretary of the Treasury would be obligated to publish the list of approved handgun models had not been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury would be unlawful if it was done under present law.

Proposed section 922(d)(2) 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 handgun model had not been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to proposed section 922(d)(2) of title 18. It is not intended that the Secretary of the Treasury would be obligated to publish the list of approved handgun models had not been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury for the Secretary to disapprove·

Under the provisions of section 922(d), the persons who purchased the handgun models had not been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury for the Secretary to disapprove these models. Since the lists would not be as readily available to non-licensees, sale or transfer of a handgun to a non-licensee by a non-licensee would be covered only if the person knew the handgun model had not been approved.

The exception contained in existing section 922(a)(1) permitting transportation, shipment, receipt, or importation for, or sale or transfer of, a handgun to a non-licensee would be unlawful if it was done under present law.
The offense described in subsection (h) would be a 5-year felony, consistent with the penalty for violation of existing sections 922(a) and 923(d) and the 2-year penalty under 18 U.S.C. App. 1202(a).

Section 2(e) of the draft bill, there is a congressional finding that receipt or possession of firearms or ammunition by persons licensed by federal or local law is a breach of public trust, and the possession or possession constitutes a burden on commerce within and among the States and is a threat to the national security.

Proposed section 922(1) contains forward the provisions of existing 18 U.S.C. App. 1203(b) barring persons employed by a person, firm, or corporation of which the person is an officer, buying or selling, 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 bill, the licensee is in fact planning to conduct business. The reference in existing subsection (g) to "commerce or affecting commerce" has been amended to "in commerce or affecting commerce" vice, and has or has reason to be in one of the groups barred from engaging in the business of redistributing handguns outright, no transfer would be permitted.

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 persons employed by employers of which the person is an officer, buying or selling, or transporting a firearm in the course of employment. Proposed sections 6(k), (l), (m), and (n) of the bill would amend section 922(h) of title 18 to bar certain persons from shipping or transporting firearms or ammunition in interstate or foreign commerce. Proposed sections 7(e) and (k) would update the cross-references to the Controlled Substances Act.

Section 6(m) would add to the language relating to mental incompetency 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 changed. Proposed section 922(h), nor has the phrase "in commerce or affecting commerce" presently contained in 18 U.S.C. App. 1202. The reference to commerce or affecting commerce was insufficient for conviction. Under the amendment to section 922(h), the language "in commerce or affecting commerce" was sufficient for conviction.

The coverage in existing sections 922(g) and (h) concerning receipt, possession, or transportation applicable at the place of sale, or other disposition. The regulations to be promulgated by the Secretary would permit volume purchases for lawful purposes, such as for pistol clubs, or for protection agencies, and private collections.

Section 7 of the draft bill contains amendments to sections concerning the relationship to licensing of manufacturers, importers, dealers, and collectors.

Subsections (a), (c), and (d) would amend section 922(g) to eliminate the fees for all licensees who manufacture, import, or deal in firearms, other than destructive devices, and who deal in ammunition. The fee system is amended to accomplish two basic purposes: to help assure that the volume of handguns sold to the public is not to conduct the business for which he is licensed, and to charge fees consistent with the provisions of the bona fide nature of the business to be conducted by the licensees.

The fee system would also be amended to provide higher fees for handgun manufacturers, importers, and dealers than for manufacturers of destructive devices.

This differentiation would permit identification of handgun dealers in order to prevent their conversion of all firearms to concentrate his efforts on handgun dealers, and the increased fees would help to cover the increased inspection costs.
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 assure himself of the legality of the license and to ascertain whether the applicant is a bona fide businessman.

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 60 days. The extension of the time limit is necessary to give the Secretary sufficient time to check the business 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 court review procedures to include administrative and court review of suspension of licenses and assessments of civil penalties.

Section 7(1) 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 manufacture, assembly, importation, 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(10) of title 18, must have a positive manually operated safety device, a height (measured from the top of the barrel to the top of the frame) of at least 4 inches, certain safety features, and adding consideration of additional criteria which would improve the safety or quality of the weapon. Curios and relics would not come under the provisions of this subsection, but would continue to be controlled by the existing law, 26 U.S.C. §§ 178.11 and 178.26. Under proposed section 923(k), the Secretary would give written notification to the manufacturer, licensed importer, licensed collector who submitted the samples for evaluation and testing. It is expected that the Secretary would be authorized for causes made by manufacturers and importers, since they will not be able to manufacture, assemble, or otherwise supply the handgun or after the effective date of proposed section 923(k) without prior approval. The section also provides that, if the Secretary does not approve a handgun model within 10 days of receipt of notification that the model is not in compliance, he may request retesting of the model within 10 days of receipt of notification that the model is not in compliance, or if he finds that retesting is not warranted, the Secretary would be required to furnish a list of approved handgun models in the proposed section 930(a) (3) to preclude shipment of Saturday Night Specials to members of the Armed Forces or of members for personal use of the member or club.

Section 9(c) would amend section 925(a) (4) to define "Saturday Night Special" as a 38-caliber or larger handgun or of firearms to members of the Armed Forces or of persons for personal use of the member or club.

Section 9(d) would amend section 925(c) to add a new paragraph (3) which would permit a court to order relief from disabilities if a person convicted of a Federal or State or local offense punishable by more than five years' imprisonment involving use of a firearm or of violating the National Firearms Act, to bar licensing of a person convicted of a State or local offense by more than five years' imprisonment if the offense related to importation, manufacture, sale, or transfer of a firearm.

Section 9(e) would amend section 925(c), which presently bars licensing a person under chapter 44 of title 18 if he has been convicted of an offense punishable by more than one year's imprisonment involving use of a firearm or of violating the National Firearms Act, to bar licensing of a person convicted of a State or local offense punishable by more than one year's imprisonment if the offense related to importation, manufacture, sale, or transfer of a firearm.

Section 9(f) of the draft bill would amend section 925(g) (3) to clearly ban importation, transfer, or possession of firearms by the Secretary of the Treasury in accord with the provisions of proposed section 923(k) of title 18. Since this provision is necessary because of the thousands of models which have been produced in the last few years and are in production, it is anticipated that the Secretary will be able to test most models produced since 1968 for compliance with the requirements of section 923(k).

As to handguns not in production since 1968, the Secretary would have test old handgun models according to their relative availability and that he will publish a list of approved handgun models in the proposed section 930(a) (3) to preclude shipment of Saturday Night Specials to members of the Armed Forces or of persons for personal use of the member or club. The Secretary is determining whether a firearm is importable under Federal law to possess a firearm (proposed 18 U.S.C. 922(1)) on or after the date of enactment.

Section 8(c) of the draft bill would amend section 922(1) of title 18 to make the provision permitting shipment or receipt of firearms sold or issued by the Secretary of the Army under section 921(a) (2) of title 18 to rifle ranges and permitting sale of "rifled arms" to the members of the National Rifle Association and clubs organized for practice with such arms, not in production, not approved by the Secretary pursuant to proposed section 923(k) of title 18.

Section 9(g) would amend section 92(f) (3) to preclude shipment of Saturday Night Specials to members of the Armed Forces or of persons for personal use of the member or club.

Section 9(h) would amend section 923(a) (4) to define "Saturday Night Special" as a 38-caliber or larger handgun or of firearms to members of the Armed Forces or of persons for personal use of the member or club.

Section 9(i) would amend section 925(c) to add a new paragraph (3) which would permit a court to order relief from disabilities if a person convicted of a Federal or State or local offense punishable by more than five years' imprisonment involving use of a firearm or of violating the National Firearms Act, to bar licensing of a person convicted of a State or local offense punishable by more than five years' imprisonment if the offense related to importation, manufacture, sale, or transfer of a firearm.

Section 9(j) of the draft bill would amend section 925(g) (3) to clearly ban importation, transfer, or possession of firearms by the Secretary of the Treasury in accord with the provisions of proposed section 923(k) of title 18. Since this provision is necessary because of the thousands of models which have been produced in the last few years and are in production, it is anticipated that the Secretary will be able to test most models produced since 1968 for compliance with the requirements of section 923(k).

As to handguns not in production since 1968, the Secretary would have test old handgun models according to their relative availability and that he will publish a list of approved handgun models in the proposed section 930(a) (3) to preclude shipment of Saturday Night Specials to members of the Armed Forces or of persons for personal use of the member or club. The Secretary is determining whether a firearm is importable under Federal law to possess a firearm (proposed 18 U.S.C. 922(1)) on or after the date of enactment.

Section 8(c) of the draft bill would amend section 922(1) of title 18 to make the provision permitting shipment or receipt of firearms sold or issued by the Secretary of the Army under section 921(a) (2) of title 18 to rifle ranges and permitting sale of "rifled arms" to the members of the National Rifle Association and clubs organized for practice with such arms, not in production, not approved by the Secretary pursuant to proposed section 923(k) of title 18.

Section 9(g) would amend section 92(f) (3) to preclude shipment of Saturday Night Specials to members of the Armed Forces or of persons for personal use of the member or club.

Section 9(h) would amend section 923(a) (4) to define "Saturday Night Special" as a 38-caliber or larger handgun or of firearms to members of the Armed Forces or of persons for personal use of the member or club.

Section 9(i) would amend section 925(c) to add a new paragraph (3) which would permit a court to order relief from disabilities if a person convicted of a Federal or State or local offense punishable by more than five years' imprisonment involving use of a firearm or of violating the National Firearms Act, to bar licensing of a person convicted of a State or local offense punishable by more than five years' imprisonment if the offense related to importation, manufacture, sale, or transfer of a firearm.

Section 9(j) of the draft bill would amend section 925(g) (3) to clearly ban importation, transfer, or possession of firearms by the Secretary of the Treasury in accord with the provisions of proposed section 923(k) of title 18. Since this provision is necessary because of the thousands of models which have been produced in the last few years and are in production, it is anticipated that the Secretary will be able to test most models produced since 1968 for compliance with the requirements of section 923(k).

As to handguns not in production since 1968, the Secretary would have test old handgun models according to their relative availability and that he will publish a list of approved handgun models in the proposed section 930(a) (3) to preclude shipment of Saturday Night Specials to members of the Armed Forces or of persons for personal use of the member or club. The Secretary is determining whether a firearm is importable under Federal law to possess a firearm (proposed 18 U.S.C. 922(1)) on or after the date of enactment.

Section 8(c) of the draft bill would amend section 922(1) of title 18 to make the provision permitting shipment or receipt of firearms sold or issued by the Secretary of the Army under section 921(a) (2) of title 18 to rifle ranges and permitting sale of "rifled arms" to the members of the National Rifle Association and clubs organized for practice with such arms, not in production, not approved by the Secretary pursuant to proposed section 923(k) of title 18.

Section 9(g) would amend section 92(f) (3) to preclude shipment of Saturday Night Specials to members of the Armed Forces or of persons for personal use of the member or club.
titled 18 the authority to administer oaths and affirmations.
Section 12 would repeal title VII of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act (18 U.S.C. App. 1201-1203) which would be covered by the proposed sections 232(b) and (i) of title 18.
Section 12 would amend section 1715 of title 42 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to ban mailing of any handgun not approved by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to proposed section 232(b) of title 18 to any individual.

The Postal Service would issue regulations, subject to concurrence in the regulations by the Secretary of the Treasury, concerning the transfer of such handguns via the mail.

the government in the United States or an entity thereof. It is intended that there be no transfer of such handgun to individuals except when they receive guns in their capacity as Government employees, and that, 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 any time, but be returned to the government entity by which they were issued if they are no longer needed by the employee's government 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 effective on the 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 of such handgun any handgun approved by the Secretary of the Treasury in the event that the handgun models approved by the Secretary of the Treasury have been published in the first sixty days after enactment.

AMENDMENT No. 820
On page 19, line 4, insert the following:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO S. 1

Page 26, add the following after the material following line 1:

"(§ 2307. Mandatory Sentence of Imprisonment

(a) In General.—Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b), a defendant who has been found guilty of:

(1) an offense under section 1823 (Using a Weapon in a Robbery),

(2) an offense described in section 1811 (Trafficking in an Opiate), or

(3) an offense described in section 1812 (Trafficking in any Narcotic Drug),

shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of not less than six months or the maximum term authorized for the offense, whichever is greater, and the minimum term of imprisonment shall be seven years, consecutive to any other term of imprisonment imposed on the defendant."

On page 4, lines 24 and 25, delete the words "The court," and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Except as provided in section 1811 (Trafficking in an Opiate), or 1812 (Trafficking in any Narcotic Drug), the court shall impose a term of parole ineligibility on a defendant convicted of an offense described in section 2307 of at least the term prescribed in section 2301(e)."

On page 92, lines 26 and 27, delete the words "The court," and insert in lieu thereof "Except as provided in section 2307 of the code, the court shall impose a term of parole ineligibility on a defendant convicted of an offense described in section 2301(d)."

On page 194, add the following new section after line 5:

"§ 2307. Mandatory Sentence of Imprisonment

(c) In General.—Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b), a defendant who has been found guilty of:

(1) an offense under section 1823 (Using a Weapon in a Robbery),

(2) an offense described in section 1811 (Kidnapping), 1831 (Aircraft Hijacking), or 1811 (Trafficking in an Opiate), or 1812 (Trafficking in a Controlled Substance),

(3) an offense committed after conviction of a previous violent offense, or conviction for the commission of a Federal offense, or local offense which would be a violent offense if the offense was a Federal offense, if the offenses were committed on separate occasions;

shall be sentenced to a mandatory term of imprisonment and parole ineligibility in accordance with the provisions of sections 2301(d) and (e)."

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 budget-related actions with Federal Government efforts to stimulate economic recovery by establishing a system of emergency support grants to State and local governments.

At the request of Mr. TOWEN, 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.
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 to give the President power to reallocate 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 opportunities 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 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 anti-inflationary effectiveness of the program."

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

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 comma, strike out all through the word "average" on line 3 and insert in lieu thereof a period and the following: "Seventy percentum of the national unemployment rate recedes below 6.5 percent for the most recent three consecutive months, the national unemployment rate is equal to or exceeds 6.5 percent per cent for the most recent three consecutive months, the national unemployment rate has equaled or exceeded 6.5 percent per cent 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 limited public use of such 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 side were recently urged by the Surgeon General to attend 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-

ations 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 documents.

Fourth. On May 18, 1973, Mountain Fuel responded to the May 1 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 21, 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 there was a need for further supplementation 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 filed a petition 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 Chairman also requesting an expedited resolution of the case.

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 Chairman of 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
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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. Pursuant to the date of August 20, 1974, for the filing of Mountain Fuel's direct testimony and exhibits and the date of October 6, 1974, as the hearing date, Mountain Fuel noted that Mountain Fuel did not have certificates to construct and operate storage facilities in the Bridger Lake and Chalk Creek fields and ordered Mountain Fuel to show cause why 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 application for the proceeding 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 to construct the Chalk Creek storage field, which was assigned FPC docket No. CP75–33, and an application for additional expenditure authorization and an expedited hearing. These applications concern the further development of the Coalville field, which application was filed under Mountain Fuel's underground storage development of the Bridger Lake, which application was filed under Mountain Fuel's underground storage development, docket No. CP71–52. No certificate was issued by the FPC for the Bridger Lake, but the operation of this field and our position on why a certificate allegedly necessary in order for the staff to make an adequate analysis for the development of this field and the alleged need for that certificate application have not been explained.

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 stated that Mountain Fuel's evidence may address the issues raised by its filings in the docket, the order stated that the 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.

Twentieth. On September 19, 1974, the company was served with a letter request from the FPC to request testimony by vernors appeared, and the staff presented no evidence.

Twenty-third. On November 6, 1974, the initial brief and proposed findings were submitted on behalf of Mountain Fuel Supply Co.

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

Twenty-ninth. 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 bucket No. CP71–52.

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

Thirty-first. 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.

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

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

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


Thirty-sixth. 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 might be required to take in the interim. The FPC delayed their decision.
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 to receive 'literally hundreds of thousands of people who will be touring the Mall, benches, first aid 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 proposal is also going to have to be made for adequate food service and adequate rest rooms at the Mall, particularly since the new National Gallery cafeterias will not be completed in time. The proposal to increase the level of funding for the tourist parking lots at the Mall is sure that the White House task force estimates that additional over-time funds are going to be needed for the Park Service and for the visitors, the task force hopes to organize a central referral system for telephone reservations. In such a system, which worked well in 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.

The Senate Bicentennial is certainly since the new National Gallery cafeterias will not be completed in time. The proposal to increase the level of funding for the tourist parking lots at the Mall is sure that the White House task force estimates that additional over-time funds are going to be needed for the Park Service and for the visitors, the task force hopes to organize a central referral system for telephone reservations. In such a system, which worked well in 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.

The Senate Bicentennial is certainly since the new National Gallery cafeterias will not be completed in time. The proposal to increase the level of funding for the tourist parking lots at the Mall is sure that the White House task force estimates that additional over-time funds are going to be needed for the Park Service and for the visitors, the task force hopes to organize a central referral system for telephone reservations. In such a system, which worked well in 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.
There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**DEFENSE—94TH CONGRESS LEGISLATION**

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

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

**DEFENSE—95TH CONGRESS**

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 Vieques.

S. 396—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 Vietnam.

S. Res. 117—a resolution to commemorate the loss and suffering of the dead and wounded by the December 26, 1974, attack on the United States Naval Base at Mayaguez, Puerto Rico.

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 agreement as they apply to prisoners of war and personnel missing in action. Amended. 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 has been submitted to the Senate as a treaty for its advice and consent.


Voted for Continuing Appropriations, fiscal year 1975.


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 $445.5 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.


**UNITED STATES-CUBA POLICY**

Mr. STONE, Mr. President, on June 16, 1975, Puerto Rican Gov. Rafael Hernández 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 were 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 newsmen in a press conference given in the city of Ponce, P.R.

In 1973, J. Edgar Hoover declared that the Cuban government funded and directed actions, and he said that one focus on the Cuban subversive 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 17 December 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 under 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 BENTIXE mentions this group in connection with a similar Castroite following operating in Venezuela, Piberto 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 bombing in New York City, which took the lives of 5 persons and injured 56 others. The attached article describing these events appeared in the Daily News, and states that if the 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 Maillard made clear that the United States favors terminating the OAS sanctions against the Cuban regime, and that our Government will vote to do so at an OAS Meeting of Consultation of Foreign Ministers which will probably be discussing the matter next Tuesday. Ambassador Malliard 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 Senator from Florida does not understand why Communist Cuba’s subversive activities matter so much to us in 1964, when the OAS imposed the sanctions and isolated Cuba from the Inter-American 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 evidence of the present Cuban regime’s assistance of acts of terror, sabotage, and which have been an international level 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 here.

The following, with no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:
CUBA-TRAINED GUERRILLAS TIED TO BOMBS

(Frank Pasco and Arthur Milligan)

A man the authorities describe as a Puerto Rican-born master spy and saboteur who received terrorist training in Cuba was identified by the police and the Federal Bureau of Investigation yesterday as the man responsible for the Jan. 24 bombing of the Fraunces Tavern in New York City, which was the third terrorist bombing in the Loop Saturday.

By the time the bomb was discovered by police and the Federal Bureau of Investigation that FALN was concentrating its terrorist activities for Puerto Rican Independence from a base in New York City, where a search had failed to turn up any bomb.

The FBI man said that Rios had jumped a $100,000 bail after having been arrested in San Juan. He is in connection with the bombing of three hotels there. Federal warrants were issued at the time, and he has been an elusive fugitive ever since.

The $100,000 bail had been met in cash by a master man who said he was Rios' brother-in-law, but who proved not to be. The mystery man also disappeared.

ELUDES COPS, AGENTS

Federal sources in Washington said that Rios used so many disguises and aliases that it was impossible to trace him.

The sources credit him with having united loosely knit bands of activists in this country since last October. Mr. President, for that reason, Mr. Domenici, I request unanimous consent to make a statement and ask that it be printed in the Record.

The report also included four recommendations: We recommend that the Secretary of Agriculture direct the Chief of the 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 details of the whole process of test sales as they are completed for specific forests, tree species, and timber conditions.

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

I am considering the conclusions and recommendations of the report as the basis for subsequent legislative or administrative action. I have asked the Chief of the Forest Service and officials of the timber industry for their comments on the substance of the report. I solicit any comments and suggestions from my colleagues as to potential courses for congressional followup of the GAO report. For that reason, Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the report be printed in the Record. The report, which is not available, is now ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows.
The tree measurement method has been used for many years in the Forest Service’s eastern and southern regions, on some thin­
ning sales on the basis of scaling the Forest Service and members of national timber indus­
y associations. We discussed the report contents with Forest Service officials and considered their views in preparing this re­
port.

The primary timber sale method used in the western regions is log measurement. Under this method a timber purchaser agrees to pay for logs taken from a sale area based on the basis of scaling (i.e., cruising, physically surveying, or computing the volume of wood in the trees before the trees are cut down). The estimate is derived by cruising, estimating the volume of timber sold by tree measurement method due to the uncertainty of funding for conducting test sales.

The following data, obtained from the three Forest Service western regions, describe the portions of each region’s fiscal year 1972, 1973, and 1974 timber sales made under the tree measurement method.

| Percent of timber sales made under tree measurement method by fiscal year |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
|                             | 1972               | 1973               |
| California                  | 3.9                | 3.3                |
| Pacific Northwest           | 3.6                | 3.1                |
| Southern Pacific            | 3.9                | 3.7                |

The tree industry has generally opposed the increased use of the tree measurement method in the western regions due to the following beliefs:

1. The Forest Service has not demonstrated the effectiveness and efficiency of the tree measurement method compared with the log measurement method.
2. The Forest Service believes, however, that the tree measurement method should be effective as the log measurement method, that it should decrease manpower requirements and the overall costs of timber sales, and that it should increase the efficiency of sales.

To confirm its beliefs, the Forest Service has attempted through test sales, to obtain data to compare the two methods. As stated above, the Forest Service had abandoned the tree measurement method due to the uncertainty of funding for conducting test sales.

A chronology of major events related to the Forest Service’s efforts to increase the use of the three measurement methods is es­
closed. (See app. I) Our review of the records relating to these events and our discussions with Forest Service and Office of Management and Budget officials indicate that the early Forest Service efforts to increase the use of the three measurement methods lacked specific direction and guidance resulting in inconsistencies among the regions in carrying out tree measurement sales and test sales procedures methods.

The emphasis on increased tree measurement sales has come not only from within the Forest Service but also from the Department of Interior (formerly called Office of the Inspector General), the Office of Management and Budget, and a 1973 interagency task force established by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of former Cost of Living Council to consider changes in Forest Service timber sales procedures methods.

The Forest Service has recognized the need to develop adequate techniques and to train people to make tree measurement sales and since the move toward increasing such sales began.

The tree measurement method has been used for many years in the Forest Service’s eastern and southern regions, on some thin­
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The tree industry has generally opposed the increased use of the tree measurement method in the western regions due to the following beliefs:

1. The Forest Service has not demonstrated the effectiveness and efficiency of the tree measurement method compared with the log measurement method.
2. The Forest Service believes, however, that the tree measurement method should be effective as the log measurement method, that it should decrease manpower requirements and the overall costs of timber sales, and that it should increase the efficiency of sales.

To confirm its beliefs, the Forest Service has attempted through test sales, to obtain data to compare the two methods. As stated above, the Forest Service had abandoned the tree measurement method due to the uncertainty of funding for conducting test sales.

A chronology of major events related to the Forest Service’s efforts to increase the use of the three measurement methods is es­
closed. (See app. I) Our review of the records relating to these events and our discussions with Forest Service and Office of Management and Budget officials indicate that the early Forest Service efforts to increase the use of the three measurement methods lacked specific direction and guidance resulting in inconsistencies among the regions in carrying out tree measurement sales and test sales procedures methods.

The emphasis on increased tree measurement sales has come not only from within the Forest Service but also from the Department of Interior (formerly called Office of the Inspector General), the Office of Management and Budget, and a 1973 interagency task force established by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of former Cost of Living Council to consider changes in Forest Service timber sales procedures methods.

The Forest Service has recognized the need to develop adequate techniques and to train people to make tree measurement sales and since the move toward increasing such sales began.

The tree measurement method has been used for many years in the Forest Service’s eastern and southern regions, on some thin­
ning sales on the basis of scaling (i.e., cruising, estimating the volume of wood in the trees before the trees are cut down). The estimate is derived by cruising, estimating the volume of timber sold by tree measurement method due to the uncertainty of funding for conducting test sales.

The following data, obtained from the three Forest Service western regions, describe the portions of each region’s fiscal year 1972, 1973, and 1974 timber sales made under the tree measurement method.
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|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
|                             | 1972               | 1973               |
| California                  | 3.9                | 3.3                |
| Pacific Northwest           | 3.6                | 3.1                |
| Southern Pacific            | 3.9                | 3.7                |

The tree industry has generally opposed the increased use of the tree measurement method in the western regions due to the following beliefs:

1. The Forest Service has not demonstrated the effectiveness and efficiency of the tree measurement method compared with the log measurement method.
2. The Forest Service believes, however, that the tree measurement method should be effective as the log measurement method, that it should decrease manpower requirements and the overall costs of timber sales, and that it should increase the efficiency of sales.

To confirm its beliefs, the Forest Service has attempted through test sales, to obtain data to compare the two methods. As stated above, the Forest Service had abandoned the tree measurement method due to the uncertainty of funding for conducting test sales.

A chronology of major events related to the Forest Service’s efforts to increase the use of the three measurement methods is es­
closed. (See app. I) Our review of the records relating to these events and our discussions with Forest Service and Office of Management and Budget officials indicate that the early Forest Service efforts to increase the use of the three measurement methods lacked specific direction and guidance resulting in inconsistencies among the regions in carrying out tree measurement sales and test sales procedures methods.

The emphasis on increased tree measurement sales has come not only from within the Forest Service but also from the Department of Interior (formerly called Office of the Inspector General), the Office of Management and Budget, and a 1973 interagency task force established by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of former Cost of Living Council to consider changes in Forest Service timber sales procedures methods.

The Forest Service has recognized the need to develop adequate techniques and to train people to make tree measurement sales and since the move toward increasing such sales began.
tree measurement method and to enable them to select which type of tree measurement method to test, should additional funding and manpower become available for this purpose.

A headquarters official acknowledged that, until March 1978, the regions had not been provided guidelines and procedures for conducting test sales. According to the March 1975 guidelines and procedures, the western regions are to develop data for both sale methods on (1) the accuracy of volume estimates, including determinations of the volume of usable timber left in sale areas by purchasers, (2) Forest Service purchaser sale preparation and contract administration costs.

**NEED FOR COMPLETE VOLUME DATA**

To compare the combined Government and purchaser costs of the two sale methods, adequate cost data relating to each method must be developed. However, no cost data were developed for the tree measurement method, the Forest Service considers all trees that are to be harvested by a sale a log measurement method. However, only the timber removed from the sale area is measured. Forest Service headquarters officials said that, in order to make a comparable volume data in a log measurement sale, a utilization scale—an estimate of the volume of merchantable timber left in the sale area by the purchaser—must be made with the estimated volume's being combined with the volume of timber removed.

**NEED FOR COMPLETE COST DATA**

To compare the combined Government and purchaser costs of the two sale methods, adequate cost data relating to each method must be developed. However, no cost data were developed for the three Pacific Northwest regions. Therefore, the need for utilization scales was not necessary for their completed test sale because the regions had not recognized this need until two of their test sales had been completed.

Southwestern region officials said they thought a utilization scale was necessary for their completed test sale because of the little merchantable material left behind. Forest Service headquarters officials said that they needed utilization scales on their test sales early in 1974 and that the March 1976 procedures provided for them.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Because the Forest Service had not provided guidelines and procedures for comparing the tree measurement and log measurement methods, the relative cost of each of the two sale methods has not been determined. The Forest Service has issued revised guidelines and procedures for developing accurate and cost data for its test sale programs. If the regions properly implement them and headquarters coordinates and monitors their implementation, these guidelines and procedures should result in the development of data adequate for comparing the two sale methods. However, the Forest Service has not determined the test sale program to be completed and does not currently plan to provide any special funding for the program.

We recommend that the separately funding for timely completion of the test sale program must be developed with other Forest Service resources. If the test sale program is completed, the Forest Service will not be able to provide well-documented evidence to settle the question of costs considered and costs of the two methods.

If there are net benefits to be gained from using the tree measurement method, as the Forest Service believes, these benefits should be documented and attained as soon as possible.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

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 tests to determine net benefits.
- Evaluate and report to the appropriate congressional committees the results of test sales as they are completed.

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

As your office agrees, we are sending copies of this 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 Packard and Representatives Patric Schranker, 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

Comptroller General of the United States
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 converting to tree measurement sales, alleging that these regions were not living up to the Forest Service's prior commitment to develop regionally flexibility in converting to tree measurement sales.

The Forest Service said that its objective was to increase tree measurement sales considerably, but that it expected its regions to use management systems which would produce acceptable results.

The Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Cost of Living Council announced an interagency task force on softwood timber and plans to consider the change in Forest Service timber sale procedures.

The Chief of the Forest Service, on the basis of the work of the interagency task force on softwood timber and plywood, announced that, as one of the actions to meet increased timber productivity goals, conversion from log measurement to tree measurement would be pursued, and that maximum long-term cost savings could be realized. The Forest Service said it expected to make rapid progress 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 said the change would result in inconsistencies among the regions and that more specific direction was indicated.

The Forest Service's Director of Timber Management indicated that the transition from log measurement to tree measurement for National Forest timber would be completed by December 31 of the fiscal year 1976.

The Forest Service sent its regions the following tentative timetable for converting to tree measurement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>over 90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Forest Service included $1 million in its budget request for fiscal year 1975 to partially cover the costs of converting to tree measurement, but regional officials said they would require more funds.

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 system.

The Forest Service was also asked to cooperate in the program by providing uniform data on costs, and it was noted that the following considerations must be addressed carefully in any comparison of costs and benefits:

- The relative costs of both methods.
- The availability of personnel involved in making these comparisons.
- The accessibility and condition of timber in the sale area.
- Flexibility in use of Forest Service personnel.

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 wide-scale conversion to tree measurement.

The Forest Service said that it intended to proceed only as rapidly as its ability to make acceptable volume estimates permitted, and it expected to review all scaling, including tree measurement, in the next several years but that it could not predict whether implementation plan targets could be met.

In brief, the Forest Service's Director of Timber Management said that the change had been determined by its quite accurate cost estimates. However, the methods have not enjoyed complete confidence by many purchasers of timber, who might well be interested in the methods because, in the industry, losses from errors occur. Although we recognize the Forest Service has expanded the use of tree measurement methods in the past, it is pointed out that both methods and costs result in both man-hours and dollars, and our efforts to increase confidence in both methods should not be taken for granted.

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 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 system. It was pointed out that the needs of (1) national Forests, (2) individual sales where, for some reason, scaling could not be provided at reasonable cost, and (3) low-value timber where 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, but regional officials said they would require more funds.

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, but regional officials said they would require more funds.

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, but regional officials said they would require more funds.

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, but regional officials said they would require more funds.

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, but regional officials said they would require more funds.

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, but regional officials said they would require more funds.

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, but regional officials said they would require more funds.

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, but regional officials said they would require more funds.
comparison of savings to justify moving ahead with tree measurement.

A comparison was made of many agencies and their methods by which timber utilization could be performed to determine whether utilization differed from the original estimates.

At that same time, the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management were working on the interagency task force on softwood stumpage and wood and that both agencies felt that tree measurement was one method by which timber utilization could be increased.

The OMB official added that OMB had no problems with tree measurement because both agencies said it would save money and increase efficiency but that he planned to ask the agencies to test industry's allegations that tree measurement was more costly and less accurate than log measurement.

JANUARY 1975

The Forest Service sent its western regions (excluding Alaska) proposed procedures and a statement for collecting time and cost data on test sales, and asked that individual test sale results be submitted to the headquarters office as they were compiled. 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 test sale data 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 on the amount of usable material on sale areas.

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 test sale data 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 on the amount of usable material on sale areas.

MARCH 1975

The Forest Service finalized the procedures proposed in January 1975 for collecting time and cost data on test sales and asked that individual test sale results be submitted to the headquarters office as they were compiled. 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 test sale data 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 on the amount of usable material on sale areas.

The Dulles Access Road was built in northern Virginia, a special access road to Dulles International Airport. 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-495, the Capital Beltway. Those using it must drive to the adjoining of the Dulles Road and access to the U.S. Geological Survey facility at Reston, Virginia. 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.

February 17, 1975

The Dulles Access Road was built in northern Virginia, a special access road to Dulles International Airport. 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-495, the Capital Beltway. Those using it must drive to the adjoining of the Dulles Road and access to the U.S. Geological Survey facility at Reston, Virginia. 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.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT:

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-495, the Capital Beltway. Those using it must drive to the adjoining of the Dulles Road and access to the U.S. Geological Survey facility at Reston, Virginia. 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.

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.

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 east. Dulles currently serves 70% of the traffic on the road (non-airport) that makes the turn around at the airport and then heads back toward Washington.

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

Mr. Dexter Davis of the F.A.A. stated that if the Virginia authorities made a definite decision to build parallel commuter roads, while the Dulles Road was being built. 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.

9. 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 would be facilitated in no way interfere with airport traffic.

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, traffic on the Dulles Road would not be affected.

11. Denial of the right to use the Dulles Road by the Federal employees of the U.S. Geological Survey created a situation where more than 200,000 gallons of gasoline are burned annually by the employees of the F.A.A. to respect the energy crisis. These employees, their families, and many others would be using our fuel for their own transportation.

12. Denial of the use of the Dulles Road to Survey employees effectively eliminates minority groups in Washington from working at the Survey. Regardless of the doctrinaire exhortations of the F.A.A., the figures show this statement to be true.

13. The morale of 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.

Very sincerely,

JAMES WOOD CLARKE,
Coordinator, Dulles Corridor Committee (And attached petitioners (1,298)).

PUBLIC EMPLOYEE UNION POWER

Mr. GARN. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to a very timely editorial which appeared yesterday, July 25, 1975, in one of our finest and most respected newspapers, the Wall Street Journal.
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 voters sets a tax levy and level, what we need to ask and have an individual or an independent moral to transfer functions vital to the unions at the wage rate that a local government authority 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 working of society to a private individual or an independent organization.

The answers to these questions are coming in daily as we see our cities and governments sink deeper into financial trouble, widespread unemployment continue, and our inflation rate begin to inch upward.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to read and consider carefully the contents of this very fine article.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

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

THE NEED FOR A LITTLE BACKBONE

During the recent U.S. conference of Mayors, the mayor of Seattle said that the growth of public employment unions ranked just behind money worries as the "most dominant concern of every mayor in the conference.

The most flagrant and most publicized instance is of course New York City. The city's capitulation to the strike by sanitation men probably dashed its last opportunity to save its creditworthiness. By now some of its municipal union leaders seem to have abandoned the belief that strike is a means of diverseness and partly out of the notion that if the city defaults on its bonds it could go on spending at the rate that built the debt bubble in the first place.

But such public union power is by no means limited to New York. Seventy-five members of Pennsylvania's biggest public employee union crippled the Keystone state for three days by walking out in a wage dispute recently centered in Birmingham, Chicago and Baltimore. Albuquerque has just suffered a police strike, though without any dramatic change in the crime rate.

Such walkouts are usually illegal, yet turning workers are rarely penalized. Instead, the usual pattern is to give them more or less what they demand: Most sanitation layoffs in New York were rescinded and Pennsylvania, who had been offered a 3.5% increase on grounds that anything higher would require a tax increase, received their hike in three stages.

Despite the growing power of the estimated 11.5 million public employees, there is sentiment in Congress to give them a breakhouse bill that power further by guaranteeing public employees the right to strike. Only about a dozen states give public employees the right to strike, and in the few that do, any federal legislation would require every state and municipality to bargain with their employees.

Any such federal law, and for that matter any state efforts to give union a greater say over wages and working conditions, needs to be regarded as and reconsidered. Not because public employees should not be treated fairly, for of course they should be. And not because public employees are second class citizens, for of course they are not. But because the nature of their relationship to the demand that their employees do their collective bargaining in the public sector is fundamentally different from collective bargaining in the private sector.

Collective bargaining implies party, more-less, between employer and employee; it's a side to side bargaining for economic alternatives. But such party does not exist in the public sector, since there is no alternative in the event firemen, police or other key workers go on strike. In that event a strike is not merely an inconvenience, but perhaps a matter of life or death. But much of this well publicized activity is often grouped by employee unions enjoy unprecedented job security; only in the very worst of times is there any suggestion that civil services 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 the scope of their demands.

This attitude is understandable, especially since not a few politicians have encouraged municipal unionists to believe that government officials are in fact treasurers. But now 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 just doesn't add up that municipal worker jobs and payrolls have been expanding constantly while productivity has declined and municipal services are worse than ever.

This situation isn't likely to get any better unless city halls, state houses and even Washington begin showing more backbone. One way to do it is to impose 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 from the outset efforts to expand the power of public employee unions.

RESIGNATION OF SECRETARY HATHAWAY

Mr. McGee, Mr. President, it is with deep regret but I notify the resignation yesterday of Stanley K. Hathaway as Secretary of the Interior after but 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 not whether you agree or disagree, but woman's integrity and ability are 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, in respect for the man, his integrity, and his ability, is undiminished. It is most unfortunate that the vicissitudes inherent in the human condition and the visible action of this able and dedicated public servant at the same of his public life just as he was setting about a new position of service to the entire Nation.

The people of the world where 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 has conducted 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 by Farah, Empress of Iran. She has posed the predicament facing 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 balance the achievement 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. In fact, the world'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 the Persian past and the spiritual life and culture. 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 the Iranian people are appreciative both the depth and the urgency of the issue before all 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 Pahlevi)

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 other world of spirituality that has taken the toil 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
entered a period of cultural crisis—a period whose manifestations range from what Arthur Koestler had called the "architectural esperanto" to many common problems confronting major cities throughout the world.

On the other hand, along with the enormous advances in science, we have isolated blocs of specialized knowledge that often remain impenetrable from one disciplinary viewpoint to another. Another disparity is the abyss that separates the masses from a smaller group of specialists. This is largely due to the fact that some of the discoveries of contemporary science do not readily lend themselves to normal expression in everyday language. As the physicist Erwin Schrödinger said, "When new scientific discoveries can be expressed in clear, one is confronted with statements that are less absurd than 'triangular circle' but more so than 'wings lions.' It is obvious that if the divorce between scientific expression and the understanding of the masses continues, the man's condition could become increasingly precarious.

Finally, and this is perhaps the most pressing matter that we are facing, 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 health. The optimists 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 reaches its nature while pretending to be honoring them.

Should one, under the circumstances, condemn such a statement, would it suggest, the acceleration of science and technology? Or would it claim a moratorium on scientific research? I do not believe so, because scientific discoveries are the environment, but they should at least understand the consequences.

The unpredictable progress of knowledge and science, but they should at least understand new scientific discoveries can be expressed in clear, one is confronted with statements that are less absurd than "triangular circle" but more so than "wings lions." It is obvious that if the divorce between scientific expression and the understanding of the masses continues, the man's condition could become increasingly precarious.

In other words, all relations between science and technology, especially in areas where the tempo of the last two centuries. But the qualitative dimension of progress is just as essential. We would be committing an irreparable error if we were to content ourselves with quantitative aims alone.

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 creative artists in the process of over-all planning.

In order to reconcile the computer with the demands of a spirituality that underlines the very substance of human life, how to harness the power of sources of science and technology without depriving mankind of his human heritage—this is the challenge that we face and must surmount.

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.

The July 1975 issue of Chatterbox, published by the Institute of Living, contained an article about Rabbi Feldman. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

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

RABBI FELDMAN—"RELIGIOUS LIBERAL"

Mr. 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 services. He spoke of the many people who have asked him questions 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 Riely and the Reverend Bobbitt, and experienced a very pleasant cooperation among them. He has provided many non-denominational services in the last 40 years, and 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 Elisabeth Chapel, and plans are already in motion for a celebratory ecumenical service. Plans include inviting prominent speakers to participate in the ceremonies.

Mr. Feldman is a familiar figure here, there are so many people aware of his vast knowledge. He has been a chaplain of the Temple Beth Israel in West Hartford where he has recently completed 50 years of leadership in that congregation. He is past President of the Central Conference of American Rabbis and of the Synagogue Council of America which includes all divisions of the Jewish faith. He is a past commander of the Connecticut State Guard, retiring with the rank of Colonel. He has also been a chaplain to the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Newington since it opened some forty years ago.

Rabbi Feldman's leadership has been and continues to be a valuable asset to the community as well as to the Institute of Living. It is our sincere hope that his association with us will be on-going and on-growing, and that more within the hospital will take advantage of the vast knowledge and kindness which he has always shown to us.

OREGON: WHERE ALL ROADS LEAD TO ROAM

Mr. HATFIELD. The State of Oregon has been known for its innovative legislative steps in several areas. Our work pioneering the initiative and referendum; our early child labor, workman's compensation, and other protective legislation all are well known.

More recently, the huge success of our State ban on nonreturnable beverage containers has spawned similar efforts throughout the West. A few weeks ago, Oregon became the first State to act against aerosols containing certain fluorocarbons as propellants.

Another forward-looking State law is our proposal to allocate a certain percentage of our gas tax revenues for the construction of bicycle trails.

In a recent article in Sports Illustrated, Robert Cantwell did a god job in capturing the spirit of this land and of people in Oregon who know about the legislation. I ask unanimous consent that an article from a recent Sports Illustrated be printed in the Record.

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

WHERE ALL ROADS LEAD TO ROAM

(By 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 about that." Oregon folks say, "We ought to do something to the government." It is a land of close votes, of realistic expectations, of bold experiments, of partial accomplishments. Of reforms that are praised abroad but often bog down at home.

In the 1860s, when the covered wagon emerged, a man named Stanley issued a patent that passed a law under which any married man able to drive four stakes in the ground could claim up to 160 acres. This innovation was one of the forerunners of the Homestead Act, which led to the settling of the West. But the Homestead Act created boundary lines 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...
are not fishing, or dedicating historic sites and campgrounds, or attending hearings to prevent highway death, or legions on the snowdrifts to write down volumes of the Oregon Laws and dreaming up ingenious new measures.

In the last few years, the legislature has not seen any major transportation innovations. The initiative and referendum, which enables voters to put their own laws on the ballot if the legislature refuses to act on a proposal, and the initiative and referendum, which allows citizens to propose new laws directly to the voters, are major factors in transportation policy. A petition signed by 4% of those who voted in the last gubernatorial election for an initiative, 6% for a referendum, and 6% for the initiative and referendum, was submitted to the secretary of state for processing when Oregon adopted it in 1992, and 21 other states eventually followed suit. In Oregon, the election laws were made less earthshaking reforms. One early piece of legislation that voters got on the ballot by their own initiative was a bill outlawing passage on railroads. Enthused by the prospect of passing their own laws, Oregon voters pressed on, coming up with acts increasing the bounty on jackrabbits, legalizing slot machines and regulating the sale of oleomargarine.

Prodded by Oregon's creative electorate, in 1971 the state legislature passed House Bill 1700, the first of its kind anywhere. The law provided that every highway department in the state must spend a minimum of 1% of all gasoline-taxes-money-1% of all highway revenue-generated by motorists and pedestrians. The Oregon gasoline tax is 7¢ per gallon, on top of the federal tax of 4¢ per gallon (and the federal tax, of course, ultimately falls back on the people), and that would be about $7 a billion gallons of gasoline a year. From this, one would assume that there is, or should be, or soon will be, enough money to build bicycle paths from Oregon to Barotonga.

Bills modeled on HB 1700 have been introduced into the legislature at least 30 other states, and the Oregon law is held by cyclists to be only a little less epochal than Magna Carta. Such bills are now being considered by legislatures in at least 50 other states. The Oregon highway department has completed or had under construction about 100 miles of bicycle paths. Most of the path is the Oregon Highway Department's Highway Department, and that department uses money it raises by selling bicycle plates. They are settling the case of Oregon's many legislative and constitutional duties to protect the environment, they are settling the case of Oregon's many legislative and constitutional duties to protect the environment. The department was forced to build the paths to keep them out of the way of automobile drivers who would use the highway department to build the paths to keep them out of the way of automobile drivers who would use the highway department. The Oregon legislature decided that the highway department hurriedly built a number of short paths in widely separated locations, using highway maintenance crews when they were not working at their regular jobs. Counters were placed on some of the paths, and the highways department would use them. A questionnaire was sent to 1000 bicyclists asking why they rode: For exercise? For fun? For socializing? A thousand copies were mailed to names selected at random, and every one percent replied that they rode for exercise.

Ten thousand copies were mailed to names selected at random again, and every one percent replied that they rode for exercise. Ten thousand copies were mailed to names selected at random again, and every one percent replied that they rode for exercise. Ten thousand copies were mailed to names selected at random again, and every one percent replied that they rode for exercise. Ten thousand copies were mailed to names selected at random again, and every one percent replied that they rode for exercise. Ten thousand copies were mailed to names selected at random again, and every one percent replied that they rode for exercise.

Still, by the time the 1973 Oregon legislative session opened, the highway department had completed or had under construction about 100 miles of bicycle paths. 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 on the path building for the Oregon Department of Transportation. You mark where you think a bicycle path should be built and try to get the state to build it, if you can imagine a bicycle path in your mind," said a man at a hearing in Eugene. Asked to step closer to the microphone, he said his name was Skeeter Duke. He wore a red-checked shirt and brown corduroy trousers, and had the nervously determined air of a man about to reveal his private fantasies. "Yes, Mr. Duke?" asked a committee member sympathetically. "I'd like to see a bicycle path built from Eugene to the coast at Florence, or to the Pacific Ocean," he said. Skeeter Duke.

As fantasies go, this was one even a part-time bicyclist could appreciate. If such a path were built, it could go from the city of Eugene and the University of Oregon, through level farmlands, past some good fishing sites on the Snake River, and enter the low mountains of the Coast Range.

There it would thread through narrow valleys, with timbered slopes on both sides so steep that even the trees seem to remain standing. Then it would enter the coastal basalt plateau, and on the westward it would enter the highlands of Oregon. In this part of the state, the ratio of cars to bikes is 8 to 1. Davis' growth began in the late '60's, after the University of California's agricultural college branch was turned into a liberal arts college. Bicycles became so numerous that motorists could not get through the streets. Some of Davis' streets happen to be extremely wide. It was possible to park cars and bicycles on the side of the street or in the driveways. Few people rode bicycles, and in the daytime they virtually force automobiles off the road. A bridge for bicycles and pedestrians arcs over the 200-foot-wide river to the University of Oregon campus. The path is a favorite training ground for the university's distance runners, and is beloved by bird watchers, elderly hikers and cyclists. Roundabouts and stop signs and tickets for drivers going 20 mph in 25 mph zones. A uniformed cop mounted on a 10-speed bike hands out tickets to speeding cyclists as well.

The Oregon legislature decided that the Davis program depended too much on unique local conditions to be applicable to Oregon. So the highway department hurriedly built a number of short paths in widely separated locations, using highway maintenance crews when they were not working at their regular jobs. Counters were placed on some of the paths, and the highways department would use them. A questionnaire was sent to 1000 bicyclists asking why they rode: For exercise? For fun? For socializing? A thousand copies were mailed to names selected at random, and every one percent replied that they rode for exercise. Ten thousand copies were mailed to names selected at random again, and every one percent replied that they rode for exercise. Ten thousand copies were mailed to names selected at random again, and every one percent replied that they rode for exercise. Ten thousand copies were mailed to names selected at random again, and every one percent replied that they rode for exercise. Ten thousand copies were mailed to names selected at random again, and every one percent replied that they rode for exercise.

Still, by the time the 1973 Oregon legislative session opened, the highway department had completed or had under construction about 100 miles of bicycle paths. 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 on the path building for the Oregon Department of Transportation. You mark where you think a bicycle path should be built and try to get the state to build it, if you can imagine a bicycle path in your mind," said a man at a hearing in Eugene. Asked to step closer to the microphone, he said his name was Skeeter Duke. He wore a red-checked shirt and brown corduroy trousers, and had the nervously determined air of a man about to reveal his private fantasies. "Yes, Mr. Duke?" asked a committee member sympathetically. "I'd like to see a bicycle path built from Eugene to the coast at Florence, or to the Pacific Ocean," he said. Skeeter Duke.

As fantasies go, this was one even a part-time bicyclist could appreciate. If such a path were built, it could go from the city of Eugene and the University of Oregon, through level farmlands, past some good fishing sites on the Snake River, and enter the low mountains of the Coast Range.

There it would thread through narrow valleys, with timbered slopes on both sides so steep that even the trees seem to remain standing. Then it would enter the coastal basalt plateau, and on the westward it would enter the highlands of Oregon. In this part of the state, the ratio of cars to bikes is 8 to 1. Davis' growth began in the late '60's, after the University of California's agricultural college branch was turned into a liberal arts college. Bicycles became so numerous that motorists could not get through the streets. Some of Davis' streets happen to be extremely wide. It was possible to park cars and bicycles on the side of the street or in the driveways. Few people rode bicycles, and in the daytime they virtually force automobiles off the road. A bridge for bicycles and pedestrians arcs over the 200-foot-wide river to the University of Oregon campus. The path is a favorite training ground for the university's distance runners, and is beloved by bird watchers, elderly hikers and cyclists. Roundabouts and stop signs and tickets for drivers going 20 mph in 25 mph zones. A uniformed cop mounted on a 10-speed bike hands out tickets to speeding cyclists as well.

The Oregon legislature decided that the Davis program depended too much on unique local conditions to be applicable to Oregon. So the highway department hurriedly built a number of short paths in widely separated locations, using highway maintenance crews when they were not working at their regular jobs. Counters were placed on some of the paths, and the highways department would use them. A questionnaire was sent to 1000 bicyclists asking why they rode: For exercise? For fun? For socializing? A thousand copies were mailed to names selected at random, and every one percent replied that they rode for exercise. Ten thousand copies were mailed to names selected at random again, and every one percent replied that they rode for exercise. Ten thousand copies were mailed to names selected at random again, and every one percent replied that they rode for exercise. Ten thousand copies were mailed to names selected at random again, and every one percent replied that they rode for exercise. Ten thousand copies were mailed to names selected at random again, and every one percent replied that they rode for exercise.

Still, by the time the 1973 Oregon legislative session opened, the highway department had completed or had under construction about 100 miles of bicycle paths. 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 on the path building for the Oregon Department of Transportation. You mark where you think a bicycle path should be built and try to get the state to build it, if you can imagine a bicycle path in your mind," said a man at a hearing in Eugene. Asked to step closer to the microphone, he said his name was Skeeter Duke. He wore a red-checked shirt and brown corduroy trousers, and had the nervously determined air of a man about to reveal his private fantasies. "Yes, Mr. Duke?" asked a committee member sympathetically. "I'd like to see a bicycle path built from Eugene to the coast at Florence, or to the Pacific Ocean," he said. Skeeter Duke.

As fantasies go, this was one even a part-time bicyclist could appreciate. If such a path were built, it could go from the city of Eugene and the University of Oregon, through level farmlands, past some good fishing sites on the Snake River, and enter the low mountains of the Coast Range.
the distance between towns was so great that the bad hit the state with extraordinary force. There were so many bicycles in the wide-open spaces of the state that the Idaho border in eastern Oregon that bicycle riding on the sidewalk was prohibited in 1890. That same year, Baker County along the abandoned narrow-gage railroad line through worked-out gold fields to the ghost town of Bourne. The emigrants were not used to living except a sumptuous mansion dating from the turn of the century. The swindlers of Bourne were unsurpassed in the way they sold stock in the city of Salem, Portland, New York and Bourne, long after it was well known there was no gold in its mines. The whole town was in on the secret, and two different (but identical-appearing) editions of the local newspaper were printed, one containing authentic news, the other, containing entirely fictitious references to nonexistent gold strikes. The inhabitants spent much of their time packing. For instance, a newspaper offended by, and the masquerade, sometimes called the most outrageous gold-mining swindle of all time, went on for several years.

The nationwide bicycle boom reached its peak in the fall of 1894, with about 75 million, and 1,182,691 new bicycles were sold. At that time the population of Oregon was one of the state's largest. Oregon had about 3,600 miles of bicycle paths over 60 separate routes. Most of the paths were built by local bicycle clubs. They were narrow, limiting cyclists to single file. Two miles of bicycle paths from town to town through the woods. In a sense, the paths of the '70s, resemble those of two generations later, for the nation was then in the late stages of industrialization. The first 44 miles of paths built with gasoline-tax money were the result of no less than 35 different projects by the state, counties and towns, most of them less than half a mile long.

Today the Oregon highway department has a department that promotes bicycle travel. The premise is that it will cost $101 million to complete. But that, too, is an old story. Oregon has no need to duplicate this experiment. At one time, under the initiative and referendum, the electorate approved a measure to charge a sales tax of 1 cent down on the money to build it. During the gold rush, voters approved a plan to finance the construction of a railway in Jackson­ville by mining gold from the excavation for the building's basement. Despite such traditions, the voters take it for granted that HB 1700 will be implemented while feeling considerable satisfaction that so many other states are following their example.

Meanwhile, pending the completion of their paths, cyclists tour on little-used back roads. Following a path described in Nick and Elke Jankowski's 55 Oregon Bicycle Trips, one cyclist met a single car in 21 miles. The hard-topped road runs through a small forest of dead apple trees, all that remains of a gigantic apple-growing insurance scheme. The idea was that the trees' plantings in one's estate would provide retirement income in old age, but they never produced any fruit.

In 55 Oregon Bicycle Trips one gains an idea of the homely attractions to be found on the way: each steep hill meticulously labeled with letters, the 1910s, blackberry bushes, wrecked ships and agates in the gravel of Agate Beach. Ernest Drapela and Kevin Prat's 30 Bike Rides in Oregon gives you how to cycle to a scenic attraction where there is a sign reading, what are you doing about Jesus? The book guides you to an abandoned school­house filled with hay, a riverbank populated with beavers, a windmill, a lot of waterfalls, a salmon pool, driftwood, and a list of public campgrounds where you can go to the toilet.

One of the projected new paths is to run from the city of Salem down to the coast as Grand Cycle. The bike path, through groves of pines and madrona trees and the town of Wonder (so named because people wondered how anybody could make a living there), is about 26 miles later, in the Oregon Caves. Another path, in the southwest corner of the state, will run near the Siuslaw River valley. The Siuslaw River valley is a scenic attraction where there is a sign reading, what are you doing about Jesus? The book guides you to an abandoned school­house filled with hay, a riverbank populated with beavers, a windmill, a lot of waterfalls, a salmon pool, driftwood, and a list of public campgrounds where you can go to the toilet.

One of the projected new paths is to run from the city of Salem down to the coast as Grand Cycle. The bike path, through groves of pines and madrona trees and the town of Wonder (so named because people wondered how anybody could make a living there), is about 26 miles later, in the Oregon Caves. Another path, in the southwest corner of the state, will run near the Siuslaw River valley. The Siuslaw River valley is a scenic attraction where there is a sign reading, what are you doing about Jesus? The book guides you to an abandoned school­house filled with hay, a riverbank populated with beavers, a windmill, a lot of waterfalls, a salmon pool, driftwood, and a list of public campgrounds where you can go to the toilet.

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 the nation and 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 implementing 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 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 throwaway beverage containers and to substitute returnable glass containers.

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 shown 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.

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 Fears 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:

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONSUMERS ABOUT AEROSOLS—FROM SAMUEL C. JOHNSON, CHAIRMAN, JOHNSON WAX, RACINE, WIS.

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 who, I hope, will want to carry on the tradition.

AEROSOLS TODAY

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 confidential research has been done in this country, and the world as a whole 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.

FLUOROCARBONS AND OZONE

The most important problem right now is that some aerosol cans release a certain type of gas called fluorocarbon. It has several names, (e.g., Freon, 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 there is a very serious concern, and several 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 being carried on by the International Geophysical Year. In addition, the National Academy of Sciences has stratospheric investigations underway which are expected to be completed early next year. Additional investigation is 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 aerosols use other kinds of propellants, including hydrocarbons and carbon dioxide.

About 15 years ago, Johnson & Johnson marketed 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 our own technical research, health concerns, and a desire to be an innovator. As much as possible, we have developed new products that do not contain fluorocarbon propellants.
Numerous scientific studies have confirmed the initial charges. Robert Rowland and Mario Molina, N.A.S. portraits of fluorocarbon-caused ozone depletion.

Ten days ago a Federal interagency task force recommended after four months of study that all aeroal 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 1st. Oregon's bill bans all aerosol propellants used in Oregon.

Legislators in 13 other states and in Congress have introduced bills to ban, restrict or control the aerosol propellants in their states.

Last year, after a quarter century of spectacular growth in which aerosol production rocketed from 4.3 billion cases in 1947 to a record 2.9 billion in 1975, production dropped to 2.7 billion cans, reflecting both the ozone controversy and recession.

This year, some aerosol producers have cut output by 25 per cent or more.

Hoping to postpone or prevent additional market erosion, the aerosol industry has begun its own ozone study, muddled sophisticated lobbies against antifluorocarbon bills, and expanded research and development programs.

Aerosol spray cans use pressurized gases such as hydrocarbons or fluorocarbons as propellants. These gases hold the can's active ingredients — deodorant, insecticide, plant growth stimulator, or any one of a thousand other products — in suspension. 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 — hair sprays, antiperspirants, perfumes and pharmaceuticals — make up half of all aerosol sales. They generally use fluorocarbons as propellants, as do most insecticides and air fresheners.

Fluorocarbons have the advantage on hydrocarbons, in that they reduce the flammability of personal care products, which often have an alcohol base. If hydrocarbons, 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 glaze, edge protectives, shampoos, toilet products — use hydrocarbons, which are not suspected of depleting ozone. These products evaporate rapidly and don't (in industry parlance) "overpower" the hydrocarbons' flammability.

Aerosols are not the only things being blamed for depleting ozone, however. Scientists say that the nitrous oxides in the exhausts from supersonic transports and the fluorocarbons used in and escaping from leaky refrigerators and air conditioners also contribute to ozone depletion. Aerosols use half the fluorocarbons produced annually and are the ones most affected by refrigerators and air conditioners.

What Dr. Rowland and Dr. Molina wrote in Nature magazine (May 6, 1974), that cloud chemistry which shields the earth from ultraviolet radiation, causing the earth to cool. Rowland's assumptions as the nonsense I think they are," Mr. Abplanalp said.

A. Karim Almed, 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 have been done."

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

To conduct research for the industry, 30 corporations and five trade associations have formed the Council on Atmospheric Studies, a three-year study costing up to $5 million of whom containing compounds, including fluorocarbons, affect the atmosphere and stratosphere. The result is attributed to the recession.

Du Pont's sales of Freon, its trade name for fluorocarbons, have been 25 per cent below last year's level in the first quarter of 1976. Du Pont accounts for one half of the 1 billion pounds of fluorocarbons produced in the nation annually. This in turn is half the world's production.

The Preston Valve Company of Younger, N.Y., the world's leading valve company, said its profits fell more than 1 billion valves last year. Its production was down 20 per cent last February and March.

Robert H. Abplanalp, an industry pioneer who perfected the aerosol valve, Preston's president and an intimate of former President Nixon, said the drop may have been a result of the controversy and ozone scare stories appearing in the media.

The worst outcome of the controversy for industry, of course, would be the outright ban of fluorocarbon aerosol.

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 inexcusable increase in skin cancer, among other things.

The industry assures its critics that, like everyone else, it does not want to see more ozone for its cases. But the industry is a peculiar, useful industry should not be snuffed out 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 I think they are." Mr. Abplanalp said.
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states involved, the bills have been killed outright, and in four all action on fluorocarbons is dormant.

In California, the bill was killed in committee by a vote of 7-6. A Democratic staff consultant on the legislation, defeated following the concentrated efforts of DuPont, Continental Can, American Can, the California Manufacturers Association, the California Chamber of Commerce, the Teamsters union and other laborers union.

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

In Congress, Representative Paul D. Rogers, Democratic of Florida, who chairs the Subcommittee on the Environment, Industry and Standards of the House Committee of Ways and Means, has been vigorous in his support for the legislation. Rogers introduced a bill to ban fluorocarbon aerosols.

However, under industry pressure, Mr. Rogers' bill is being修改ed so much that instead of requiring a ban it would require the Environmental Protection Administration to report to Congress within two years, after reviewing 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 industry analysts estimate that, in the event of a ban, three to nine years would be needed to develop and market substitution products to match fluorocarbon aerosols. However, under industry pressure, Mr. Rogers' bill is being modified so much that instead of requiring a ban it would require the Environmental Protection Administration to report to Congress within two years, after reviewing ozone depletion, to recommend whether action be taken.

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 1896. Jews have served with distinction in U.S. wars from the Revolution to the war in Vietnam, and have always participated and volunteered with military forces in all the major wars since the time that a Jewish War Veterans Post was established 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, located in the State of New Mexico, was held in accordance with our by-laws and by the rules of the American Legion.

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, located in the State of New Mexico, was held in accordance with our by-laws and by the rules of the American Legion.

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, located in the State of New Mexico, was held in accordance with our by-laws and by the rules of the American Legion.

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, located in the State of New Mexico, was held in accordance with our by-laws and by the rules of the American Legion.
Address by Robert Fleisher, Commander of Albuquerque, N.M. Post No. 375.
Benediction: Rabbi Leonard A. Helman of Santa Fe, N.M.
Closing of Altar.
Retiring of Salute to Colors: The American Flag by Eastyman Symphonic Wind Ensemble.
Exit Music to Buffet Dinner:
Parade March #1—The Goldman Band.
Edward Franco Goldman, Conductor.
Colonel Bogey March—The Goldman Band.
On the Hudson—The Goldman Band.
Musical Arrangements by Gerald I. Feit (on tape) taken from official Army Field Music.
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THE ADMINISTRATION'S OIL POLICY—WHO ADMINISTERS IT?

Mr. ABBOUREZK. 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. It can be oil policy and at the same time be incidental that significant numbers of former oil company employees, lawyers, and consultants occupy top-grade positions in 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 the oil industry. These agencies all have responsibilities which bring them close to the oil industry. The GAO declined to comment whether or not these owners and associates have inputs of any 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 policies.

The companies listed below do not control only domestic oil supplies. They control and produce and market oil in every one of the areas of the countries, and the point of view of the companies which have a good understanding with and access to a couple of Under Secretaries of the Department of 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 studied, 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 for example, though its make-up will not be undergoing and will have a meshing of Government activity from the smallest adjustment to the broadest exemption.

We must ask whether personnel in its Office of General Counsel had had previous oil company clients. Thus, we can assume that today's figure is greater than 201.

The data I am 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. Some 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 commission, with one exception, have all but announced that they favor the 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 smaller "independents." We must ask whether this distribution does not lend weight to the argument that the FEA's policies and enforcement favor the major industry.

The allocations and equalization programs distinguish significantly between major and smaller companies, and between integrated companies and 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 shortages; and change the legislation and administration of mineral leases. These are sensitive parts 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 the chairman of the board and chief executive of Exxon. It should be remembered, is one of the 25 largest defense contractors. The Deputy Secretary of Defense is formerly the chairman of the board and chief executive of Exxon.

In the case of consultants, in addition, many are still employed by companies which are on the receiving end of contracts or regulations. In the Defense Department these individuals responsibilities include developing procurement policies and directives, for example.

The assertion that these people are the only ones with the expertise to administer oil policy is false. There is no need for people in policymaking positions to have technical knowledge of geology—they must have a clear understanding of the balance between public interest and economic health, and of the principles which preserve this balance. They must first be proved—how a good economist reads tables as well as an oil company economist.

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 preceding page of the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/title</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Department of Defense</th>
<th>Energy Research and Development Administration</th>
<th>Federal Power Commission</th>
<th>Department of Transportation</th>
<th>Interstate Commerce Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GS-13 Personnel management specialist</td>
<td>Texas Oil Co.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-14 Physical science administrator</td>
<td>ESSO Standard Oil Co.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-12 Environmental specialist</td>
<td>Westgate-Greenland Comptroller General</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LISTING OF FORMER OIL COMPANY, OIL COMPANY AFFILIATED AND OIL COMPANY RELATED EXECUTIVES AS ATTORNEYS WHO THEMSELVES OR WHOSE LAW FIRMS REPRESENT OIL COMPANIES NOW WORKING FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN POSITIONS PRIMARY ABOVE THE GS-12 LEVEL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company name</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
<th>Department of Energy Administration</th>
<th>Department of the Interior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas Oil Co.</td>
<td>Wagesman</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSO Standard Oil Co.</td>
<td>Weightman</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westgate-Greenland</td>
<td>District agent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Central Intelligence Agency did not respond, and we trust the information furnished will serve the purpose of your request. 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 I 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 the grade for expert and consultant positions. However, only a few exceptions, such individuals are paid the maximum rate allowable—the daily equivalent of $85.00 per annum or $138 per day for each service 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 from the company. We also compiled a list of examples of the duties performed by the employees in their Federal positions.

Enclosure II contains the department's or agency's response to each request. It includes a detailed analysis of the employee's former employment, and any lump-sum payments or deferred compensation rights received at time of separation from the company. We also compiled a list of examples of the duties performed by the employees in their Federal positions.

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.

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 preceding page of the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
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<th>Department of the Interior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
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<td>District agent</td>
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**LISTING OF FORMER OIL COMPANY, OIL COMPANY AFFILIATED AND OIL COMPANY RELATED EXECUTIVES AS ATTORNEYS WHO THEMSELVES OR WHOSE LAW FIRMS REPRESENT OIL COMPANIES NOW WORKING FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN POSITIONS PRIMARY 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>Former employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Texas W.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Director, operations division</td>
<td>LaSalle Refining Co.</td>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aven, Robert O.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Supervisory price analyst</td>
<td>Union Oil Co. of California</td>
<td>Management trainee, special task force member</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes, Donald K.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Economist</td>
<td>Exxon</td>
<td>Engineer and real estate agent</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartley, William</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Petroleum engineer</td>
<td>Shell Oil Co.</td>
<td>District representative</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeker, Donald J.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Regional administrator</td>
<td>Texaco</td>
<td>Accounting clerk</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beebe, Donald K.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Program analyst</td>
<td>Oasis Oil Co.</td>
<td>Accounting clerk</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevan, John G.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Program analyst</td>
<td>Mobile Oil Co.</td>
<td>Technical specialist</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biewer, John H.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Member, Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Sunray Oil Co.</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borden, John E.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Supervisory industrial specialist</td>
<td>Gulf Oil Co.</td>
<td>Manager, marketing and development</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Donald D.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Supv., case resolution officer</td>
<td>Humble Oil</td>
<td>Assistant administrative specialist</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buhler, Donald J.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Cities Service Oil Co.</td>
<td>Manager, compliance</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childs, Donald J.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Industrial specialist</td>
<td>Gulf Oil Co.</td>
<td>Regional and program supplement</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluns, Donald K.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Mobile Oil Co.</td>
<td>Manager, financial control</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen, Robert J.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Program analyst</td>
<td>H. S. Holappa &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Assistant manager</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keam, Philip F.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Program analyst</td>
<td>Commonwealth Oil Refining Co.</td>
<td>Manager, petroleum engineering</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koerkemburn, Dennis</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Petroleum specialist</td>
<td>Citrus Petroleum</td>
<td>Manager, planning and process</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugo, Gerald L.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Economist</td>
<td>Shell Calif.</td>
<td>Manager, finance and operations</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langdon, James C.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Supervisory. tax law specialist</td>
<td>Cities Service Oil Co.</td>
<td>Manager, sales</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaney, Samuel R.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Director, operations division</td>
<td>Exxon</td>
<td>Regional and program supplement</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, John R.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Director, operations division</td>
<td>Mobile Oil Co.</td>
<td>Technical specialist</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichterweiler, Charles</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Auditor</td>
<td>Petroleum Geophysical Co.</td>
<td>Assistant manager</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubke, Lawrence</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Physical science administrator</td>
<td>Exploration Consultants, Inc.</td>
<td>Manager, petroleum engineering</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malin, Lionel B.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Foreign affairs officer</td>
<td>Standard Oil</td>
<td>Manager, petroleum exploration</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maitland, Ivan F.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Trade specialist</td>
<td>Mobile Oil Co.</td>
<td>Manager, petroleum exploration</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfield, IRA C.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Physical science administrator</td>
<td>Atlantic Refining Co.</td>
<td>Manager, petroleum exploration</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCord, James A.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Director, operations division</td>
<td>International Petroleum of Columbia, Ltd.</td>
<td>Assistant manager</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehovic, George E.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Executive assistant</td>
<td>Humble Oil and Refining Co.</td>
<td>Manager, petroleum engineering</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metz, Alfred C.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Supervisory industrial specialist</td>
<td>B.P. Oil Co.</td>
<td>Manager, petroleum engineering</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, Robert W.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Regional administrator</td>
<td>Exxon</td>
<td>Manager, petroleum engineering</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, James R.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Program analyst</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Corp.</td>
<td>Manager, petroleum engineering</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muller, John G.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Mechanical engineer</td>
<td>Standard Oil Co. of California</td>
<td>Manager, petroleum engineering</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuegge, John M.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Staff assistant</td>
<td>Texaco Inc.</td>
<td>Manager, petroleum engineering</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver, David R.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Asst. director programs and analysis</td>
<td>Ashland Oil &amp; Refining Co.</td>
<td>Manager, petroleum engineering</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osbourne, John H.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Program analyst</td>
<td>Ashland Oil &amp; Refining Co.</td>
<td>Manager, petroleum engineering</td>
<td>Not given</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.
- Analyzing current and projected events and proposed actions in the United States and worldwide on oil and gas supplies and requirements.
- Dealing with exploration of crude oil, natural gas, and geothermal fluids.
- Discharging operational responsibilities in the restriction on production of crude oils, unfininished petroleum oils, and finished petroleum products.
- Developing recommendations for legislation and administration procedures to update mineral leasing acts.
- Dealing with the development and reliability of United States access to foreign energy supplies and the energy relationship of the United States to other nations.
- Developing, reviewing, and coordinating policies related to internationally-oriented activities in area of energy matters, multinational corporations, equitable allocation, pricing and utilization.
- Keeping informed on the economic conditions and developments in and between energy producing nations and industries.

**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—Department of the Interior**

<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>Parker, Norbert A</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Geologist</td>
<td>Carter Oil Co.</td>
<td>Miscellaneous geologist</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fecorano, Joseph</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Supervisory resourceman</td>
<td>Exxon Corp.</td>
<td>Engineer and operation adv.</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fello, Chester R</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Supervisory geologist</td>
<td>Standard Oil Co.</td>
<td>Manager, engineering research</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry, Dell V</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Distribution specialist</td>
<td>Humble Oil Co.</td>
<td>Terminal superintendent</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powers, E. Lloyd</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Auditor</td>
<td>Gulf Oil &amp; Development Co.</td>
<td>Senior research geologist</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice, Donald R</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Financial analyst</td>
<td>Shell Oil Co.</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stein, David L</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Director, industrial systems and data analysis</td>
<td>Shell Oil Co.</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story, Joseph C</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>International economist</td>
<td>Self-employment</td>
<td>Financial analyst</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Barlock</td>
<td>GS-19</td>
<td>Economist</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topping, Clyde P</td>
<td>GS-11</td>
<td>Industry economist</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Co.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinsin, Stanley L</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Auditor</td>
<td>Mobile Oil Corp.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner, Arthur J</td>
<td>GS-11</td>
<td>Physical scientist</td>
<td>American Oil Co.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, George W</td>
<td>GS-11</td>
<td>Supervisor case resolution officer</td>
<td>American Petroleum Oil Co.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willock, Jack</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Petroleum engineer</td>
<td>Sinclair Oil Co.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willock, Jack</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Petroleum engineer</td>
<td>Shell Oil Co.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worley, Emery K</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Federal/State liaison officer</td>
<td>Shell Oil Co.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yost, Mervin W</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Expert—energy resource development</td>
<td>Shell Oil Co.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developing recommendations for legislation and administration procedures to update mineral leasing acts.

**For former employment:**
- Dealing with exploration of crude oil, natural gas, and geothermal fluids.
- Discharging operational responsibilities in the restriction on production of crude oils, unfinished petroleum oils, and finished petroleum products.
- Developing recommendations for legislation and administration procedures to update mineral leasing acts.

**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>Position/title</th>
<th>Lump-sum payments or deferred compensation rights received on separation</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>Owner</td>
<td>Sold complete interest to individual party</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>Attorney-client</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beasley, D. Otis</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Standard Oil of New Jersey</td>
<td>Party chief—Field geologist</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackkamper, Erna</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Hydrologist</td>
<td>Petrole Brasileiro S.A.</td>
<td>Geological supervisor—Exploration manager's staff</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, William S</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Patent attorney</td>
<td>Union Oil Co. of California</td>
<td>Patent attorney</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottrell, W. D.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Chief, Bureau of Land and Mineral Resources, Division of Resources</td>
<td>Tide Water Oil Co.</td>
<td>Engineer and operations supervisor</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman, C. Brewster, Jr.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Assistant Solicitor, Territories</td>
<td>American Pipeline Corp.</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, C. Keith</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Geologist (administrative)</td>
<td>American Stratigraphic Corp.</td>
<td>Vice president</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froelich, Albert J</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Geologist</td>
<td>San Jose Oil &amp; Gas Co.</td>
<td>Surface geologist party chief</td>
<td>Lump-sum payment of $8,685 received from profit-sharing retirement plan through Great West Life Assurance Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerrity, Thomas A</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Field selector</td>
<td>Canso Oil &amp; Gas Co.</td>
<td>Senior Subsurface engineer</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammel, Judge</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Administrative Law Judge</td>
<td>Magellan Petroleum Corp.</td>
<td>Senior geologist and acting manager</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stahl, William W</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Field selector</td>
<td>Shell Oil Co.</td>
<td>Staff attorney</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lump-sum payment of $8,685 received from profit-sharing retirement plan through Great West Life Assurance Co.
LAW

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 geoscience 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.

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>Bensinger, Carl Howard</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Nuclear engineer</td>
<td>Central Research Laboratories</td>
<td>Research chemist</td>
<td>Lump-sum payment for unused vacation time. Payment may also have covered a small personal contribution to company retirement fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright, Glenn O</td>
<td>STS-1</td>
<td>Permanent technician, Atomic Safety and Licensing</td>
<td>Amerada Petroleum, Shell Oil Co, Shell Development Co</td>
<td>Research chemist</td>
<td>Not identifiable to specific company. Accured retirement payments of $608 per month from Shell following statutory retirement age at 60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinkman, Donald S</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Coordinator for technical specifications</td>
<td>Amoco Co</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, E. H</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Systems engineer</td>
<td>Gulf General Atomic</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Walter H</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Geologist</td>
<td>Mallory, Charles</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beck, John H, Jr</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Assistant director</td>
<td>Mobile Oil Co</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns, John J</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Staff assistant, environment &amp; region</td>
<td>Mobile Oil Co de Venezuela</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lohrenz, John</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Chief, SA development</td>
<td>Mobile Oil Co</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallory, Charles K, Jr</td>
<td>GS-17</td>
<td>Deputy Assistant Secretary (Power Resources and Regulation)</td>
<td>Mobile Oil Co</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothershead, James</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Staff assistant, environment &amp; region</td>
<td>Shell Oil Co</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, Alan K</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Assistant Solicitor</td>
<td>Texas Oil Co</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish, William W</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Assistant to the Secretary</td>
<td>texas Oil Co</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt, James L</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Texas Oil Co</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, David</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Geologist</td>
<td>Texas Oil Co</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shreeve, Detweil C</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Attorney-advisor</td>
<td>Texas Oil Co</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soller, Charles H</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Assistant solicitor</td>
<td>Texas Oil Co</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate, Max, Jr</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Training officer and staff engineer</td>
<td>Texas Oil Co</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchudy, Robert H</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Research geologist (cablebathy)</td>
<td>Texas Oil Co</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodall, James O</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Assistant regional solicitor</td>
<td>Texas Oil Co</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wunnickle, William G</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Petroleum engineer</td>
<td>Texas Oil Co</td>
<td>None.</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

<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>Beddinger, Carl Howard</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Nuclear engineer</td>
<td>Central Research Laboratories</td>
<td>Nuclear safety engineer</td>
<td>Not given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinkman, Donald S</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Coordinator for technical specifications</td>
<td>Amoco Co</td>
<td>Research engineer and quality assurance engineer.</td>
<td>Not given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, E. H</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Systems engineer</td>
<td>Gulf General Atomic</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Walter H</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Geologist</td>
<td>Mallory, Charles</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beck, John H, Jr</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Assistant director, environment &amp; region</td>
<td>Mallory, Charles</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns, John J</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Staff assistant, environment &amp; region</td>
<td>Mallory, Charles</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lohrenz, John</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Chief, SA development</td>
<td>Mallory, Charles</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallory, Charles K, Jr</td>
<td>GS-17</td>
<td>Deputy Assistant Secretary (Power Resources and Regulation)</td>
<td>Mallory, Charles</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothershead, James</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Staff assistant, environment &amp; region</td>
<td>Mallory, Charles</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, Alan K</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Assistant Solicitor</td>
<td>Mallory, Charles</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish, William W</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Assistant to the Secretary</td>
<td>Mallory, Charles</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt, James L</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Mallory, Charles</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, David</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Geologist</td>
<td>Mallory, Charles</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shreeve, Detweil C</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Attorney-advisor</td>
<td>Mallory, Charles</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soller, Charles H</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Assistant solicitor</td>
<td>Mallory, Charles</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate, Max, Jr</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Training officer and staff engineer</td>
<td>Mallory, Charles</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchudy, Robert H</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Research geologist (cablebathy)</td>
<td>Mallory, Charles</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodall, James O</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Assistant regional solicitor</td>
<td>Mallory, Charles</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wunnickle, William G</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Petroleum engineer</td>
<td>Mallory, Charles</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LISTING OF FORMER OIL COMPANY, OIL COMPANY AFFILIATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
<th>Company name</th>
<th>Position/title</th>
<th>Former employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burkhardt, Winston</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Sr. chemical engineer</td>
<td>Arco Chemical Co.</td>
<td>Site manager</td>
<td>Not given.</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>
<td>Not given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colton, John P.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Fuel fabrication engineer</td>
<td>Gulf Nuclear Union Corp.</td>
<td>Quality control manager</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kovacs, John M.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Mechanical engineer</td>
<td>Aerogel-Geneco</td>
<td>Engineering specialist</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraus, Harry Euerth</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Licensing project manager</td>
<td>Exxon Nuclear</td>
<td>Senior nuclear engineer</td>
<td>None.</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>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Kelly, Artie A.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultor</td>
<td>Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>NA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker, Frank L.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Atlantic Richfield Harford Co.</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>NA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schroeder, Frank, Jr.</td>
<td>GS-17</td>
<td>Acting Director, Division of Technical Review, Office of Nuclear Reactor Licensing</td>
<td>Phillips Petroleum Co.</td>
<td>Manager, water reactor safety program office</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Thomas R.</td>
<td>GS-16</td>
<td>Acting Director, Office of Operations Evaluation</td>
<td>Phillips Petroleum Co.</td>
<td>Manager, field project engineer</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnote on following page.**
### 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>Naheem, Stephen A.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant (interrim)</td>
<td>Surrey, Karrass and Morse</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhoades, Theodore E.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Attorney-adviser (tax legislation)</td>
<td>Morrison, Forester, Holliday, Clinton &amp; Clark</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt, 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, Madele</td>
<td>Executive level V</td>
<td>Chief counsel for the Internal Revenue Service</td>
<td>Gebanis, Johnston, Gardner, &amp; Clark</td>
<td>Attorney and partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitthorn, William H.</td>
<td>GS-17</td>
<td>International economist (Director, Office of Financial Resources)</td>
<td>Exso Eastern, Inc</td>
<td>Financial and economic advisor; economist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Former employment

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 F.</td>
<td>Executive level</td>
<td>Deputy Secretary of Defense</td>
<td>Sodex, Inc</td>
<td>Chairman of board and chief executive officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danner, John J.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Supv. 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 Research</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>Huxtable, Gary W.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Attorney advisor (general)</td>
<td>Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey)</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladd, Frederick A.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Mechanical engineer (general)</td>
<td>Fury Oil &amp; Transport Co., Ltd</td>
<td>Geophysical engineer (at one period during employment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard, Robert E.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Attorney advisor real property leg &amp;</td>
<td>Atlantic Richfield Co</td>
<td>Land superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield, Morton A.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Gulf Oil Co</td>
<td>Land lease administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougal, Myres S.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Mobile/Tessco</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matte, Edward W.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Realty specialist</td>
<td>Pacific Gas &amp; Electric Co</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monismith, Carl L.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Shell Oil Research Lab</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichols, Joe E.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Mathematician</td>
<td>Standard Oil of California</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckard, David</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Geophysical Service, Inc</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeves, Bruce B.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Operations research analyst</td>
<td>Gulf Oil Co</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed, Thomas C.</td>
<td>Executive level IV</td>
<td>Director, telecommunications and command and control systems</td>
<td>Quaker Hill Oil Co, Bradley Exploration Co</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rees, Howard C.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Foreign affairs specialist</td>
<td>Overseas Taskship Corp</td>
<td>Executive trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renier, James J.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Exso Standard Oil Co</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slivker, Charles F.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Gulf Oil Co</td>
<td>Not given</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.

### Department of Defense

Excerpts of duties performed by the above employees:

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.

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.

Advise 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.
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>Former employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christians, Robert D</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Chemical engineer</td>
<td>Gulf Research &amp; Development Co.</td>
<td>Senior project engineer, management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kastinger, Carl</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Continental Oil Co.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leachy, Philip C</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Chief, real estate and maintenance management</td>
<td>Phillips Petroleum Co.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindseth, Robert D</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Supervisory communication engineer</td>
<td>Consolidation Coal Co.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leachy, Philip C</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Chief, real estate and maintenance management</td>
<td>Phillips Petroleum Co.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazocco, Nester John</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Supervisory chemical engineer</td>
<td>Consolidation Coal Co.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mott, William E, STS 24 Thermal applications specialist, Gulf Research & Development Co.

Randall, James E, GS-41 Attorney, Jersey Nuclear Co. (affiliate of Standard Oil of New Jersey).

River, Wayne W, GS-14 Industrial relations officer, Phillips Petroleum Co.


Steffen, Frederick W, GS-14 Research supervisor, chemistry, Consolidation Coal Co.

Yavorsky, Paul M, GS-15 Research supervisor, exploratory engineering, Consolidation Coal Co. (affiliate of Continental Oil Co.).

---

1 Equivalent to GS-12.
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.

Advising 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 developmental aspects 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>Former employment</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrer, John W</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Supervisory regulatory gas utility</td>
<td>South Petroleum Co.</td>
<td>Staff geologist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd, Ellis R, Jr.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Head, planning and special projects</td>
<td>Gulf Oil Corp.</td>
<td>Decision engineer,ie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensen, William</td>
<td>GS-16</td>
<td>Administrative law judge</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, John R.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Supervisory regulatory gas utility</td>
<td>Alko Oil &amp; Gas Co., Inc.</td>
<td>Production superintendent and engineer;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loring, William</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Supervisory general engineer</td>
<td>U.S. Bureau</td>
<td>Former employee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Scientific and technical schedule, equivalent to GS-16, 17, or 18.
2 Equivalent to GS-15.

Lump-sum payments or deferred compensation rights received upon separation.

---

None. Retired.

None. None. None.

None. None.

None. None.

None. None.

None. None.

None. None.
# LISTING OF FORMER OIL COMPANY, OIL COMPANY AFFILIATED AND OIL COMPANY RELATED EXECUTIVES AS WELL AS ATTORNEYS WHO THEMSELVES OR WHOM LAW FIRMS REPRESENT OIL COMPANIES NOW WORKING FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN POSITIONS PRIMARILY ABOVE THE GS-12 LEVEL—Continued

| Employee name | Grade | Position/title | Company name | Position/title | Former employment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></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, Rush, Jr.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Stulbush &amp; Ricks, Sandy, Laughlin &amp; Browder.</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>Executive level III</td>
<td>Chairman</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, Gramble &amp; Ryan).</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reisch, Charles F.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Chemical engineer</td>
<td>Arco 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>

### FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Excerpts of duties performed by the above employees:

Presiding over formal administrative hearings and issuing orders and rendering decisions on cases heard.

Supervising and programming technical investigations relating to producer rate certificates involving natural gas companies.

Engineering the analysis of transmission system pipeline applications.

Preparing reports analyzing the present and future availability of fuels for electric power generation.

Monitoring current natural gas supply levels and demand.

Consulting on geostatistics and editorial matters.

Writing opinions, orders for members, and providing written analysis of pending cases for the Commission.

### LISTING OF FORMER OIL COMPANY, OIL COMPANY AFFILIATED AND OIL COMPANY RELATED EXECUTIVES AS WELL AS ATTORNEYS WHO THEMSELVES OR WHOM 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>Former employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aubry, 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>Shell Oil Co.</td>
<td>Senior asphalt representative</td>
<td>$7,000 deferred pay in 5 annual installments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald, John R.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Highway engineer</td>
<td>Standard Oil of Indiana</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englesland, Irwin</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Operations research analyst</td>
<td>Union Oil Co. of California</td>
<td>Chemical engineer</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory, James B.</td>
<td>Executive level III</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Standard Oil of Indiana</td>
<td>General manager</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landgren, Jerome F.</td>
<td>GS-12</td>
<td>Attorney-adviser</td>
<td>Texaco Inc.</td>
<td>General counsel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattee, Frank S.</td>
<td>GS-12</td>
<td>Highway safety management specialist</td>
<td>Cities Service Oil Co.</td>
<td>General manager</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, James C.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Transportation safety manager</td>
<td>Consumers Power Co</td>
<td>General engineering manager</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Basil H., Jr.</td>
<td>GS-11</td>
<td>Attorney-adviser</td>
<td>Hunt Oil Co.</td>
<td>General counsel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, John B.</td>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Transportation industry analyst</td>
<td>Texaco</td>
<td>General counsel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisleder, Robert W.</td>
<td>GS-14</td>
<td>Electronics engineer</td>
<td>Amerada Petroleum Corp</td>
<td>Computer systems consultant</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Leon B.</td>
<td>GS-15</td>
<td>Supervisory environmental science research specialist</td>
<td>Mobil Oil Co.</td>
<td>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.

### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Excerpts of duties performed by the above employees:

Reviewing and approving state standard specifications and plans proposed for use on Federal-aid highway construction.

Conducting model/intermodal programs in pipeline safety.

Developing communication system concepts and channel control procedures for satellite air traffic control systems.

Serving as an expert in petroleum/liquid matters and carrying out natural gas engineering functions.

Determining and establishing program policies, objectives and priorities, and directing the development of action plans to accomplish the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration mission.

Planning and supervising a program of research to devise more effective means to protect highway systems against the natural hazard.

Ensuring safe water supplies for roadside rest areas.

Advising 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 not advised of the consideration 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 the 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 and 30 minutes on any debatable motion, appeal, or point of order.

Mr. MONToya. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the comments 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 2, line 11, strike "$7,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000";

On page 11, line 14, strike "$265,000" and insert "$500,000";

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. App. 2161 (b)), $16,250,000.

For payment of "Expenses, Defense Production Act" for the period July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976, $7,800,000.

On page 12, line 21, strike "$104,000" and insert "$274,000"

On page 13, line 3, strike "$386,000" and insert "$68,500"

On page 13, line 33, strike "$23,500,000" and insert "$6,750,000"

On page 14, line 2, strike "$8,875,000" and insert "$8,000,000"

On page 14, line 7, strike "$330,000" and insert "$730,000"

On page 14, line 9, strike "$132,000" and insert "$1,142,584,000"

On page 14, line 16, strike "$8,400,000" and insert "$8,500,000"

On page 17, line 11, strike "$94,500,000" and insert "$94,700,000"

On page 18, line 4, strike "$23,825,000" and insert "$23,875,000"

On page 19, line 2, strike "$20,860,000" and insert "$20,865,000"

On page 20, line 3, strike "to remain available until September 30, 1976" and insert "to remain available until September 30, 1976, and in addition a period of 30 minutes on any debatable motion, appeal, or point of order.

On page 23, line 1, strike "$1,161,384,000" and insert "$1,142,584,000"

On page 23, line 2, strike "$622,586,000" and insert "$633,766,000"

On page 23, line 3, strike "(except as provided herein)" and insert "(except as provided herein)"

On page 26, line 2, strike "Provided Further, That all amounts remaining unobligated on September 30, 1976, in connection with the special revolving fund established in Public Law 93-381, under the heading "Federal Buildings Fund, Limitations on Availability of Appropriations" which are hereby rescinded and shall be deposited in miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury of the United States" and insert "Provided Further, That all amounts remaining unobligated on September 30, 1976, in connection with the special revolving fund established in Public Law 93-381, under the heading "Federal Buildings Fund, Limitations on Availability of Appropriations" which are hereby rescinded and shall be deposited in miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury of the United States"

On page 24, line 13, strike "$840,000,000" and insert "$425,000,000"

On page 24, line 15, strike "$839,000,000" and insert "$391,000,000"

On page 25, line 16, strike "$1,141,354,000" and insert "$1,069,300,000"

On page 25, line 31, strike "$474,050,000" and insert "$653,000,000"

On page 25, line 23, strike "$26,300,000" and insert "$27,000,000"

On page 25, line 9, strike "$110,000,000" and insert "$111,750,000"

On page 26, line 1, strike "$39,750,000" and insert "$250,000,000"

On page 26, line 2, strike "$40,000,000" and insert "$16,000,000"

On page 26, line 6, strike "$374,050,000" and insert "$26,300,000"

On page 26, line 10, following "United States", insert the following: Provided further, That not more than the amount so transferred to the Treasury Department into a special account pursuant to section 9 of the Act of June 14, 1948, 48 Stat. 339 (40 U.S.C. 401a), and available pursuant to annual appropriation Acts, may be transferred and consolidated on the books of the Treasury Department into a special account pursuant to section 9 of the Act of June 14, 1948, 48 Stat. 339 (40 U.S.C. 401a), in accordance with the purposes specified in such section.

On page 27, line 11, strike "$160,000,000" and insert "$325,000,000"

On page 27, line 14, strike "$40,000,000" and insert "$8,900,000"

On page 28, line 21, strike "$323,500,000" and insert "$425,000,000"

On page 28, line 8, strike "$346,132" and insert "$300,000"

On page 29, line 15, strike "$61,538" and insert "$75,000"

On page 37, at the end of line 19, insert "except as provided in section 204 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1975 (Public Law 93-544)"

On page 38, line 24, insert:

Sec. 509. Except for expenditures for Presidential travel contained in the White House Office appropriation or except for expenditures to the "Supreme Court" appropriation, no funds appropriated by this Act may be expended:

(a) pursuant to a certification of an officer or employee of the United States unless:

(1) such certification is accompanied by, or is part of, a voucher or abstract which describes the payee of the payment or services for which such expenditure is being made, or

(2) the expenditure of funds pursuant to such certification, and without such a voucher or abstract, is specifically authorized by law; and

(b) unless such expenditure is subject to audit by the General Accounting Office or is specifically exempted by law from such an audit.

On page 40, at the beginning of line 17, insert "South Viet Nam,"

Mr. MONToya. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the comments be agreed to en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purposes of amendment as original text.

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 $8,300,403,000 for programs and activities under this appropriations bill. The recommendation of the committee is $6,338,955,000. This is a reduction from fiscal year 1975 appropriations to $8,300,403,000. Of Postal Service, $6,338,955,000 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 93-544.

The bill passed the House of Representatives July 17, 1975, in the amount of $8,265,332,152. 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 purposes: to provide, as requested by the President at budget amendments following completion of House hearings. These amendments were denied by the Senate on a 71 to 11 vote, and 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 yeas 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. MONAHAN of Oklahoma to the House bill reduced these appropriations by $21,778,000. The increased funding will provide staffing and resources to support increased tax administration responsibilities. The House bill reduced these appropriations by $21,778,000 over the House bill. The reduction from last year is primarily the result of the one-time social security payment of $1,935,000,000 which I mentioned previously.

The major increase to the House allowance is restoration of $15,000,000 to the Customs Service. The House bill reduced these appropriations by $2,145,000 over the fiscal year 1975 appropriation, a reduction of $14,890,000. The increased funding would procure additional materials for the mailers and from the Treasury Department.

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 this funding in the fiscal year 1976 appropriation. The administration for the Hoover Institution was accorded too late to hold hearings. Appropriation of these funds will enable the Department of the Treasury to match private contributions, over a five-year period, for construction of educational facilities for the Hoover Institution.

Increases to the House bill include $50,000 for the Office of the Secretary and $180,000 for the Office of Revenue Sharing for increased staffing; and $3,250,000 for the Secret Service to provide additional agents for protective assignments. The House bill provided for increased manpower to assist the 30th anniversary of the United Nations, the Bicentennial celebration, and the ever increasing number of visits of foreign dignitaries.

Revisions are recommended from the House bill in appropriations for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, the U.S. Customs Service and the Bureau of the Mint.

TITLE II—U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

The bill recommends concurrence with the House bill of $1,582,185,000 for the U.S. Postal Service. This is an increase of $39,250,000 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 10 years for certain regulated mailers and from 10 years to 16 years for certain nonprofit mailers, the President failed to include the fiscal year 1976 requirement of $92,500,000. 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, and 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 yeas 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. MONAHAN of Oklahoma to the House bill reduced these appropriations by $21,778,000. The increased funding will provide staffing and resources to support increased tax administration responsibilities. The House bill reduced these appropriations by $21,778,000 over the House bill. The reduction from last year is primarily the result of the one-time social security payment of $1,935,000,000 which I mentioned previously.

The major increase to the House allowance is restoration of $15,000,000 to the Customs Service. The House bill reduced these appropriations by $2,145,000 over the fiscal year 1975 appropriation, a reduction of $14,890,000. The increased funding would procure additional materials for the mailers and from the Treasury Department.
funds for the projects specified in Public Law 93-381 which remain unobligated on September 30, 1976, to be rescinded and deposited in miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. Future requirements for such projects, if the committee agrees, would be included in the budget estimates of subsequent years. The committee does not agree with the House language. Unavailability of these construction projects, in my view, after September 30, 1976 could prevent GSA from meeting commitments as a result of judgments rendered in favor of contractors in the coming fiscal year, and would result in increased costs to the Federal Government.

**LANGUAGE CHANGES**

In addition to the language changes which I have previously referred to, the committee has included several items which are of general interest. Funds for a transition period are provided in this bill which will allow the fiscal year of the Department of Defense to commence October 1, 1976 rather than July 1, 1976. Language is included in section 504 of title V of the bill to allow funding to remain for obligations incurred prior to September 30, 1976.

A new section 508 has been added to title V of the bill which will require substantial material in support of payments based on certification by an officer or employee of the United States unless the expenditures are authorized by law in those instances where the expenditures are subject to audit by the General Accounting Office. The language will except travel expenses of the White House Office and payments of the Treasury Department for legitimate law enforcement purposes.

In section 602 of title VI of the bill, the committee included language to permit the U.S. Government to employ refugees of South Vietnam in the same manner as refugees employed abroad, or in the current fiscal year. This provision was included at the request of the State Department.

**CONCLUSION**

Mr. President, before concluding my remarks, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished members of the subcommittee, including the minority members, Senator Bellow and Senator Hatfield; and also my appreciation to Mr. Fred Rhodes and Mr. Arthur Levin of the staff, and Mr. Burkett Vre Kirk, the staff member of the minority.

I want to say that the bill met with the approval of both sides of the committee. It was the best that we could do under the circumstances, and I sincerely hope that it will be approved as presented to the Senate.

**PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR**

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jerry Stuckes of the staff of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Hansen) be given the privilege of the floor for today.

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

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, as a minority member of the subcommittee which considered H.R. 5957, the appropriation bill for the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, I want to associate myself generally with the remarks of the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Montoya) and to commend the committee for the high quality and cordial chairmanship of this bill so promptly.

This measure now before the Senate is the product of many days of hearings and persevering effort put forth not only by the assistant majority leader and cordial chairman, but also the other members of the subcommittee.

I congratulate the chairman for the way 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 $5,492,000 over the budget estimate and an increase of $78,452,848 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 Services Administration for capital investments. This payment was to increase the capitalization of the revolving fund which had not been augmented since 1967. Price increases over the past 8 years had depleted the resources available to the fund. My colleagues should know that the House denied this increase without prejudice because it was sent up after hearings had been completed.

The other big item involved a $92,500,000 increase over the budget estimate to provide funding for the extended periods of phasing authorized by Public Law 93-585. The committee has included several items in those instances where the expenditures are authorized by law or national emergency and where the resources are available to the fund. My colleagues should know that the House denied this increase without prejudice because it was sent up after hearings had been completed.

This increase over the budget estimate is anticipated that during the period 1975-76, 50 million Americans will be traveling abroad and returning to the United States. This is an increase of 4 percent.

Incidentally, this latter figure does not include Americans going to Mexico and Canada. Because of the large number traveling to these countries, we are not able to keep exact figures.

It should also be noted that next year Montreal will be the host for the summer Olympics. I think it is safe to say that this year will attract hundreds of thousands of Americans to cross the border north, visit Montreal, and return.

This will indicate that during the period 1975-76 our Customs Service will be more than ever burdened with the task of processing international visitors. This is an increase of over 14 percent. Incidentally, the gentleman who has left the Senate is the distinguished Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Inouye).

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I thank the chairman very much.

Regrettably, I was not able to attend the House-Senate conference committee meeting on Tuesday last. If I had been there, I would have proposed a certain amendment to this bill. At this time, I wish to present this problem to the chairman, because I feel that we should have conference with an open mind to the possibility of reconsidering the action taken by the Senate.

Mr. President, this relates to the amendment for the Customs Service and primarily for the sum approved for those with inspection responsibilities.

In 1974, we played host to 14.1 million international visitors. During the period 1975 and 1976, which will be the Bicentennial period, we anticipate welcoming over 32 million international visitors. This is an increase of over 14 percent. Incidentally, the gentleman who has left the Senate, these are very conservative figures.

During the year 1974, 23.9 million Americans went abroad. When these Americans return, they have to be processed through facilities of the Customs Service. It is anticipated that during the period 1975-76, 50 million Americans will be traveling abroad and returning to the United States. This is an increase of 4 percent.

Incidentally, this latter figure does not include Americans going to Mexico and Canada. Because of the large number traveling to these countries, we are not able to keep exact figures.

It should also be noted that next year Montreal will be the host for the summer Olympics. I think it is safe to say that this will attract hundreds of thousands of Americans to cross the border north, visit Montreal, and return.

We are hoping that the Bicentennial will be a great year for visitors, a year when visitors can come to the United States feeling welcome.

So I would hope that the conferees, in meeting with the House of Representatives, will reconsider the action taken.

The action by the Senate would reduce the amounts set aside for personnel by an amount of $5,080,000. This affects 400 customs inspection personnel. I sincerely hope that the chairman will keep these facts in mind while in conference and, if possible, reconsider the action taken by the Senate committee.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, may I say that the distinguished Senator from Hawaii that I certainly will give this matter my most thorough consideration before we go to conference, and we will discuss it in conference.

I might say, by way of background, that the situation has arisen because the 1975 bill provided for an additional 501
positions. The President, after we provided these positions, sent a rescission message which 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, 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 have been informed, we have been informed that it is very urgent that provision be made for funding these positions.

I can assure my good friend from New Mexico that we will discuss this matter very thoroughly and try to provide adequate funding in conference to assist in funding these positions.

Mr. ENGVE. I thank the chairman very much.

Mr. MONTOYA. 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 Consumer Credit Protection Act, 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 $6.335 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 budget, that we regard as the responsibility of the Committee on Appropriations. The best estimate of the staff of the Budget Committee, however, is that the bill here reported is 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 our Government. Mr. MONTOYA 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 our Committee in making these restraints, 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. JAVITIS. Mr. President, I would like that.

Mr. MONTOYA. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. JAVITIS. Two minutes.

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITIS. Mr. President, we have two fine Senators who are managing this bill, and we all understand and recognize that.

Mr. MONTOYA. We in the subcommittee have not been very thoroughly and try to provide adequate funding in conference to assist in funding these positions.

Mr. JAVITIS. Mr. President, I would like that.

Mr. MONTOYA. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. JAVITIS. Two minutes.

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITIS. Mr. President, we have two fine Senators who are managing this bill, and we all understand and recognize that.

I have no additional comments, and unless a Member requests that I yield to him, I will ask:

Mr. JAVITIS. Mr. President, I would like that.

Mr. MONTOYA. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. JAVITIS. Two minutes.

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITIS. Mr. President, we have two fine Senators who are managing this bill, and we all understand and recognize that.

I have no additional comments, and unless a Member requests that I yield to him, I will ask:

Mr. JAVITIS. Mr. President, I would like that.

Mr. MONTOYA. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. JAVITIS. Two minutes.

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITIS. Mr. President, we have two fine Senators who are managing this bill, and we all understand and recognize that.

I have no additional comments, and unless a Member requests that I yield to him, I will ask:

Mr. JAVITIS. Mr. President, I would like that.

Mr. MONTOYA. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. JAVITIS. Two minutes.

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITIS. Mr. President, we have two fine Senators who are managing this bill, and we all understand and recognize that.

I have no additional comments, and unless a Member requests that I yield to him, I will ask:

Mr. JAVITIS. Mr. President, I would like that.

Mr. MONTOYA. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. JAVITIS. Two minutes.

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITIS. Mr. President, we have two fine Senators who are managing this bill, and we all understand and recognize that.

I have no additional comments, and unless a Member requests that I yield to him, I will ask:

Mr. JAVITIS. Mr. President, I would like that.

Mr. MONTOYA. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. JAVITIS. Two minutes.

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITIS. Mr. President, we have two fine Senators who are managing this bill, and we all understand and recognize that.

I have no additional comments, and unless a Member requests that I yield to him, I will ask:

Mr. JAVITIS. Mr. President, I would like that.

Mr. MONTOYA. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. JAVITIS. Two minutes.
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. Mr. Hatfield, 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.

The Senate from New York is much more knowledgeable in this field than I am. I am wholly committed to the objectives which he seeks to outline. I am not as familiar with the program requirements from the money point of view as he is, but I am sure that his judgment on that point is responsible, and I support that decision.

Mr. JAVITTS. I say to Senator MONTOYA that it is the new factor I am bringing to him. The bill was dealt with very diligently; we debated the issues. It is cosponsored by Senator Percy and Senator Nunn. It has been ordered reported from the Committee on Government Operations, and it represents the consummation of highly effective work by two of our greatest unions.

All I am saying is that it will be encouraging, at least, if Senators Nunn and Percy and I, as well as others, can come to the conference and lay before them the equity of the situation which is new.

I agree thoroughly with Senator Montoya. He did not know anything about this, and he did exactly right.

All I say is that perhaps we can save 3 or 4 months of very valuable time if the conferences are now convinced that this matter is going to be put on a new and infinitely better road, well worth at least the budget estimate. That is all I ask. I ask for no commitments—just that the door be kept open. If the Senator does not like it, he will strike it out in conference, but at least the door will be kept open.

Mr. MONTOYA. I say to the distinguished Senator from New York that last year's and the fiscal year—over the $855,000 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 insistence to put $2 million, because they have not provided adequate justification for us to recommend to Congress an appropriation of over $2 million.

Mr. Hatfield. 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-term 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 written 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 another chance. The conferences can easily throw it out. If we can demonstrate to the Senator that at last this will really deserved the money that is at least specified in the budget, I am really telling him something 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 you 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 conferences think it is deserved, they can do it, especially since I am not asking the Senate committee to go beyond the budget estimate.

Mr. MONTOYA. May I say to my friend from New York, he is very eloquent, very kind, very persuasive. I am sure that my colleague Mr. Muskie will not ask the Senator from New York wait until the next supplemental so that we can give the Committee an opportunity to come before the subcommittee and tell us precisely where they see they are doing and what they will do with respect to the mandate in the new legislation? I can assure the Senator from New York that if they come in and persist with a good case and tell us that they are really going to launch a meaningful effort in the field of productivity, I will personally recommend additional funding.

Mr. JAVITTS. I say to my colleagues that I am trying to do, knowing how these things go and because we are so much on the threshold, is just to leave the door open. I saw Senator Hatfield yesterday. He is the kind of Senator that will help me with this. May I ask him that?

Mr. MUSKIE. I perhaps did not indicate previously how impressed I was with the work done in the Committee on Government Operations, which is composed of very distinguished Members of this body, in particular Senator Javits, whom I have great faith, has established new edicts of activity for the Commission, I am sure that they will not be able to staff the Commission with personnel to carry out these mandates within the next 2 or 3 months. So if the Commission is intent on upgrading its mission as a result of the recommendations in the new legislation, I shall be pleased to look at the new mission and evaluate the additional recommendations in a future supplemental. I shall certainly do that.

I want to impress upon my colleague from New York that we really will give the proposal a good hearing, so that if additional personnel is needed, we will provide for additional funding.

Mr. JAVITTS. Mr. President, I respect Senator Montoya enormously. I think what he is telling me is in complete good faith. Half a million dollars is not going to make or break anything. If the Senator feels that strongly about it, I am not going to press any further.

Mr. MONTOYA. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. HATFIELD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes.

Mr. HATFIELD. I do not really think there is any difference between the objectives being sought by my colleague from New York (Mr. Javits) and the objectives of the Government Operations Committee, if my colleague from New Mexico (Mr. Montoya). I think the Senator from New York has provided us with some new information which will certainly give us a new perspective on the Commission. I do not think it will take much to implement whatever the Government Operations Committee is proposing. I join the chairman in urging my colleague
that he ask for any additional funding for nuclear energy, the President will request 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 be with the President. 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 has set. Page 178.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. I thank the Senator.
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore, Mr. PASTORE. 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 shall not withhold the recommendation of the subcommittee.

Mr. SchWEIKER. I do intend to make it a point of order, but I certainly-yes, I will not withhold it. But I do intend to make it.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I shall send to the desk a resolution for myself and Mr. PASTORE (for himself, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. INOUYE, and Mr. MONTOYA) submitted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the President seek the immediate consideration of strengthening the effectiveness of the International Atomic Energy Agency's safeguards on peaceful nuclear activities and seek informal cooperation with other nuclear suppliers to insure that the most stringent safeguard conditions are applied to the transfer of nuclear nuclear activities such as technology to prevent the proliferation of nuclear explosive capability.

Whereas the Senate of the United States renewed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in recognition of the devastation associated with a nuclear war and of the desperate effort to avert the danger of such a war;

Whereas the parties to the treaty expressed a common belief that the proliferation of nuclear weapons would seriously increase the danger of nuclear war;

Whereas the parties to the treaty pledged to accept specified safeguards regarding the transfer to non-nuclear weapon states of special nuclear materials and facilities for the processing, use, or production of such materials;

Whereas recent events, including the explosion of nuclear devices, and new evidence of uranium enrichment facilities, and the proposed transfer of nuclear enrichment and reprocessing facilities to non-nuclear weapon states, emphasizes the imperative need to increase the scope, comprehensiveness, and effectiveness of international safeguards on peaceful nuclear activities so that there will be no further proliferation of nuclear weapons capability;

Resolved, That the President seek the immediate consideration of strengthening the effectiveness of the International Atomic Energy Agency's safeguards on peaceful nuclear activities and seek informal cooperation with other nuclear suppliers to insure that the most stringent safeguard conditions are applied to the transfer of nuclear nuclear activities such as technology to prevent the proliferation of nuclear explosive capability.

Whereas the Senate of the United States renewed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in recognition of the devastation associated with a nuclear war and of the desperate effort to avert the danger of such a war;

Whereas the parties to the treaty expressed a common belief that the proliferation of nuclear weapons would seriously increase the danger of nuclear war;

Whereas the parties to the treaty pledged to accept specified safeguards regarding the transfer to non-nuclear weapon states of special nuclear materials and facilities for the processing, use, or production of such materials;

Whereas recent events, including the explosion of nuclear devices, and new evidence of uranium enrichment facilities, and the proposed transfer of nuclear enrichment and reprocessing facilities to non-nuclear weapon states, emphasizes the imperative need to increase the scope, comprehensiveness, and effectiveness of international safeguards on peaceful nuclear activities so that there will be no further proliferation of nuclear weapons capability;

Resolved, That the President seek the immediate consideration of strengthening the effectiveness of the International Atomic Energy Agency's safeguards on peaceful nuclear activities and seek informal cooperation with other nuclear suppliers to insure that the most stringent safeguard conditions are applied to the transfer of nuclear nuclear activities such as technology to prevent the proliferation of nuclear explosive capability.
The hope of all peoples of the world, now and for future generations, is a worldwide system of comprehensive and effective international safeguards. The primary purpose of which is to prevent the diversion of fissionable material from peaceful nuclear activities to nuclear weapons. Although there are now international safeguards auspices 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 people 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.

Today, Senator Mondale and I are introducing a resolution which calls upon our President to initiate serious and urgent steps to encourage our nuclear supplying 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 an 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, preserve 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 the interest of peace for the solution of nuclear proliferation problems. The resolution be added as co-sponsors of this resolution for their introduction of this resolution.

I, too, am pleased that it is coming before the Senate on Foreign Relations. I join with my colleague from New York in expressing my dedication to a careful examination of the situation.

I also have the privilege of serving as the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, of which I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I shall make it my personal responsibility to see that it has the utmost consideration.
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Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senate yield briefly?

Mr. PASTORE, Mr. President, wish to be heard, this sounds very interesting to me.

Mr. PASTORE, I yield.
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Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, wish to be heard, this sounds very interesting to me.

Mr. PASTORE, I yield.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senate yield briefly?
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Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, wish to be heard, this sounds very interesting to me.
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Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senate yield briefly?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senate yield briefly?
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Mr. PASTORE, I yield.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senate yield briefly?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senate yield briefly?
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Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, wish to be heard, this sounds very interesting to me.
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Mr. PASTORE, I yield.
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Mr. PASTORE, I yield.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senate yield briefly?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senate yield briefly?
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Mr. PASTORE, I yield.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senate yield briefly?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senate yield briefly?
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been under discussion by technical experts within the IAEA but they have never been enforced by the Agency and the U.S. Government. One can only hope that they will work. Such procedures will have to be much more restrictive than the traditional IAEA reactor safeguards. Unlike reactors, separation plants will require a continual 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 not yet to be resolved. And it is not yet clear that these questions can be answered satisfactorily in the foreseeable future. Even in the United States, where we have had many years of military experience in the production 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 Regulatory 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 separation facilities. There is no economic justification for the construction of a relatively small national plutonium reprocessing 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 countries that are reportedly seeking to buy plutonium separation plants would be in a position to build a plutonium reprocessing facility for decades, if ever.

One wonders why on earth are we doing it, and that speculation is truly unfounded. In view of the fact that several of the countries that are reportedly seeking to buy these plants—Brazil, Argentina, and Pakistan—have not ratified the Non-Proliferation Treaty, we would be foolish not to wonder about their intentions.

These questions, and others raised in the Senate by Senators Pastore, RICC, and Glass, prompted me, on June 10, to introduce Senate Resolution 188. That measure sought to express the opposition of the Senate to the transfer of uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing plants. It also sought to adopt a fully effective international safeguards system could be adopted. Twenty-one Members of the Senate, from both political parties, joined me in cosponsoring that resolution.

On June 27, West Germany and Brazil signed their contract, which included uranium enrichment and plutonium separation plants. I was particularly disappointed, for Helmut Schmidt was quoted 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 exist within the Congress and within the executive branch, but apparently it was not communicated strongly enough nor directly by President Ford or Secretary Kissinger to the West German Chancellor.

There has been a tendency among government officials in other countries, undoubtedly encouraged by spokesmen for their nuclear industries, to dismiss U.S. criticisms of the fuel cycle sales as the verbal work of "peripheral people" who would like to obtain the contracts for themselves. This argument is untrue and it totally ignores the real issues that are at stake.

West Germany Government maintains that the safeguards included in their agreement with Brazil will be fully adequate, noting that they go beyond the existing NPT requirements. General Electric was reportedly reached that German-supplied technology, as well as materials and equipment, would be safeguarded by the IAEA, that safeguards would be maintained on the entire, that third countries would be subject to safeguards, and that equipment 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 requirements with respect to physical and materials security have yet to be spelled out. Noticeably absent is a requirement for regionalization 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 technology transferred from West Germany to operate these plants from developing their own technology, unfortunately, Germany may not prove itself to be an easy answer but since Brazil, as a nonparticipating country, is not bound by the Non-Proliferation Treaty to forgo weapons production, the dilemma is all the more disturbing.

My intention is not to make accusations against Brazil or any other country. I only point out that there are many unanswered questions with respect to safeguards agreements. Those questions are serious enough to warrant delay in the transfer of this equipment and technology 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 pressure is so intense that the temptation will be for suppliers to impose less rather than more effective controls over the use of this technology. Efforts to achieve a fully effective international safeguards program could be completely undermined. For example, the NPT Re-
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 by which the 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, the executive office of the President, and certain 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 read the amendment, as modified, and as follows:

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 10, line 14, After "Director" insert ", whose position shall be in addition to the positions authorized in section 3(d) ";

On page 10, line 18, strike out "$1,550,000" and insert "$1,600,000".

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield back the remaining 2 minutes of my time.

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. YOUNG. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The resolution was adopted and the bill to be read a third time.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Do the Senators yield back their time?

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. YOUNG. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time has been yielded back.

The bill, having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senators will take their seats. Senators will be in order so that the rollcall can be completed.

Will the Senators take their seats and will the Senate stand up to hear the rollcall?

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. ROBERT BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LORIE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. MORGAN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), are necessarily absent.

Mr. MONTOYA. The Senator from Michigan (Mr. HARR), is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, 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.

The Acting President pro tempore. Under the previous order the Senate will now proceed to consider 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 the 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 Senate from Maryland (Mr. Mathias) and the Senate 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?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. Proxmire. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) without loss of the floor during consideration of this bill:

Mr. Gilbert Keyes, Mr. James Gehrig, Mr. Craig Voorhees, and Mrs. Mary Jane Due.

Mr. Proxmire. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kenneth McLean, Mr. Robert E. Malakoff, and Mr. Howard Shuman, of my staff, as well as Mr. Robert Mills be accorded the privilege of the floor during consideration of this bill.

The Acting President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. Proxmire. Mr. President, this is the beginning of a large program of Housing and Urban Development, the Veterans' Administration, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, the National Science Foundation, the consumer protection agencies, the Environmental 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. It 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 Senator.

Will all Senators wishing to converse kindly withdraw to the cloakroom, and the Senators in 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 1 percent we are over the request of the President and about 1 percent over what we feel the House of Representatives would have included in the bill if they had the same sort of agreement.

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 treat 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 the 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 living 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 that is what some programs 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.

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 Senate 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. Bell, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Young, and Mr. Schiiller confer with the Senate on the part of the Senate.

SPECIAL HEALTH REVENUE SHARING ACT OF 1975—VEETO—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.
For that reason, we felt that to multiply this by 40 on top of the fact that the $626 million was extraordinarily conservative 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 $626 million by 40.

The reason why it is unfair, Mr. President, is that there is going to be 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-for- one, and say: This is bad housing. So, we think it is unrealistic, inaccurate, and unfair. For that reason, we decided to 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 in the Senate by a 94 to-0 vote an emergency housing bill that provides a substantial amount to be loaned by the Federal Government at 7% interest and paid back in 15 years. This is an extremely small amount of adverse impact on the budget in terms of outlay will be almost insignificant 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 an impression of overfunding. 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 figures 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 are 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 for 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. The $75 million was requested by the staff of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Housing and the Library of Congress, and the Appropriations Committee, and from the staff of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

The appropriations bill provides $100 million for cities under 50,000—the cities that are most neglected in our 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, last year, the House cut one-third of that, out of assisted housing. We also provided $100 million for assisted housing. We believe this agency should be maintained, because the programs have been diminished sharply. It is hard for me to understand that. The House increased the funding for comprehensive planning grants; but there was a cut in the planning grants program. The House increased the funding for the emergency housing bill. The committee cut $2 million from the EPA authorization for the 1-year figure, based on the best advice we could get from the experts. It restored $75 million for the planning grant 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 $8 million of the cut in the regional management service, or almost three-fourths of the cut.

As I say, I think these cuts were merited, because the programs have been diminished sharply. It is hard for me to understand that the funding for HUD has been cut to have such a large number of staff people when they are operating such an anemic program.

With respect to the EPA, the committee did not change the figure. This is an area where EPA could not spend the money before. 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 out of what the NASA budget was for development, which was $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 added the amount for the Selective Service System—on very good grounds, I believe. The Selective Service system has done nothing, and I mean nothing, for a couple of years now. They have not had an induction; 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. Mathias, for the advice we could get from the Senate staff of the Appropriations Committee, and from the staff of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs. He was very helpful with respect to this bill, devoted a great deal of time and energy to the task, and was very helpful.

I also thank Tom van der Voort, who is a new member of the Appropriations Committee staff. He used to serve on my staff, and he did an excellent job—very intelligent and thoughtful staff job. Bob Clark is a veteran of the Appropriations Committee and has been here for many years, and was extremely helpful.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from the Librarian of Congress, Mr. Mather, and from the Library of Congress Research Service.

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

Congressional Research Service

To: Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs.
Attention: Robert Malakoff.

Subject: Appropriations for "Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing".

In our July 1975 Budget, the President requested $622.3 million in new contract authority for the Section 8 program. The House, in its FY 1976 Appropriations bill, provided $626 million. The Senate Appropriations Committee reduced the House figure by $1.5 million.

We estimate that $626 million will cover the full funding needed for 1976. We do not believe that the $622.3 million would have been enough to meet all the needs of the Section 8 program in 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 contracts that will be incurred in the next fiscal year was made necessary by the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. Section 301(a) of that Act requires Congress to adopt a concurrent resolution containing "such budgetary information as is necessary to carry out the budget authority" for the next fiscal year. Section 8(a) of that Act defines budget authority as the authority by law to incur obligations which will result in immediate or future outlays. In order to determine the budgetary resources that will be incurred pursuant to contracts authorized by law, the full $26 billion is listed as contract authority.

In reporting H.R. 8070, the 1976 HUD appropriation bill, the House Appropriations Committee conformed 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 2 and 59). In order to avoid double counting, the $662 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 in this manner, it was not, in fact, the manner applied by OMB, an alternative interpretation is preferable. The "budget authority" requested by the President is the $662 million in contract authority which, after all, is "authority provided by law to enter into obligations which will result in immediate or future outlays involving Government funds."

There are several reasons why Section 3(a) should not be applied to cover the full $26 billion.

1. There is no evidence in the legislative history of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 that any attempt was made to change the status of funds in the budget. In fact, the Act deals with matters to be included in the congressional budget resolution, 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 evidence that the Congress intended that any funds be treated differently than "budget" authority on the books, it was necessary to draft definitions for the law. In developing these definitions, the intent was to conform to practice, not to change it. This intent is manifested in the Statement of Managers: "The Managers intend that the definition of budget outlays and contract authority for purpose of the congressional budget process be the same as that used for the executive budget." (2)

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 $662 million. It would be a perversion of congressional practice to list projections of costs to be incurred as many as 40 years from now as current budget authority.

3. An estimate, the $26 billion is sensitive to a number of assumptions. The range of reasonable assumptions is such as to permit a budget authority of $10 billion or more in the estimate. In fact, the House Appropriations Committee (H. Rept. No. 94-313, at p. 5) estimates the run-out costs at approximately $18.2 billion, or $10 billion below the amount incorporated in its own CSBA Table.

4. Because of the sensitivity of the estimate to assumptions, Congress will not be able to apply its own assumptions without quantifying the impact of assumptions on the President's budget. For example, if Congress were to vote the full $662 million in contract authority but cut the estimate of future costs from $26 to $18 billion, it would appear that Congress has reduced the President's budget by $10 billion. Of course, not a dime will have been cut because the Government will still have incurred the $662 million in future years. This possibility illustrates why imputed costs should not be reckoned as budget authority.

AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH

Undeniably, there is considerable advantage in estimating the future costs of new contract authority voted by Congress. Without such estimates in hand, it would be possible for Congress to assess the value of the Housing program in terms of the prospective costs to American taxpayers, and not merely in terms of the initial contract authorizations. But estimates should be treated as estimates, with full recognition of their sensitivity to different assumptions about future conditions. Estimates should not be accepted as status property even masters on which Congress must take current action.

One way to provide long-range cost projections without confusing them with actionable budget authority is to provide the run-out costs in a "below the line" memo or footnote rather than in the CSBA Table itself. If run-out costs were shown in the CSBA Table the President's run-out estimate of $26 billion in contract authority would be possible to indicate that while Congress has granted the full amount of contract authority requested by the President, below the line, the President's run-out estimate of $26 billion could be noted, along with Congress' own estimate of full future costs. Moreover, it would be feasible to display the full range of reasonable estimates without exaggerating or misleading congressional action on the budget. Below the line, it would be possible to indicate that while Congress is granting the full amount of contract authority requested by the President, it does not go along with his run-out estimate and that because of uncertainties about future costs, it is provided a rank of estimates for consideration.

In conclusion, the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 does not compel the change in accounting methods introduced by OMB, and this change can produce a number of undesirable effects. In the first place, for housing, if the multiplier is published in the Budget Authority figure for the Housing Assistance Program is multiplied by 40, there will be a strong temptation to use this program because costs are multiplied. For example, a cut of only $100 million in the current program level would produce a $4 billion cut in budget authority.

5. The budget authority figures for other government programs are not multiplied by the total life of the program. For example, retirement benefits to former Federal or social security benefits are carried for only a single year even though these programs, once approved, will continue for years.

6. The objectives of the Budget Control Act can be met in other ways without artificially ballooning the budget authority figures for long-range accounting. For example, the Senate Committee Report can project the ultimate cost of the program under alternative assumptions, thereby warning the people of the long-range consequences of the current program.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc and that this bill be amended be regarded for the purpose of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to be waived by reason of agreement to this order.

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

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 8, insert: EMERGENCY HOMEOWNERS' RELIEF FUND

For emergency mortgage relief payments, administrative expenses not otherwise provided for, and for other expenses of the Emergency Homeowners' Relief Fund, as authorized by title 7 of the Emergency Housing Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-50), $75,000,000 to remain available until expended.

STATE HOUSING FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES

For Interest grant payments pursuant to section 8 of the above Act and Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1974 and for administration, $300,000,000, of which not more than $100,000,000 shall be used for administration. Appropriations for general administrative expenses under section 8 of the Housing Act of 1974 ($300,000,000), 

On page 3, line 5, strike: "that in fiscal year 1976, the appropriation pursuant to section 8 of the above Act for any contract approved on the basis of fair market rents will be increased by an amount equal to 1 percentage point of the amount which was published in the Federal Register during April 7, 1976."
And insert in lieu thereof: "That at least $75,000,000 of such contract authority shall be available only for contracts for annual contributions to the activities of the Federal Housing Administration, as provided by the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1701);"

On page 1b, line 9, strike $300,000,000 and insert "$500,000,000;"

On page 4, line 11, after "substantial" insert: "and not less than $40,000,000 shall be available 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 housing projects for the elderly and handicapped, and not more than $100,000,000 may be made available for construction only."

On page 6b, line 18, strike "$825,000,000" and insert "$525,000,000;"

On page 8, line 17, strike "$825,000,000" and insert "$525,000,000;"

On page 6, line 4, after "$185,116,000" insert: "of which $18,650,000 shall be provided from transfers from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration;"

On page 6, line 13, after "$48,500,000" insert: "of which $9,000,000 shall be provided from transfers from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration;"

On page 6, line 17, insert: "EMERGENCY PURCHASE ASSISTANCE FUND"

The total amount of purchases and commitments authorized to be made pursuant to section 313 of the National Housing Act as amended (12 U.S.C. 1735; 42 U.S.C. 1364; Public Law 94-90), shall not exceed $5,000,000 outstanding at any one time which amount shall be in addition to balances of outstanding at any one time which amount shall be in addition to balances of commitments authorized to be made pursuant to said section and which shall continue available after August, 1976, as provided herein. Provided, That the Association may borrow from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with said section, such amounts as are necessary to carry out the purposes and requirements of said section as authorized herein.

On page 7, line 20, insert: "EMERGENCY PURCHASE ASSISTANCE FUND"

For the revolving fund established pursuant to section 313 of the Housing Act of 1964, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1432b), $50,000,000, to remain available until August 22, 1976.

On page 8, line 8, strike "$2,700,000,000" and insert "$2,800,000,000;"

On page 8, line 19, strike "$400,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000;"

On page 9, line 6, strike "$500,000" and insert "$1,200,000;"

On page 10, line 16, strike "$83,000,000" and insert "$83,200,000;"

On page 10, line 21, strike "$83,000,000" and insert "$80,000,000;"

On page 10, line 18, strike "$400,000" and insert "$600,000;"

On page 10, line 20, after "Council" insert: "$1,200,000;"

On page 12, line 4, strike "$8,214,000,000" and insert "$1,175,000,000 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);"

On page 12, 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);"

On page 12, line 18, after "$10,300,000" insert: "of which $1,287,000 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);"

On page 12, line 24, after "$2,615,000" insert: "$1,039,475,000;"

On page 13, line 7, strike "$14,520,000" and insert "$14,200,000;"

On page 13, line 12, strike "$12,803,000" and insert "$12,500,000;"

On page 14, line 2, strike "$9,077,000" and insert "$10,334,000, of which $5,905,000 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);"

On page 15, line 7, strike "$43,935,000" and insert "$41,200,000;"

On page 15, line 12, after "$13,700,000" insert: "$10,000,000;"

On page 18, line 3, strike "$10,697,000" and insert "$10,000,000;"

On page 22, line 8, strike "$6,000,000" and insert "$8,000,000;"

On page 22, line 14, strike "$1,000,000" and insert "$4,000,000;"

On page 24, line 20, strike "$2,628,980,000" and insert "$2,683,860,000;"

On page 25, line 6, strike "$7,153,000" and insert "$7,160,000;"

On page 25, line 21, strike "$87,000,000" and insert "$84,100,000;"

On page 28, line 3, strike "$20,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000;"

On page 28, line 4, strike "$3,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000;"

On page 28, line 16, after the comma, insert: "for the activity for which the limitation applies;"

On page 28, line 19, after the word "Act," insert: "for the activity for which the limitation applies;"

On page 30, line 11, strike "$40,000,000" and insert "$33,000,000;"

On page 30, line 21, strike "$8,300,000" and insert "$8,300,000;"

On page 30, line 10, strike "$7,499,000,000" and insert "$7,999,700,000;"

On page 31, line 15, strike "$1,885,000,000" and insert "$1,580,000,000;"

On page 31, line 18, strike "$8,214,475,000" and insert "$8,214,475,000;"

On page 31, line 21, strike "$84,472,000" and insert "$84,472,000;"

On page 31, line 25, strike "$84,472,000" and insert "$92,976,000;"

On page 31, line 31, strike "$92,976,000;"
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 was very pleased that the subcommittee and then the full committee accepted my recommendation to increase funds for housing for the elderly and handicapped to $500 million, which is $290 million over the House position and $385,000 above the budget estimate.

First, let me say that these funds are repaid at Treasury rates and, therefore, do not appear as new budget authority, nor do they encumber the budget of the United States, as do regular appropriations. For the housing for the elderly or handicapped program, known as the 202 program, to really work, it must provide flexible direct-loan permanent financing in addition to construction financing, and all these loans must be at favorable rates. The bill language and operations direct that this be done and the committee has earmarked $400 million to be available only for non-profit sponsors with no financial requirements imposed as a condition of loan approval.

I have had assurance from HUD officials that they will now go forward with this program after having held back last year, despite the fact that we voted funds for this program last year.

The most significant new HUD program is the so-called section 8 program, as the committee has done and the committee has earmarked $460 million to be available only for non-profit sponsors with no financial requirements imposed as a condition of loan approval.

The Emergency Housing Act of 1975, just passed this month, contained authorization for the homeowners relief fund, and the committee and the House committee have voted the full budget authority, nor do they encumber the budget of the United States, as do regular appropriations. For the housing for the elderly or handicapped program, known as the 202 program, to really work, it must provide flexible direct-loan permanent financing in addition to construction financing, and all these loans must be at favorable rates. The bill language and operations direct that this be done and the committee has earmarked $400 million to be available only for non-profit sponsors with no financial requirements imposed as a condition of loan approval.

I have had assurance from HUD officials that they will now go forward with this program after having held back last year, despite the fact that we voted funds for this program last year.

The most significant new HUD program is the so-called section 8 program, as the committee has done and the committee has earmarked $460 million to be available only for non-profit sponsors with no financial requirements imposed as a condition of loan approval.

The Emergency Housing Act of 1975, just passed this month, contained authorization for the homeowners relief fund, and the committee and the House committee have voted the full budget authority, nor do they encumber the budget of the United States, as do regular appropriations. For the housing for the elderly or handicapped program, known as the 202 program, to really work, it must provide flexible direct-loan permanent financing in addition to construction financing, and all these loans must be at favorable rates. The bill language and operations direct that this be done and the committee has earmarked $400 million to be available only for non-profit sponsors with no financial requirements imposed as a condition of loan approval.

I have had assurance from HUD officials that they will now go forward with this program after having held back last year, despite the fact that we voted funds for this program last year.

The most significant new HUD program is the so-called section 8 program, as the committee has done and the committee has earmarked $460 million to be available only for non-profit sponsors with no financial requirements imposed as a condition of loan approval.

The Emergency Housing Act of 1975, just passed this month, contained authorization for the homeowners relief fund, and the committee and the House committee have voted the full budget authority, nor do they encumber the budget of the United States, as do regular appropriations. For the housing for the elderly or handicapped program, known as the 202 program, to really work, it must provide flexible direct-loan permanent financing in addition to construction financing, and all these loans must be at favorable rates. The bill language and operations direct that this be done and the committee has earmarked $400 million to be available only for non-profit sponsors with no financial requirements imposed as a condition of loan approval.
I am also pleased that the committee has voted the full budget estimate of $90 million for the Veterans Administration program for health and rehabilitation 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, additional funds will be needed for these programs.

Again, I want to commend the chairman and all members of this committee that have been here.

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 $82.4 million to the amount voted by the House for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and directed NASA to modify the 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 herein recommended for NASA. The committee restored a $48.4 million cut in the Pioneer Venus 1978 planetary mission, a program to be approved by 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 both federal and scientific community, and the Congress.

Therefore, following the commitment to this project last year, the deferral recommended by the House in effect required the LST to proceed with the remainder of 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 spacecraft 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 develop- and that these funds do not commit it to development, but merely support ongoing technical work which would facilitate making a decision on how to proceed.

Finally, in addition to restoring a total of $494.4 million in R. & D. funds cut by the House, the committee recommended $67 million, to an 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 was added to the comprehensive program of research, technology, and monitoring of the phenomena of the upper atmosphere so as to provide the necessary data to maintain the chemical and physical integrity of the earth's upper atmosphere. This program is designed to develop the fundamental data concerning the earth's upper atmosphere that will make hypotheses concerning the ozone layer and the actions which we subsequently should or should not take to protect the integrity of that layer.

The committee action restored this program since theories have been postulated that various chemical compounds such as the freons, which are widely used, and are very important, of many of our industries, can inadvertently be modifying the ozone layer with subsequent potentially damaging effects to life on earth. It is the intent of the authorizing legislation now funded in this appropriations bill recommendation to acquire the scientific data on this most significant matter.

I think it is important for the Senate to note that while the Recom will show that the committee added $56.4 million to the House bill for NASA for research and development, the final amount recommended herein for fiscal year 1976 is only $44.9 million. The committee's budget request for fiscal year 1976 and, furthermore, that the total amount recommended in the bill for NASA for fiscal year 1978 is $228,800,000 above the estimated budget requests for those periods.

Mr. President, the funds recommended in this bill for NASA will support:

The Space Shuttle—a transportation system to provide efficient and economical access to space to facilitate the exploration and exploitation of that medium for the benefit of mankind beginning in the early 1980's.

Space science.—A program to understand the origin of and the complex interactions of the planets and the solar system and the application of the knowledge acquired to the earth's atmosphere and to the earth itself. It is as a result of this program combined with its application to NASA's efforts at earth resources measurement as recommended by the earth resources technology satellite—Landsat 1 and 2.

Aerospace programs.—A program to support the continued development of spacecraft technology and instrumentation for application to meteorology, communications, earthquake research, and other direct applications including the new and most promising area of earth resources measurement as represented by the earth resources technology satellites—Landsat 1 and 2.

It is with satisfaction that I note that the Senate Appropriations Committee, at the recommendation of the 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 45 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 to housing. Thousands of others 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. For the State of Kentucky, this bill 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, new housing starts for the State of Kentucky have not been very significant.

Certainly, with this appropriation, we will not solve all—or even most—of our housing needs. But it will move forward in a number of important areas.

First, the bill earmarks $100 million for the SMBA 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. This bill would make available for fiscal 1976, perhaps as little as $36 million would be available, which is far below what many of these areas expected to receive when the program was devised. Many communities in my State have applications for funding under this program. In some cases, these communities had previously worked on similar housing revitalization projects, only to have the rules of the game changed in the middle of their efforts. Now to present them with an absence of funding under the new program will only dishearten and discourage proposed projects. This, it seems to me, is not the cor-
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 312 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 process. As we all know, there are various types of planning funds available—for health, transportation, community development, etc. 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. Furthermore, this 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 the problem of 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 pensions remain fixed, 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 loans 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 312 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 spur 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 the amendment report concerning the two programs.

The first relates to construction grants available under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments, 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 slower than I hope it is. In response to a question I asked during subcommittee hearings, the Department indicated that obligations and expenditures were as follows:

- For the $4.6 billion authorized under Public Law 92-500—$4.5 billion has been obligated through April 30, 1976. By the end of each fiscal year, the cumulative obligations are anticipated to reach the following levels:
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>Obligations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$4.6 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>$6.5 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>$12.1 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>$18.0 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 and land use laws are often the program's legal questions which still may be in resolving them. Therefore, I am pleased that the committee report includes language which gives 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 time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be debated.

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 7, line 7, strike "$100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$75,000,000."

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 for 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 Senate bring this issue before Congress.

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 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 make this program feasible, 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 focus local interest in neighborhood preservation and housing rehabilitation activities. 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. It's use avoids legal questions which still may be involved in some areas regarding the use of community development block grant money for this purpose and the conferees may be reluctant.

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's appropriation for section 312?

Mr. PROXMIRE. 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 $87 million of carryover. We provide $50 million which the President did not request. Appropriations were increased to 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,
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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 this past session, the Senate has become a converted person, 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 do.

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 committee, which are under.

At this time I would be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from California, who was a coauthor of the authorization legislation and who has worked for 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 legislative area.

I hope very much that the sum covered in the Senator's amendment can be approved. I recognize that is not what is likely to occur on the Senate floor, as 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 $50 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.

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.

I hope the Senate will 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 tempore. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator 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, with a very strong personal public, 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.

There are many 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 there exists a 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 the 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 if only money is available. 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 this, 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 Government National Mortgage Association, the committee to by the committee in the following language:

The Department is urged to make these funds available for all programs covered, both conventionally 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 this is critically important, especially at a time when it is so very difficult to get money for the multifamily projects or the multifamily mortgage that is needed.

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 language, I am sure. 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, Boston, 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 Senator that it has enough flexibility. Senator from Maryland and their judgment and their understanding of the situation, and the fact that they show themselves willing and that there have been $5 billion 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 coupled, in particular, with this. 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 unanticipated.

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. PROXMIRE. ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Maybe I have one 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 working very well on a national level, 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 it is not too late, that it has 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. TAYFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield one minute?

Mr. MATTHIAS. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. TAYFT. I thank the Senator and I just want to comment on the remarks and say that I think the Senator from Illinois is correct. The Senate is not the place for this discussion. I think it would be a good idea to have the discussion with the President and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. The Senator from Illinois is right. We should have a full Senate hearing to discuss this important topic.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, this amendment restores $4.5 million of the approximately $6.2 million cut from the administration's request for funds to administer HUD's housing programs. The amendment would restore the ability for effective implementation of the section 518(b) reimbursement for defects program. It would help provide the resources needed for more effective implementation of all FHA mortgage programs.

Hearings of the Banking Committee, of which the distinguished Senator from Illinois is the chairman, were held recently in Chicago revealed HUD and FHA's inability to inspect property adequately before it was insured.

So I urge the Senate to adopt the amendment that was offered by the Senator from Illinois, Mr. TAYFT.

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 think that in view of the fact that she is a new Secretary, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has a monumental job, she has
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 tem. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator add me?

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) be added as cosponsor.

The Acting President pro tem. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. 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 the time might be in order.

In the early 1930's I participated in bringing the Homeowners Loan Corporation into being as a member of the House of Representatives. I recall the debates and the efforts that were made at that time. I reemphasize that money has been saved, that time, when we will give opportunity for homeownership to the American people, they respond with a responsible attitude and participation. It was so in that original effort. We did not lose money. Money was made for the U.S. Government by that endeavor, which, at the time, was looked upon by some persons as an expenditure of Federal funds on which there would be huge losses.

We must recognize that by and large our Nation is well served when citizens have the opportunity for homeownership. I believe that when we put persons to work to construct homes and give incentives to persons to purchase homes and keep those homes viable, we have strengthened the American society.

In that period of trouble in the 1930's we were able to realize the underpinning and the structuring which we could add to the Nation by the development of housing programs.

I hope now, in a period of economic instability, we will realize not only the necessity of strengthening the housing industry from the standpoint of giving employment, and the ownership incentives which are helpful to fathers, mothers, and families, but we will realize again that this is money well spent. It is an investment. It will pay a dividend on the dollars that are expended.

I appreciate the privilege of joining my colleague as a cosponsor of this amendment to insure that personnel will be available to administer housing programs.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. He recognizes that this is not just a question of decent housing for American citizens. It is also a very largely a question of the economy, the welfare of our economy. No single sector of our economy is more important than the housing industry.

These programs are basically sound. They can make the dream of homeownership a reality in America. They can help. But if they are not adequately staffed, they cannot be implemented without adequate staff. I am grateful to the Senator for his words.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I feel constrained to comment briefly on what the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has said about the HOLC. I remember it quite well.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It was 1934.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was 1934. I was not in Congress. I was busy in Huntsville, Ala., but I worked for the HOLC as one of the county representatives. I saw many homes saved for the people who were living in them through the insolvency 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 the Roosevelt put into effect among all of the very fine programs that he initiated.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will my colleague yield further?

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, how much time remains to the sponsor of this amendment?

The Acting President pro tem. 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 circular 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 very rewarding when 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. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington be added as a cosponsor.

The Presiding Officer. 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 a bureaucracy 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 none of these are their figures, not mine. In other words, these people 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 know the Secretary of HUD has done a marvelous job here. I have 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, it does not make 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 most agree that the kind of persuasive arguments of the Senator 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 clear 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 even now and they are going 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 300,000 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 their staff on board because they anticipated that the program would come back. Well, maybe it will, but they do not even have any plans to have a program sufficient to warrant keeping on board the number of people they have.

I would hope that the Senate would not restore the very limited cut we have put in here. I think very highly of Mrs. Hills. She is a wonderful person. She was a fine Assistant Attorney General. But in this case I hope we can resist her attractive and very hard to resist appeal. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, this amendment restores only a small part of the total cut made by the committee from the House appropriation. These workloads are going up, and they are going up as a result of actions by Congress. Those workloads cannot begin to be performed without corresponding staff.

Let me mention just a few examples of increasing workloads within HUD.

The new section 518(b) program has to be implemented.

The new section 223(f) program for refinancing existing multifamily structures involves a workload totally beyond that anticipated in the budget.

Staffing requirements for the new sec-
tion & 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.

In total, 399,000 units 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. It 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 pleased 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 farther. 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 43 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 appropriation, and I hope that they get all the people they need to do the work. But I would like to see some evidence first.

Frankly, it is a new thing for me to advocate a decrease in the number of Government employees, particularly considering the State that I represent. But it is also discouraging for me to see HUD coming extremely discouraged with HUD, and 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 supported, and we should hold 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 that by 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 recommended 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 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. STEVENSON). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON). On this amendment 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. BROKEN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMNEE), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURRICK), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARKER), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. MORGAN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NEILSON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STEVENSON), 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. BLAHLATT), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDBLATT), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERRY), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 335 Leg.]
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I have cleared this request with the Republican leader (Mr. Heck Scee), and it has been cleared with Mr. GRIFFIN and with Mr. MATTHIS, the ranking minority member on this bill. I have cleared it with Mr. Javre, who is the minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and with the appropriate Senators on this side of the aisle who are directly involved.

I ask unanimous consent that there be a 30-minute limitation on the debate on the President's veto message on S. 66, the nurses training bill, that the 30 minutes begin to run at 1 p.m. today, and that the vote occur then at 1:30.

Mr. HELMS. Reserving the right to object, where does my amendment fit in? Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. The Senator, I am sure, can call up his amendment immediately after these for the fiscal year 1976. If the half-hour period intervenes, he could call it up following the vote.

Will it be agreeable with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, if he decides that he wants a rollocoll vote on his amendment, that that go over until after the vote on the veto message, so that he wants a rollcall vote on Appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Independent Agencies Appropriations, 1976

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6070) making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent executive agencies, boards, bureaus, commissions, corporations, and authorities, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and the period ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent that its reading be dispensed with.

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

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT-INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1976

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6070) making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent executive agencies, boards, bureaus, commissions, corporations, and authorities, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and the period ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this amendment is offered on behalf of myself and my colleague from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY, to add $60 million to carry out section 314 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

I am authorized to say that Senator HUMPHREY, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, 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 with the administration and come up with a figure that is two-thirds, or rather than the $75 million that we appropriated a year ago.

This money would help to clean up and keep to pollution one of the most cherished recreational 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 the rest.

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, I am convinced 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 oblige 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. We are 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 no chance this administration would proceed any faster than they would if we provided $10 million.

For these reasons, I think it would be a step in the right direction 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 $50 million, and I think that is probably a mistake on the part of the Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am willing 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 us to cover all of the need that exists. But it will be a step in the right direction.

Last year, Congress appropriated $75 million for the clean lakes programs, but $4 million in a Presidential veto. But if we had $75 million was scaled 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 commendable in 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...
of the lakes are in bad condition or going dead. We possess the skills to clean up our lakes. But to date, we have not possessed the commitment at the Federal level to do so. Our amendment to increase funding for this important program will be a step in the right direction.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem. The Chair will have to call the attention of the gallery to the fact that they are invited visitors and guests and, therefore, conversation will have to be kept down so that the Chair can maintain order.

The Senator will proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The point that I seek to emphasize is that a judgment has been made on this item at a larger figure on a larger amendment. Is that correct?

Second, when the EPA and the OMB do not have money available, they always have excuses. If money is made available, hopefully, they will be able to use it effectively. Just the opposite fashion of if we have only $10 million for all the lakes in the United States of America for clean-up, at a time when everybody knows that this precious resource is being destroyed in place after place and State after State.

I think that we would be inviting the criticism that we do not care. As I understand my colleague, the Budget Committee chairman (Mr. Muskie) who has responsibility here as the budget officer for the Senate, did not find himself in opposition to this but felt it was agreeable. Is that correct?

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator is correct. Then we were making up the budget resolution in our calculations, that, of course, did not show in the resolution itself. But our calculations easily accommodate this amendment. Is that correct?

Second, when we are learning a great deal about the agency is beginning to move, these community lakes are being destroyed by pollution, siltation, and algae growth. The program is finally getting started. It gives the Government a chance to move ahead. The States are ready to move ahead. Localities are ready to move ahead. The only problem is, again, the dead-end street, Dullsville, Washington, D.C.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What we are talking about here is not just the outlay. It is the budget officer for the Senate, did not find himself in opposition to this but felt it was agreeable. Is that correct?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield back my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have not yielded back my time yet.

Once again, I say I appreciate the presentation of the principal threat to Minnesota. I agree that Wisconsin is particularly anxious to get this kind of legislation. We would benefit greatly from it. But there is no question in my mind at all that the presentation is not going to proceed that fast. $10 million would mean a rapidly escalating program, a more than 100-percent increase, and I doubt if we are going to get more action.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that this is an amendment which I think can be misinterpreted, under the circumstances the Senate would be better served if I move to table the amendment.

Mr. MONDALE. Well, the Senator withholds?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I beg the Senator's pardon. I thought he was through.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, 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 community lakes. Last year, we appropriated $75 million, but regrettably, the bill was vetoed. There are already many applications—good applications—from the State of Washington, from Wisconsin, from Minnesota, from Florida—all over the country—in this crucial area. To ask for a modest $25 million for this national program, when we already know how to deal with them, 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 in any event. I hope the Senate will accept it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I understand it, we did appropriate the $75 million. That was vetoed. And when we appropriated $4 million.

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-percent increase. I move to table the amendment, Mr. President, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from New York (Mr. MUSKIE), 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 Arizona (Mr. GOLDBERG), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) are necessarily absent.

The result was—yeas 40, nays 40, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), 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 Arizona (Mr. GOLDBERG), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) are necessarily absent.

The result was—yeas 40, nays 40, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 yield to the distinguished floor manager that the sponsors of the amendment would be willing to compromise further.

The original amendment would have added $40 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, 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 400 percent over what we did last year.

Mr. MONDALE. The truth of it is that we went $75 million this year; we are perfectly willing to accept this compromise provided we do it by a voice vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Great; let it go.

The yeas and nays are withdrawn.

Mr. MONDALE. 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, 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. 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.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 20, line 13, strike out "$370,766,-000" and insert in lieu thereof "$835,766,000".

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 stated.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to state 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:

At the appropriate place add the following new section:

"Sec. . Prior to December 1, 1975, no part of the proceeds of the Act shall be used directly or indirectly to provide Federal financial assistance, including grants, loans, or loan guarantees, to or for or 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."

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, N.C., which is under investigation and audit by the General Accounting Office."

That project is being investigated and audited by the General Accounting Office of the distinguished House Member from the Second District of North Carolina (Mr. FOUNTAIN), I requested such action. Let me emphasize at the outset that while the Senator from North Carolina 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 doubts that the project would indeed develop. 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. There project, it was said, would be a new, "Freestanding" community with its own industrial base to 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 not in order. The Chair requests the visitors in the galleries to cease from conversing so that the Senate can be in order.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

During the earlier years, Soul City officials assured 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 extensive 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 parks, parking, 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 as remarkable a manifestation of social engineering, and another unmasking the tired old concept that enough money thrown helter-skelter at any problem will make it go away, or make it seem larger. In any case, any proposal, will make it happen. In one form or another over the past 6 years, the Federal Government has thrown millions of Federal dollars into the taxpayer's dream 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 billion.

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 open spaces, 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 these taxpayers, footing the bill, if this 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 there 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 identified as of May 15, 1975. I understand that it required weeks to compile this list. And, of course, who knows how many more they may ultimately identify?

The list of the individual items is lengthy and complicated. It is informative to note a few, however. For example, on February 26, 1974, the Soul City Co. received a loan guarantee from the HUD-New Communities Administration in the amount of $14 million for land acquisition and land development. Of this amount, $5 million in federally guaranteed bonds have been sold. Between March 1, 1971, and June 30, 1974, OEO, again through its Community Services Administration, provided grants to the Soul City Foundation in the amount of $86,54 in plan and shop comprehensive health delivery program. Between March 1, 1973, and June 30, 1974, OEO, again through its Community Services Administration, provided a grant in the amount of $96,000 for a social planning project.

Between July 1, 1973, and August 30, 1974, the Office of Education of HEW...
provided grants in the amount of $89,320 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 26, 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. That same day, HUD provided 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 HUD grants. Then, there is the Warren Regional Planning Corp., which has obtained a total $1,204,000 in grants for Soul City Sanitary District and Soul City Utilities Co. From HUD on that one day—September 28, 1973.

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 only possible 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 disclosed numerous federal grants, loans and loan guarantees made to five non-profit Soul City organizations controlled by McKissick Enterprises Inc. and interlocked with four profit-making organizations headed or dominated by him.

Memoranda on the last presidential campaign, obtained by the Senate Watergate Investigation Committee, indicate success in getting federal help to his change in political loyalty to former President Nixon. McKissick made use of the federal financial arrangements for Soul City after publicly endorsing the former president's re-election campaign. He charged his party registration, headed a national political committee and made a personal gift of $800 to the re-election campaign funds before or at the same time three of his Soul City organizations were negotiating for federal financial help that eventually was granted.

McKissick's control and influence within the four profit-making and five non-profit organizations that own and comprise Soul City was beneficial to his political campaign and gave a feeling of confidence of interest. For instance, McKissick is chairman of the non-profit Warren Regional Planning Corp., which got $274,000 in federal funds in 1973 to provide "technical assistance" to the profit-making Floyd B. McKissick Enterprises Inc. and some other heads. A partial audit of Soul City operations by the U.S. Department of Commerce's Office of Minority Business Enterprises, conducted under the new audit law, shows McKissick Enterprises Inc. got trademarked furniture that had been paid for with government funds and was then rented to the government—either the corporation that he also heads. The same audit shows McKissick Enterprises charged the profit-making organization more than five times an acceptable rental cost for trailer office space. Overall, the audit questioned one-third of the planning corporation's expenditures, but nothing ever resulted from the questioning.

McKissick's wife serves as chairman of the Soul City Sanitary District, which got a $704,000 federal grant to build a water and sewer system for the Soul City development, which is controlled by McKissick. One of McKissick's two minor partners, T. T. Clayton, serves on the boards of the nine Soul City organizations. Clayton's wife is the $20,000-a-year director of Soul City Foundation Inc., one of the five groups which with Clayton isn't directly connected. McKissick's son-in-law- $17,000-a-year director of the foundation. This foundation has obtained eight federal grants totaling more than one million to plan social and human services programs for the future Soul City.

Mr. HELMS. Despite the fact that an investigation and audit of the participation of the Federal Government in the development of Soul City have been going on for some time, certain Federal agencies are continuing to provide Soul City with financial assistance. On July 3, 1975, the Office of Minority Business Enterprise 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 $30,000 to support the program. Its stated purpose is to provide assistance to the Soul City Foundation, an educational, cultural and new city—help to build it—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.
clue 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 Brooke, Administrator of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and inquire about this matter. The time by then was exactly 8:10. I found her hard at work, and 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 following appeared to me: that HUD would not provide further financial assistance to Soul City until the report of the audit and investigation was in. Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent in a moment that my amendment be withdrawn.

Mr. President, let me say further, however, that I believe that the other Federal agencies involved with this Soul City matter should exercise the same wisdom and cooperation exhibited by the officials at HUD, and withhold further financial assistance, whether direct or indirect, from Soul City pending the audit report. I believe that a prudent consideration of the taxpayers' dollars requires no less.

This is not just a routine audit. It is an audit that has been requested by not just one Member of the Congress, but two. It is an audit that has been advocated by one of the largest newspapers in the land. It is an audit that has been requested by its reporters. Now, I do not know what the report of the audit and investigation will say. I do not know if it will be favorable or negative. I do not want to risk the use of millions of dollars of tax money. But, I do know this: however that money has been used, for whatever purposes, it is widely regarded as a gross waste. There have been funds expended for health care, but there are no patients. There have been funds expended for art and culture but there is no evidence of such there, except for the tradi

ional folk art, and so forth, of the area, and we have always had that for free. There have been funds expended for industrial recruitment and employment training, but there is no industry, and there are no employees. There have been funds expended for roads, water and sewer needs, and social planning, but except for the occupants of a few house trailers, there is so little.

Whatever the result of the inquiry of the General Accounting Office, an obvious fact will remain—Soul City is suspected by many citizens of my State of the greatest single waste of public money that anyone in North Carolina can remember. It is based upon concepts developed out of an intellectually and morally bankrupt doctrine, a doctrine that suggests that enough money thrown at any problem will make it go away, or thrown at any proposal will make it happen. It just does not work that way, Mr. President. There really is no such thing as a free lunch. Somebody must pay the price. The taxpayers of my State are quite certain that they know who that "somebody" is.

I withdraw my amendment.

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 tem pore. 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. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, would you 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 says 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 of 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 tem pore. 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 objecting 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 results.

But, Mr. President, I think, in all fairness, that the Record ought to show just what is involved in this case.

An article which appeared in the Raleigh News and Observer printed 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, Office 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 Mr. Pat Stith was the reporter responsible for the News and Observer's recent series on Soul City, first appeared at our offices, it was apparent to us that Mr. Stith did not present a fair and balanced report on the subject. During the course of discussions, Mr. Stith consistently evidenced disinterest in any and all positive aspects of the Soul City project. Furthermore, his reporting of the factual statements, recorded data, 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 by Mr. Stith, 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 agencies.

Furthermore, Mr. Stith's representations with respect to the relationship of pre-development costs, the required equity contributions from the Commercial 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 has been to bring jobs to Warren and Vance Counties. These counties have been losing jobs for 25 years due to a decline in farming. Overall population in the region has been static for this period. The desire to reverse this trend led the State of North Carolina, the cities of Oxford and Hendersonville, the County of Warren and the County of Soul City. The unique concept of Soul City is to provide experience with rural minority businesses. This effort has been actively advocated by planners, economists and legislators.

On January 31, 1975, the Office of the Inspector General of HUD conducted 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 $5,000 Federal grants and loans and the $85 million New Community guarantee. The findings of this audit were as follows:

The bulk of the audit was directed to verifying 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 has been much personal criticism of the Soul City project. Some of which is included in Mr. Stith's articles. That 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 presently in serious financial difficulty. It would appear to me that fairness would be a matter of more balanced attitude, investigation and report.

Sincerely,

MELVIN MARGOLIES,
Assistant Administrator Office of Finance.

That is, of HUD's Office of New Communities.

Mr. President, as I said, we want fairness. Of course, if there is any irregularity in the handling of Federal funds by Soul City, or any other new town, or any other agency, then we ought to have a complete investigation, audit, and report to the Congress of the United States.

But we do not think we ought to withhold grants merely because some newspaper reporter has made a charge which HUD has already found to be the result of personal bias. I think we ought to go on with grants to Soul City, wait for the audit to be returned and, if we find any irregularity, then we should act upon the irregularity at that time.

When we are dealing with any other agency, any other department of this Government, any other town, or any other city merely on the basis of allegations made by a newspaper reporter.

We are not going to try to snoop around, people and convicting them without evidence? This is a nation of laws, not of men. We have said it time and time again.

I am very pleased that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina is not pressing his amendment. He has every right to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate, as he has done, and he has every right to ask for an audit. But we also have every right to hear and know all of the facts before the Senate of the United States is called upon to make a decision and cast its vote.

I will be very pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina the remainder of any time that I may have. But I do think that the record ought to be made, and I hope that we are just going to at least bring to the attention of the Senate through its Record, the statement of a Federal employee in the Office of New Communities at HUD, indicating what HUD's findings have been, and HUD is the proper department initially to investigate these matters for the Congress of the United States. I do not say that the GAO should not do the audit, but the important audit is being done, as it has been done, by HUD. And they found no irregularity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the letter that was addressed to Mr. Stith be printed in the Record at this time.

The A C T I N G P R E S I D E N T pro tem, Mr. SITTON. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

Claude SITTON,
Editor, Raleigh News and Observer.
Raleigh, N.C.

DEAR Mr. Stith: At the time 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 that he intended to present a fair and balanced report on the subject. During the course of discussions, Mr. Stith consistently evidenced disinterest in any and all 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 time to do that." In fact, in response to a series of very abrasive comments and questions by Mr. Stith, the General Manager indicated that he did not have the staff to investigate in detail very unsubstantiated allegations of news reporters, but was required to devote time to substantive inquiries or concerns by the appropriate persons.

Furthermore, Mr. Stith's representations with respect to the relationship of pre-development costs, the required equity contributions 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 pre-development 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, pre-development 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 normal circumstances, $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 Soul City in order to assure that the other $500 thousand was properly invested in Soul City, HUD insisted that, instead of the $1.28 million being paid out and the $500 thousand being transferred back to Soul City, Soul City deduct the $500 thousand from the $1.28 million and transfer the difference $788 thousand to the entity entitled to such payment. This, in fact, is what happened, and it has its total required equity contribution of $1.5 million.

In addition, Mr. Stith implies that HUD permitted the developer to draw funds from the HUD guaranteed loans without determining if a part of these funds were for reimbursement of costs previously paid by HUD or Federal agencies. The $1.5 million grant from the Office of Minority Business Enterprise ("OMBE"). This is inaccurate. The Soul City documents HUD guaranteed were expressly excluded from the developer's certificate of valuation and the results of any review of eligible costs for draws from the HUD guaranteed funds.

One example of a misleading presentation is the implication that McKissick made a $200,000 profit on the purchase and sale of two Federal actor loans. McKissick paid $390,000 for 1810 acres. Thereafter, he acquired 250 additional acres for $75,000. In all, he acquired 2060 acres for the Soul City Company for $600,500, 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, I do not believe is within my personal knowledge since I did not arrive at HUD until April, 1974. However, these allegations were investigated by the General Accounting Office and evidence of wrongdoing is found, we will be the first to insist that appropriate remedial action be immediately taken. For example, 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 $2.5 million has also aided the existing Warren and Vance County Schools and $1.8 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 abandoned its initial goal, 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 extended too rapidly.

The entire emphasis of the Soul City project has been to bring jobs into Warren and Vance Counties. These counties have been historically dependent upon tobacco farming. Overall population in the region has been static for this period. The desire and the need for new development in North Carolina, the cities of Oxford and Henderson, and Vance County to support the Soul City project is the unique concept of Soul City is to provide experience with rural growth centers. This concept has been actively advocated by planners, economists and legislators.

On January 31, 1976, the Office of the Inspector General of HUD completed a review of certain aspects of the Soul City Company, the HUD Area Office, and the local government agencies as they pertained to the administration of the $10 million of
Federal grants and loans and the $5 million New Community guarantee. The findings of this audit were as follows:

The results of the inquiry, observation, and examination disclosed one major area of concern which pertained to administrative matters. This area, which may have resulted in less efficiency.

In regard to the accounting and reporting systems used in controlling grant funds, we estimated no mismanagement of grant and loan funds.

It is indeed distressing to me to encounter a reporter of articles that so clearly displays preconceived personal bias. Undoubtedly, Soul City has many problems and difficulties, some of which are included in Mr. Stith's articles. That 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 developments are presently in serious financial difficulty. It would appear to me that fairness would have required a more balanced attitude, investigation and report.

Sincerely, 

Marylin Marchand, 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 sense of fairness. But I want to be unfair to the taxpayers, too. As far as the GAO is concerned and the investigations Senator 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 preliminary reports 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 peruse a small city. He will then see, 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, which is, I believe, 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 looking to lake. 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 be 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 charge that cities, and presumably HUD, are in the cheese factory. That may be precisely what has happened, because the distinguished Secretary of HUD, Mr. Hills, disapproved the procedures ordered by Mr. Claude Sitton, which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts put in the recession, and it is agreed that the Margolis letter to the Secretary orders that there have been incredible abuses in the new communities program.

So all the Senator from North Carolina is saying is let us find out what 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 year when we began to divide up among the hold-harmless communities and the non-hold-harmless communities is that 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 can 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 in providing this extra amount is 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 money would be 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 Secretary's idea 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 it, 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 think that our State and every other State has found that the small cities that had no previous urban renewal, or model cities are now trying to get some money. By definition, they are not hold-harmless and therefore are not going to get money. This at least would provide money for some of them.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for clarifying what could have been an ambiguous, confusing situation and making clear what we intended to do with the funds.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Frank Gorman have the privilege of the floor during the consideration of Mr. Domenici's amendment.

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

IMPROVING OUR NATION'S HOUSING AND URBAN COMMUNITIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am delighted with the excellent work of the Appropriations Committee in H.R. 8070, which includes fiscal 1976 funding for programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. At a time when the construction industry is in its worst shape in decades, when unemployment in the construction industry exceeds 20 percent nationally and is much higher in many parts of the country, when home ownership is becoming a further and further removed from the grasp of the majority of America's families, when the recession-induced problems of urban decay and fiscal crisis are front page news throughout the Nation, this appropriation for housing and urban development is of crucial importance.

The provisions in the appropriation are of particular interest to me.

First, I am very pleased that this bill provides $75 million for the emergency homeowners relief fund. These funds will provide direct assistance to homeowners who are threatened with foreclosure of their mortgages and loss of their homes.

I am particularly pleased that the committee has clearly stated in its report that the full $500 million authorized for this fund can be appropriated at a later date, if further need is demonstrated. Of course, we all hope that economic conditions will rebound and that foreclosures will become an unpleasant memory. However, we must be prepared for high levels of unemployment for many months to come, and the committee language in its report is certainly welcome.

Second, I am pleased to see that the Appropriations Committee has moved rapidly to fund the emergency assistance and grant program authorized by Congress by the Emergency Housing Act of 1975 and signed by the President on July 2, 1975. This important program can help stimulate the housing industry and provide jobs for unemployed construction workers.
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 authority needed to wait on the authority provided in the current bill runs out.

Third, I am pleased that the committee has appropriated $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. Now, I hope that 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 prove the neighborhoods in which their citizens live. This $50 million, I 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 abandoning this program, I am delighted the committee is supporting a level of appropriations that is adequate to maintain the vitality of this program.

The assistance provided under this section results in a much more efficient use of taxpayers money than would otherwise be true. By spending this $125 million to help State and local governments think ahead and plan ahead, we save our taxpayers many times this amount. I urge my colleagues who will go to conference on this measure to fight hard for the funding level that we are approving today. The House-approved level of $50 million would be disastrous for those communities that rely on section 701.

There is a need for larger sums to implement our clean lakes program. I shall join with my colleague, Senator Mondale, to seek an increase in these funds. Again, there is a need for additional employees for HUD. We do not want to cripple the work of the housing program by failure to have adequate staff to process loan applications and mortgage guarantees.

Mr. President, again I compliment the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, particularly Mr. Proxmire, the able chairman of the Housing and Urban Subcommittee, for an outstanding piece of work. 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 comments are appropriations for HUD. I recognize the difficulties of appropriating funds for an administration which seems largely indifferent to the needs of the Americans, whether they are of low, moderate, 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 we can look for some improvements 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 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 renting of 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, many public housing authorities in my home State of California run efficient and successful conventional public housing programs. Many 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 by 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 serves as a new and substantial help in meeting this critical problem. I know that colleges in California will greet this change in the law with enthusiasm.

Next, I am 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 $28 million below the authorized figure for 1976, could have threatened the successful programs which have been established in California. The Senate figure of $125 million is far more consonant with our national need for long-term urban planning, and I hope that the Senate's figure will be agreed to by the Senate-House conference. Certainly, we should be able to cut the 1976 figure below the $100 million which we provided in 1975. Our needs have grown, and so have the problems to be dealt with under the section 701 program. I was delighted to support the recommended level of $125 million.

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 most of fiscal year 1975 which resulted from a funding shortfall. The shortfall resulted from an error in contribution in the passage 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 Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.

There are 10 such counties in California—Monterey, Napa, Placer, San Joaquin, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Solano, Sonoma, Stanislaus, and Yolo—with combined populations in excess of 1.6 million people. Surely those communities are entitled to funding for community development, just 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
million be earmarked for such "discretionary balance" communities, which lie within standard metropolitan statistical areas, but are not eligible for formula funding under the 1974 act. That is the formula amount over the $54 million provided last year. However, it is still far short of the amounts in excess of $400 million which such areas expected to receive during fiscal year 1976 at time of passage of the act. I believe that figure should be increased by at least $50 million to insure equity for these smaller communities; $150 million would be better than $100 million. I am not offering an amendment to this effect because the senior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Proxmire) has indicated that he will convey the Senate Banking and Housing and Urban Development Committee's willingness to consider remedial action to correct the error of calculation contained in the 1974 act. I urge him to act promptly, and I hope that he will take appropriate action later in the year, both through substantive legislation and through later appropriations measures.

All in all, I believe that the HUD funding is fair and, in most cases, is generous and appropriate. But an actual tight budget is nowhere more apparent than in the area of housing and urban development. Millions of Americans are without decent homes, and hundreds of thousands of others are desperately seeking help in their battle to provide livable environments without bankrupting themselves. I support the Senate's efforts to take a strong lead in housing for the homeless and help to our cities, and I believe that this bill represents a good-faith effort to meet those goals.

I would like to turn my attention to one other section of this bill, that for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I am happy to note that the Senate has recommended appropriation of the full NASA budget request, the amount of $576 million. Congress has already passed the session—by about an additional $7 million in newly requested authority. It is fair to say the fiscal year 1976 funding for NASA is at an austerity level. For the first time in its history, no new programs are contemplated. Therefore, I believe the committee acted wisely in recommending that the fully authorized amount be funded. Any amount short of NASA's prudent requests would have threatened vital programs.

I am especially heartened by the fact that the Senate reversed the precipitous attempt by the House to cut the Pioneer Venus and the large space telescope. When I first heard of the cuts, I was horrified, since I believe both programs promise scientific benefits far in excess of the sums scheduled to be spent on them. I wrote to Senator Proxmire, chairman of the subcommittee, urging that the full funding for those programs be restored. The letter explains my reasons for supporting these two programs in detail and I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record.

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

```
DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN:

On the Senate Appropriations Committee report for FY 1976 which I have just received, I am happy to note that the House Appropriations Committee, in its report on the Appropriations Bill for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, has recommended appropriation of the full NASA budget request, the amount of $576 million. Congress has already passed the session—by about an additional $7 million in newly requested authority. It is fair to say the fiscal year 1976 funding for NASA is at an austerity level. For the first time in its history, no new programs are contemplated. Therefore, I believe the committee acted wisely in recommending that the fully authorized amount be funded. Any amount short of NASA's prudent requests would have threatened vital programs.

I am especially heartened by the fact that the Senate reversed the precipitous attempt by the House to cut the Pioneer Venus and the large space telescope. When I first heard of the cuts, I was horrified, since I believe both programs promise scientific benefits far in excess of the sums scheduled to be spent on them. I wrote to Senator Proxmire, chairman of the subcommittee, urging that the full funding for those programs be restored. The letter explains my reasons for supporting these two programs in detail and I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:
```
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 Ap-
propriations Committee directed in its report that funds be used to modify the 40x80 wind tunnel at the Ames Research Center until the Committee has had an opportunity to review the neces-
sary funding in a forthcoming budget request. This directive will preclude the use of any
NASA funds to begin work on modifying that facility.

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 $12.5 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 essential to maintain the nation's leadership in aeronautical research and development. A study initiated by the Aero-

nautics and Space Branch Board is included in the recommendations for modification of the Ames facility.

The proposed 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 rational-
ity for making this change is compelling. For example, the ill-fated AH-56A Cheyenne heli-

copter program cost some $400 million before cancellation. That program would have included 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 mak-
ing such savings.

The House Committee's reason for limiting funding on the Ames facility was that no formal budget request had been received. The absence of such a request was the result, in the judgment of the Appropriations Management and Budget. Yet NASA, other govern-

ment agencies and aeronautics experts are in agreement that such a facility is necessary to permit NASA desired flexibility in its planning. In view of the continuing governmental need for budget in full-scale wind tunnel research and development, and considering the three year lead time required for the modification, such flexi-

bility is imperative.

In summary, I would urge the Subcommit-
tee to give its closest attention to the three proposals discussed. That consideration of funding for Pioneer Venus, continued

reasonable funding for the Large Space Tele-

scope, and discretion for NASA to begin mapping the large space telescope, and discretion for NASA to begin mapping projects in the Ames wind tunnel. Ac-
tion on these three issues by the Subcommit-
tee will assure that NASA is able to con-
tinue its planning and worthwhile pro-
grams in these areas.

If the Subcommittee does not act, the result may be further delays in vital pro-
grams, such as Pioneer Venus, and possible repercussions to the continuation of one or all of these programs. I believe the benefits and the mod-
ifications are needed, and I hope that the initiative of the Senate will continue. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JOHN V. TUNNEY
U.S. Senator

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, for the reasons stated above, I feel that the de-
cision to proceed with the Pioneer Venus program will be well justified on the basis of economy. The 1-year delay en-

visioned by the House would have cost 2 years in deployment of the probe, and perhaps an extra $80 million in cost.

I am assured 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 utiliza-
tion of earthbound telescopes.

In short, I believe that the approipa-

tion of full funding for NASA is amply justified. The recent ending of the Apollo program must remind us all of the in-

numerable benefits both tangible and intangible, which the space program has brought us. I look forward to many years 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' READJUSTMENT 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 vet-

erns by $1.2 billion over the sums designated by the Senate. The Appropriations for the GI Bill.

These additional funds should go a long way to assure that those veterans and dependents who qualify, are able to continue their educations which were in-
terrupted or not begun as a result of mil-

itary duty.

The additional sums should adequately protec-
t the veterans of this Nation from the situation they faced during the clos-
ing months of this past fiscal year when the funds ran out for their education. As a result of the Senate's decision to fund the GI bill benefits in the amount designated by the House of Representa-
tives for the GI bill.

Under the circumstances, it appears un-
reasonable to propose completely the use of
NASA funds for the Ames facility. If NASA is able to reprogram funds to begin the process of planning and modification, it should be able to do so. Such action appears justified considering the previous exten-
sive review of this request by the House and Senate Committees. It would therefore suggest that the Senate Commit-
tee not include limiting language in its re-

quest and that the Senate confer with H.R. 8070 be instructed to seek the deletion of the language circumscribing NASA's discre-

tion to permit NASA to be the money necessary to permit NASA desired flexibility in planning. In view of the continuing governmental need for budget in full-scale wind tunnel research and development, and considering the three year lead time required for the modification, such flexi-

bility is imperative.

In summary, I would urge the Subcommit-
tee to give its closest attention to the three proposals discussed. That consideration of funding for Pioneer Venus, continued

overpayments, and through the addition of $1.2 billion which the committee has proposed, I am hopeful that we will be able to avert a similar hardship during 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 Pro-
tection Agency's budget for the purpose of controlling noise pollution as the re-
sult of an amendment accepted by the House of Representatives.

The intent of this amendment by Congresswoman 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 funds for noise control of FHA loans to noise-impacted areas based on computerized data, rather than on clear, site noise level readings. Under the Noise Control Act, the Department of Housing and Urban Develop-
ment does have the responsibility for the control of noise pollution as it impacts the housing market, but only in consul-
tation with the Environmental Protec-
tion Agency, which has checkoff authority, and after the development and ac-
ceptance of an adequate environmental impact statement. The Environmental Protection Agency is amply justified in ensuring HUD and other Federal agencies to adopt uniform noise measurement systems in order to improve cooperation among the agencies and facilitate deci-
sions concerning noise pollution con-

control. Unfortunately, HUD has not indi-
cated their cooperation in this effort.

The specific problem which precipi-
tes introduction of this amend-

ment in the House, and which, I am

glad to say, caused the committee in the Senate to adopt strong report language to curtail such problems in the future, is the impact of noise on the Castle Air Force Base in California on the Merced-Atwater area. Under the Noise Control Act, the EPA and FAA are em-
powered with the authority to control noise from commercial aircraft and air-

ports. Military air base noise is to be controlled by the Department of Defense with Environmental Protection Agency advise and recommendations.

Based on a computerized noise map given it by the Air Force, the Department of Housing and Urban Develop-

ment unilaterally prohibited the grant-

ing of FHA loans to noise-impacted pro-

jects in the Merced-Atwater area. This decision was based on hypothetical rather than site noise readings of the estim-

adedly impacted area. Subsequently, HUD reassessed the decision and freed eight subdivisions from this restriction, suffi-
cient housing, they said, to see Merced-

Atwater through Noise. Unfortunately, the En-

vironmental Protection Agency Statement will be completed. Based on that statement, HUD will decide the fate of the remaining housing.
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; if we clearly do not want to establish accoustical 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 be in harmony 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 for this part 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 is the maximum that can be useable at this time. 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 Wisconsin. The economy needs thousands of thousands of dollars of 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 appropriations if the full $5 billion is authorized—provided in H.R. 8070 is used by the administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

VEREINS' ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION ITEMS

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, the committee's action in accepting for the most part the administration's 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 Medical 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 Health, Education, 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's special survey report 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 to provide a very adequate 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 to Congress, with 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 continues 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 staffing need-$28.4 million 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 over fiscal year 1975 appropriation will enable the VA to move strongly towards meeting approximately 6,200 of the deficiency of 7,963 hospital core staff identified in the survey report. I have already spoken on our intention with respect to 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 construction hospital census by 1,238 average daily patients census, with respective dollar amounts potentially short of $20 million and $33,858,000. 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 serve to allow VA to activate additional specialized medical services which the survey report found essential. That report found that 24 hospitals lack surgical intensive 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 report regarding underutilization of VA specialized medical units. Our subcommittee will be working with the Department of Medicine and Surgery to improve 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 supphmentary funds in the VA department's budget to meet fire protection standards at 28 VA hospitals, and to support maintenance and repair to correct structural and safety deficiencies identified in the management of VA hospitals.

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 zero 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 $8,700,000 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 projects.

Cemeteries

In this connection, Mr. President, the committee has also indicated that certain repayment of $2.3 million for construction funds requested for national cemetery development might be reprogrammed.

Mr. President, the Veterans' Administration is in the process of developing sites for four new regional VA cemeteries. It was the Appropriations Committee's understanding, however, that those sites were not yet chosen, and the committee therefore concluded that it was not likely that sites would be develop in fiscal year 1976 and directed that the $8,000,000 proposed in the budget for such site development be reprogrammed into other programs. The construction of major construction sites for four new regional VA cemeteries makes a substantial construction progress possible.

I have been advised, Mr. President, that three new or new additional Air Force Base necessary in California 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 Administration. I urge GSA to act quickly so that this land can be released to the VA and site development can proceed.

Mr. President, the information I receive indicates that the VA is much more advanced in site selection than had previously been thought. Given the committee report language concerning this matter and my discussions with Chairman Proxmire and Hartke, 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 advanced on a New England site so that the VA should clearly be able to proceed in fiscal year 1976 with significant construction of new national cemeteries and certainly a reprogramming of the $3 million will not be called for.

Medical and Prosthetic Research

In the medical and prosthetic research item, the Appropriations Committee will direct the VA to maintain its present level of research, which, given increases in research funding over the last several years, is realistically beyond the bounds of the VA. However, Mr. President, I have reservations about the impact of a reprogramming of this research effort on the VA and believe that a budget that does not allow for growth in the next fiscal year is unrealistic. I do hope that in fiscal year 1977 an appreciable increase will be allowed 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. President, the budget for health personnel 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 personnel for the Nation, this budget item cannot remain static for too long a period. As we indicated in our appropriations submission, we expect that the fiscal year 1977 appropriation will give recognition to growth in VA medical schools at State institutions using VA hospitals as clinical facilities, and the establishment of new training programs at 102 institutions affiliated with VA hospitals at State institutions, including new medical schools and other health personnel training institutions. In addition, these new programs have produced two critical gains for VA hospital programs: first, the improved Health Care provided veterans through teaching programs; and second, the establishment of highly qualified specialists as staff members of the VA affiliated hospitals.

As a result of this program, 15 VA hospitals have for the first time affiliated with a VA hospital and the affiliations of some 30 additional VA hospitals have been considerably strengthened.

The administration requested $30 million for support of this program, and this amount is included in the bill reported from committee. Of this amount, $11 million will be used for continued support of the five medical schools already activated. The $19 million which is available for expansion of new training programs at affiliated medical schools or other health training institutions, will be totally utilized to continue existing programs and to make necessary modifications for training facilities in VA hospitals affiliated with institutions receiving grant funds.

Thus, Mr. President, the fiscal year 1976 appropriate request will provide for no grants to support existing health training institutions in improving and expanding their training programs. I am not going to recommend additional funding for this program at this time, Mr. President, but I do want to say that this program is of such great value, not only to the beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration, but also to the medical community. I believe the committee should consider the possibility of providing additional funding for this program in the supplemental later this year. There are currently $7,740,540 worth of approved but unfunded grants under this program. These have been carefully evaluated by a careful review process, in which a broad range of experts participated. I believe the benefits which can be derived from the support of these programs fully justify their support and hope that when the supplemental is considered, this recommendation will be given to appropriating additional funds for this purpose.

Mr. President, I plan to recommend this amount to the Budget Committee for purposes of the reconciliation process in connection with the second current resolution in addition to the $55.9 million I have already described in the motion on the lower figures in the House-passed bill and the $2.8 million for additional core staffing—approximately 6 weeks' salary. I urge the committee to support this request and the $2.8 million for additional core staffing—approximately 6 weeks' salary. The precise amount of these needs will, of course, need to be reestimated in September, but as of now they total $66.5 million. Similarly, we will need from $50 to $70 million more in medical care appropriations to fund VA physicians' special pay called for in title II, S. 1714, as recommended from the Veterans' Affairs Committee, which I trust we will pass next week. The House has already passed a companion measure.

General Operating Expenses

Mr. President, I am pleased that the committee has approved a last minute supplemental budget request to pay for 1,100 additional VA regional office temporary positions. These positions are urgently needed to handle the extra benefits payment workload created by the economic recession.

I am concerned, however, with the temporary nature of the committee's recommendation with respect to these positions. If the COE workload remains at its current high level, it appears likely that an annualized appropriation will be needed to fund these positions.

I urge the committee to act carefully in this situation, and if necessary, to approve a supplemental appropriation for this purpose.

Compensation, Pensions and Readjustment Benefits

Mr. President, I also am pleased that the committee concurred with the higher budget requests—and did not agree with the lower figures in the House-passed bill with respect to appropriations for VA compensation and pensions and readjustment benefits.

I note, however, that past experience has shown that the budget requests are grossly underestimated the eventual need. This was certainly the case for fiscal year 1975. The committee has recognized fully the uncontrollable nature of these VA expenditures, and I am confident that the committee will act favorably upon any requests for supplemental funding, should it become necessary. I believe the House estimate of $1 billion for this purpose is a well-accurate and perhaps on the conservative side.

Conclusion

I would like to express my full support for the action taken by the Appropriations Committee.
tion Committee with regard to the amounts appropriated for the Veterans’ Administration hospital and medical program and the other accounts, with the caveat's I've outlined. The distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee with regard to the Veterans’ Administration hospital and medical program, and their staff members have once again demonstrated their insight in distinguishing the essential programs and their components as to providing the support needed for them.

I urge the Members of the Senate to give their support to H.R. 8070 as reported from committee.

EXHIBIT


Hon. William Proxmire, Chairman, Committee on HUD-Space, Science-Veterans Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are writing to express our recommendations with respect to the VA appropriation budget request submitted by the President with respect to the Veterans Administration hospital and medical program (specifically the medical care budget request). We would like to communicate to you our findings with respect to the FY 1975 budget request for the Veterans Administration hospital and medical program.

(1) The budget for health personnel education and training (residents, interns, and other trainees) and medical research must support the training of 73,000 individuals with an average employment for such purposes of $1,705 in FY 1976. These are the same total figures supported in the FY 1976 budget request and appropriation; the total FY 1976 allocation from the medical care item for education and training costs is less than $1,000,000 over the $185,476,000 estimated for FY 1975. We urge that your Committee report express this view and specifically recognize the need for inclusion in the FY 1977 budget request of sufficient funds to support training costs as well as an appropriate expansion of the size of the education and training programs.

(2) The FY 1976 construction budget contemplates funding for construction and education facilities construction which occurred in the FY 1975 construction budget request. Again, although the construction of such a project would be a constructive use of VA funds, we believe that the President and his staff should reexamine the FY 1975 budget request and request that the construction of VA Hospitals and Clinics’ facilities be deferred to FY 1977. This measure would then be consistent with the general growth of the fiscal year 1976 Federal budget as presented by the President. We urge that your Committee report express this view and specifically recognize the need for inclusion in the FY 1977 budget request of sufficient funds to support higher training costs as well as an appropriate expansion of the size of the education and training programs.

(3) The FY 1976 construction budget contemplates funding for construction and education facilities construction which occurred in the FY 1975 construction budget request. Again, although the construction of such a project would be a constructive use of VA funds, we believe that the President and his staff should reexamine the FY 1975 budget request and request that the construction of VA Hospitals and Clinics’ facilities be deferred to FY 1977. This measure would then be consistent with the general growth of the fiscal year 1976 Federal budget as presented by the President. We urge that your Committee report express this view and specifically recognize the need for inclusion in the FY 1977 budget request of sufficient funds to support higher training costs as well as an appropriate expansion of the size of the education and training programs.

(4) We also strongly recommend Core hospital staffing to carry out the recommendations in the Chief Medical Director’s Special Study in both the FY 1975 supplemental and FY 1976 budgets. We believe that the staffing levels in the medical care program falls short by 1,757 in average employment (FTEE) of the 7,633 total specifically identified and found necessary to operate the VA hospitals, nursing homes, and outpatient clinics. At an average salary of approximately $18,000, plus 1,757 in average employment would entail a full-year cost of $238,414. We also understand that, in testimony to your Committee last month, Chief Medical Director John D. Chase indicated that these 1,757 core staff positions are in addition to the 1,757 core staff that he felt that persons to fill them were recruitable.

Nevertheless, we understand that it may not be feasible in the next few months to increase the FY 1976 appropriation total annual request (for the seven medical care budget requests which we have identified in our recommendations) by the amount we recommend. If the commitment is made to increase the FY 1976 moving average the 301(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-344), a print of which is enclosed for your information, we believe that we have identified in the seven budget items in question and have found certain underestimates for FY 1975 and FY 1976 in the following categories and budget reallocations, we find the overall request of $4,247,334,000 to be deserving of full support by you, the Senate, the Administration, and the subcommittee for such purpose as was made in the deliberations and report of the Senate Budget Committee. We are providing this information to your Committee in the event that you wish to provide funding for these purposes either in the FY 1975 second supplemental appropriation bill or in the FY 1976 regular VA appropriation.

We have identified four basic weaknesses in the FY 1976 medical and hospital program budget requests which we believe must be clearly understood in the context of our recommendations that the overall Administration hospital and medical program budget be supported.

1. The budget for research (taking into account a transfer-in of $2,865,000 in health sciences research funds in FY 1975 and $65,000,000 in FY 1976) is $95,000,000 in 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 report express this view and call for inclusion in the FY 1977 request of an appreciable increase in research funding in order to avoid the significant damage to the valuable on-going VA research effort which a second standstill year might occasion.

2. The budget for health personnel education and training (residents, interns, and other trainees) and medical research must support the training of 73,000 individuals with an average employment for such purposes of $1,705 in FY 1976. These are the same total figures supported in the FY 1976 budget request and appropriation; the total FY 1976 allocation from the medical care item for education and training costs is less than $1,000,000 over the $185,476,000 estimated for FY 1975. We urge that your Committee report express this view and specifically recognize the need for inclusion in the FY 1977 budget request of sufficient funds to support higher training costs as well as an appropriate expansion of the size of the education and training programs.

3. The FY 1976 construction budget contemplates funding for construction and education facilities construction which occurred in the FY 1975 construction budget request. Again, although the construction of such a project would be a constructive use of VA funds, we believe that the President and his staff should reexamine the FY 1975 budget request and request that the construction of VA Hospitals and Clinics’ facilities be deferred to FY 1977. This measure would then be consistent with the general growth of the fiscal year 1976 Federal budget as presented by the President. We urge that your Committee report express this view and specifically recognize the need for inclusion in the FY 1977 budget request of sufficient funds to support higher training costs as well as an appropriate expansion of the size of the education and training programs.

4. We also strongly recommend Core hospital staffing to carry out the recommendations in the Chief Medical Director’s Special Study in both the FY 1975 supplemental and FY 1976 budgets. We believe that the staffing levels in the medical care program falls short by 1,757 in average employment (FTEE) of the 7,633 total specifically identified and found necessary to operate the VA hospitals, nursing homes, and outpatient clinics. At an average salary of approximately $18,000, plus 1,757 in average employment would entail a full-year cost of $238,414. We also understand that, in testimony to your Committee last month, Chief Medical Director John D. Chase indicated that these 1,757 core staff positions are in addition to the 1,757 core staff that he felt that persons to fill them were recruitable.

Nevertheless, we understand that it may not be feasible in the next few months to increase the FY 1976 appropriation total annual request (for the seven medical care budget requests which we have identified in our recommendations) by the amount we recommend. If the commitment is made to increase the FY 1976 moving average the 301(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-344), a print of which is enclosed for your information, we believe that we have identified in the seven budget items in question and have found certain underestimates for FY 1975 and FY 1976 in the following categories and budget reallocations, we find the overall request of $4,247,334,000 to be deserving of full support by you, the Senate, the Administration, and the subcommittee for such purpose as was made in the deliberations and report of the Senate Budget Committee. We are providing this information to your Committee in the event that you wish to provide funding for these purposes either in the FY 1975 second supplemental appropriation bill or in the FY 1976 regular VA appropriation.

We have identified four basic weaknesses in the FY 1976 medical and hospital program budget requests which we believe must be clearly understood in the context of our recommendations that the overall Administration hospital and medical program budget be supported.

1. The budget for research (taking into account a transfer-in of $2,865,000 in health sciences research funds in FY 1975 and $65,000,000 in FY 1976) is $95,000,000 in 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 report express this view and call for inclusion in the FY 1977 request of an appreciable increase in research funding in order to avoid the
future years. Further, because of the time
constraints inherent in this year's tight
schedule, all such estimates and views do not
decor there the views of such member of
the Committee as to each particular
subject area.

The Committee staff may be of fur-
ther assistance in your consideration of vet­
ers' 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, veteran's income security programs, such as compensation and pension, will have to be adjusted to reflect cost-of-living in­
creases, currently estimated to reach 14 per-
cent. The fiscal year 1976 budget, which was
enacted of Public Law 93-295, similarly, the effect of inflation on non-
security programs it administers may be affected
in various ways. Potential VA liability in the housing
area resulting from service-connected
disabilities. The fiscal year 1976 budget
provides for 25,766 veterans and 103,500
employees. Thus, all of the foregoing could
continue to operate during fiscal year 1976, since enactment of Pub­
lic Law 93-295.

Similarly, the effect of inflation on non-
security programs it administers may be affected
in various ways. Potential VA liability in the housing
area resulting from service-connected
disabilities. The fiscal year 1976 budget
provides for 25,766 veterans and 103,500
employees. Thus, all of the foregoing could
continue to operate during fiscal year 1976, since enactment of Pub­
lic Law 93-295.

Similarly, the effect of inflation on non-
security programs it administers may be affected
in various ways. Potential VA liability in the housing
area resulting from service-connected
disabilities. The fiscal year 1976 budget
provides for 25,766 veterans and 103,500
employees. Thus, all of the foregoing could
continue to operate during fiscal year 1976, since enactment of Pub­
lic Law 93-295.

Similarly, the effect of inflation on non-
security programs it administers may be affected
in various ways. Potential VA liability in the housing
area resulting from service-connected
disabilities. The fiscal year 1976 budget
provides for 25,766 veterans and 103,500
employees. Thus, all of the foregoing could
continue to operate during fiscal year 1976, since enactment of Pub­
lic Law 93-295.

Similarly, the effect of inflation on non-
security programs it administers may be affected
in various ways. Potential VA liability in the housing
area resulting from service-connected
disabilities. The fiscal year 1976 budget
provides for 25,766 veterans and 103,500
employees. Thus, all of the foregoing could
continue to operate during fiscal year 1976, since enactment of Pub­
lic Law 93-295.
of the Office of Construction; $16.6 million for cemetery work; $5 million to correct seismic deficiencies of VA hospitals and VA-managed NHBHs; $3,417,000 has been obligated out of the $26 million available for this purpose (subchapter I of chapter 82). Of the remaining $20 million appropriated, approximately $21 million has been obligated for expansion of training capacity at existing medical and dental schools affiliated with VA hospitals and for initiation and expansion of other health manpower training facilities (subchapters II, III, and IV of chapter 83).

The overall VA medical care, administration, research, and health manpower assistance, and construction budgets are generally concentrated based on load projections and other estimates in the budget, with two caveats: The standstill budgetary impact that existed in fiscal year 1975, when the VA was required to provide educational grants for education and training (residents, interns, and other trainees—projected at 76,000, with 8,170 for medical students and dental students (with one more under serious consideration) have been identified for initiation in conjunction with State universities, clinical teaching facilities; $21 million has been obligated out of the $25 million available for this purpose (subchapter I of chapter 82). Of the remaining $17 million appropriated, approximately $9 million has been obligated for manpower training authority. Thus far, 5 universities, utilizing VA hospital clinical facilities, have initiated or are in the process of initiating in conjunction with medical schools (with one more under serious consideration) of the Office of Construction; $16.6 million has been obligated out of the $20 million available for this purpose.

The Veterans Health Care Expansion Act of 1973 (Pub. L. 93-82) has been pending concurrently with the Presidential proclamation which will have the effect of extending the exchange of medical information programs’ authorization of apportionments for readjustment assistance for the first full year.

**III. BUDGETARY IMPACT OF ACTION ON PIONERIAL LEGISLATION PROPOSALS**

The administration has requested legislation to repeal the 2-year extension of the delimiting period for readjustment assistance benefits provided by Public Law 93-357. If enacted, such legislation would reduce outlays by $81 million in fiscal year 1975 (using the April 1, 1975, as the beginning date of the President’s budget) and $600 million in fiscal year 1976. Despite administration opposition, Congress unanimously enacted legislation extending the delimiting period to an additional 2-year period within which to utilize educational assistance benefits. It is highly uncertain whether the Senate-passed repeal of this legislation will be enacted.

**B. Medical care**

The administration has also requested legislation to effect reimbursement to the VA by private insurers for the cost of inpatient hospital and medical and dental care and treatment provided for the non-service-connected disabilities of veterans, especially those with serious service-connected disabilities (80 percent or more). The act also made improvements in the nursing home care (subchapter II of chapter 82). It advanced administrative and mandating the VA to provide educational assistance and educational support to veterans with serious service-connected disabilities, to ensure adequate reimbursement for property loss and for health care provided in private facilities, and in the medical care of veterans.
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budget request, recent experience would indicate that this is low. For example, the increase projected by the budget is considerably less than the term in question, and a percentage increase, than the utmost 13 per cent increase originally projected for fiscal year 1974. In this connection, it must be noted that 1974 was the first fiscal year during which the new housing credit provisions were in the Veterans Health Care Expansion Act of 1974 (Pub. L. 93-82) began to impact on outpatient visits. It is possible, however, that the fiscal year 1975 estimate of 80 percent too low and that the additional work generated by Public Law 93-82 will increase the total fiscal year 1975 outpatient visits by about 53.2 million. Using an average of $30 per outpatient visit, the medical budget increase of $28,468,000 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 $920 million.

Second, the budget includes an estimate of $757 million in average daily patient census (ADPC) for fiscal year 1975. This estimate is $29,420,000. This seems to be underestimated by 36 percent; fiscal year 1976 requirements will be $29,230 ADPC, with a backup cost of $15,655,000.

A less certain area of possible underestimate in the budget is the demand for outpatient treatment which could be generated by the high unemployment rate and the concomitant loss of health insurance coverage by previously covered former workers. Congress has now before both Houses legislation to provide health care to the unemployed which would likely obviate this potential area of increase in demand on VA medical facilities. Since the administration has strongly opposed this legislation, however, every less of health insurance benefits have lapsed by virtue of their job loss, and enrollment of such patients will be understated, and, hence, the VA system may well experience an increase in demand for health care services brought about by the lapse of health insurance coverage due to unemployment.

Mr. WEEKER. Mr. President, I rise to commend the Senate Appropriations Committee for authorizing $35 million to implement the section 802 program.

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 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 play a major role in providing a suitable living environment for all Americans. To date, 33 States have created State housing agencies, whose 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 taxable market. Mr. President, during the consideration of the first supplemental appropriations bill, the Senate adopted an amendment which appropriated $35 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 urged HUD to increase their assistance with respect to the development of regulations to implement the program. What has HUD's response? Delay, Inaction.

At this point, I would like to highlight an appropriate section of the Senate committee's report.

In appropriating these funds, the Committee intends that the HUD secretary will provide regulations for the program as soon as possible with respect to the provisions for interest reductions as well as for Federal guarantee of bonds to be issued by States for the revitalization of slum areas and the construction of housing for low- and moderate-income families in connection with such revitalization.

This strong report language makes it clear that the Senate will not tolerate any more footdragging on this program. We need action, not further study.

Since the moratorium in 1975, the housing problems have increased, the backlog of units to be produced has grown, and the capability for producing housing has diminished.

It is my understanding that the administration has strongly opposed this legislation, presented a convincing case, in a letter to Senator PROXMEES. Their letter refutes the objections expressed by the administration's spokesman. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed at this point in the Record.

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

COUNCIL OF STATE HOUSING AGENCIES,
July 14, 1974.

SECRETARY WILLIAM PROXMEES,
7th S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator PROXMEES: I am writing to you as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Development to express our strong support for inclusion in the pending appropriation bill for the Department of Housing and Urban Development of $800,000 of contract authority to fund the interest differential commitment authority under section 802 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.

Section 802, as you know, provides new authorities to assist State housing and development agencies to issue bonds for their programs through the issuance of taxable obligations in the public market. It was enacted at Congressional initiative, with Senator Weeker and Representative Russ taking lead roles and with the strong support of the Council of State Housing Agencies and the National Governors' Conference. HUD has not yet, almost a year after Congress's enactment of this provision, started to implement these new authorities, nor has it announced when or under what terms it will operate this program.

As you know, HUD argued that last time Section 802 was before Committee in the January supplemental appropriation bill, that it needed more time to study this program. I hope we will now have a more tractable method for financing new construction under the Section 8 program. Section 802

Housing Agencies and many of its members, conducted this week, I can report unanimous and increasing support for this program. What has HUD's response? Delay, Inaction.

At this point, I would like to highlight an appropriate section of the Senate committee's report.

In appropriating these funds, the Committee intends that the HUD secretary will provide regulations for the program as soon as possible with respect to the provisions for interest reductions as well as for Federal guarantee of bonds to be issued by States for the revitalization of slum areas and the construction of housing for low- and moderate-income families in connection with such revitalization.

This strong report language makes it clear that the Senate will not tolerate any more footdragging on this program. We need action, not further study.

Since the moratorium in 1975, the housing problems have increased, the backlog of units to be produced has grown, and the capability for producing housing has diminished.

It is my understanding that the administration has strongly opposed this legislation, presented a convincing case, in a letter to Senator PROXMEES. Their letter refutes the objections expressed by the administration's spokesman. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed at this point in the Record.

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

COUNCIL OF STATE HOUSING AGENCIES,
July 14, 1974.

SECRETARY WILLIAM PROXMEES,
7th S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator PROXMEES: I am writing to you as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Development to express our strong support for inclusion in the pending appropriation bill for the Department of Housing and Urban Development of $800,000 of contract authority to fund the interest differential commitment authority under section 802 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.

Section 802, as you know, provides new authorities to assist State housing and development agencies to issue bonds for their programs through the issuance of taxable obligations in the public market. It was enacted at Congressional initiative, with Senator Weeker and Representative Russ taking lead roles and with the strong support of the Council of State Housing Agencies and the National Governors' Conference. HUD has not yet, almost a year after Congress's enactment of this provision, started to implement these new authorities, nor has it announced when or under what terms it will operate this program.

As you know, HUD argued that last time Section 802 was before Committee in the January supplemental appropriation bill, that it needed more time to study this program. I hope we will now have a more tractable method for financing new construction under the Section 8 program. Section 802
meets these objectives in a way that will hold interest rates down by permitting a better balance of demand between the taxable and tax exempt markets.

(b) Mr. deWilde questions whether the subsidy and the expanded use of taxable bonds is cost effective if the tax exemption is not simultaneously eliminated on all issues. We fail to see the connection. Each time that a taxable bond is issued in lieu of a tax exempt bond, additional tax revenues are derived equal to, on the average, as much as 50% of the interest earned on the taxable bond, according to Treasury Department estimates. A subsidy of 38% is not cost effective if it, too, is not less to the federal government than the additional revenues derived. In addition, Mr. deWilde states there appears to conflict with past Treasury policy, which actively promoted the use of taxable bonds with corresponding increased federal subsidies in limited fields rather than use of tax exempt bonds in such fields. Results of this policy are not to limit the existing authority of those agencies. (c) Mr. deWilde states that changed economic conditions require new analyses of Section 802. As indicated earlier in this letter, changed conditions have essentially served to increase the need for and importance of Section 802.

As we have stated before, the Council of State Governments stands ready to assist HUD in any way possible to develop program guidelines, forms and procedures which will allow Section 802 to be promptly implemented. With your support, we hope to have that chance soon.

Sincerely,

JOHN G. BURNETT

President

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, in 1973, the Federal Government abandoned the goal of providing a decent home for all Americans. The section 802 program is designed, in part, to provide these State agencies with the Federal assistance that is necessary to tackle the tough jobs in our inner cities.

I am deeply disappointed with HUD's opposition to this program. To me, their position on this matter is indicative of an overall lack of commitment to the housing goals, as set forth by the Congress.

I hope this appropriation of $38 million will survive a House-Senate conference committee. The States have the expertise and the enthusiasm to do the job. Let us not allow the apathy in Washington to kill this vitally needed program.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore, The yeas and nays have already been ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry.

Is it not just about time to proceed to the vetoed legislation?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is correct. 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 vote on 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 Senate will receive a message from the President of the United States returning, without approval, the bill (S. 66) to amend the Public Health Service Act and related health laws to revise and extend the health revenue sharing programs, the programs of the community mental health centers program, the program for migrant health centers and community health centers, the National Health Service Corps program, and the programs for assistance for nurse training, and for other purposes, which reads as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I am today returning, without my approval, S. 66, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide support for health services, nurse training, and the National Health Service Corps program. This bill is very similar to two separate bills which I disapproved during the last session of the 93rd Congress, H.R. 14214 and H.R. 17083. In my memoranda of disapproval, dated December 23, 1974, and January 3, 1975, respectively, I cited a number of reasons why I could not approve those bills. Those objections remain valid for the measure before me today.

As in last year's bills, S. 66, would authorize excessive appropriation levels. I realize that in considering the bill this year, the 94th Congress made some reductions in the total cost of the measure. However, the levels authorized are still far in excess of the amounts we can afford for these programs. The bill would authorize almost $550 million above my fiscal year 1976 budget request for the programs involved, and it exceeds fiscal year 1977 levels by approximately the same amount, resulting in an increase of $1.1 billion. At a time when the overall Federal deficit is estimated at $60 billion, proposed authorization levels such as these cannot be tolerated.

When I signed the Tax Reduction Act of 1975, I pledged to do everything in my power to keep this year's deficit from exceeding $60 billion and to restrain the longer-run growth of the deficit. I stated that I would resist every attempt by the Congress to add to that deficit. Bills currently being considered by the Congress would add $25 billion to the fiscal year 1976 deficit and $45 billion to next year's deficit. If they were to become law, they would lock us into a permanent policy of excessive spending and make the Federal budget a primary cause of inflation for years to come. To avoid this, I have no choice but to veto these bills if the Congress insists upon sending them to me.

A part from its excessive authorization levels, S. 66 is unsound from a program standpoint. In the area of health services, for example, the bill proposes extension and expansion of Community Mental Health Centers. The programs have not been adequately demonstrated and should now be absorbed by the regular health services delivery system. S. 66 also would continue and expand such separate categorical programs as Community Health Centers and Migrant Health Centers. In addition, it would authorize several new narrow categorical, and potentiality costly programs. These existing authorities, including $30 million for the treatment of hypertension, $17 million for rape prevention and control, $10 million for home health service demonstration agencies, and $18 million for hemophilia treatment and blood separation centers. Three new national commissions on specific diseases also would be established. The Federal role in health services delivery through such narrow categorical programs is not consistent with development of an integrated, flexible health service delivery system.

The Administration repeatedly and vigorously has opposed measures such as S. 66 and urged passage of a more effective and more equitable approach to Federal assistance for health services. H.R. 4819 and S. 1203, which reflect our proposals, would consolidate various separate programs into the flexible project grants authority of the Public Health Service Act to allow funding of a wide variety of health services projects based on State and local needs. Moreover, such programs could be for demonstration purposes. Once a new service model has been adequately tested, its adoption into the delivery of services can—and should—be the primary responsibility of the State sector and State and local governments.

The Federal role in overcoming barriers to needed health care should emphasize health care financing programs and encouragement of Federal spending is estimated at $22 billion this year. These programs establish specified eligibility and benefits standards and
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 individual communities and groups for special funding assistance. In my view, this is clearly an inequitable approach to health problems and an unwise attempt to make the judgments made in Washington for those of responsible persons in State and local governments and the private sector.

Criticizing the registered nurse training authorities, S. 66 inappropriately proposes continuation of large amounts of capitation and construction support. These support mechanisms have outlived their usefulness. 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 tightening in some areas. As early as January 1973, the American Nurses’ Association stated that “... it appears that the shortage of staff nurses is disappearing.” Our failure to limit growth now necessarily will result in a large excess number of nurses, creating the same kind of oversupply that has left thousands of elementary and secondary school teachers disillusioned with the lack of prospects.

The general nursing student assistance provisions contained in this bill are largely duplicative of existing undergraduate 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 submitted 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 inappropriate structure our health care system. I urge the Congress to pass such legislation, using the bill that 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 introduced a bill to combine these 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 have compromise with 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 money we are authorizing in these programs are for any new initiatives.

One initiative is a home health services 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 without new programs. 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 to the best interest of the people.

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, 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 United States, in public 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.

These 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, so trained, educated, and motivated young people to go into the underserved areas of this country—young people, who because of their training, are so well prepared 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.

It 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, a 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 soundly defeating the death knell of these programs and the Administration has submitted legislation in Washington for those of responsible persons in State and local governments and the private sector.

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 individual communities and groups for special funding assistance. In my view, this is clearly an inequitable approach to health problems and an unwise attempt to make the judgments made in Washington for those of responsible persons in State and local governments and the private sector.
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With these increases, the employment market for general duty nurses already is tightening in some areas. As early as January 1973, the American Nurses’ Association stated that “... it appears that the shortage of staff nurses is disappearing.” Our failure to limit growth now necessarily will result in a large excess number of nurses, creating the same kind of oversupply that has left thousands of elementary and secondary school teachers disillusioned with the lack of prospects.

The general nursing student assistance provisions contained in this bill are largely duplicative of existing undergraduate 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 submitted 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.
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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).
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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 have compromise with 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 money we are authorizing in these programs are for any new initiatives.

One initiative is a home health services 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 without new programs. 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 to the best interest of the people.

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, 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 United States, in public 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.

These 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, so trained, educated, and motivated young people to go into the underserved areas of this country—young people, who because of their training, are so well prepared 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.

It 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, a 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 soundly defeating the death knell of these programs and the Administration has submitted legislation in Washington for those of responsible persons in State and local governments and the private sector.
sion 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, his designee, has 15 minutes remaining.

Who yields time?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senate yield the remainder of my time?

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield my time to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Thank the Senator.

I understand 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 parts of nursing 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 me 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 Service Corps. 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 takes 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 provisions 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, 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 states 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—and I will vote for this.

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 woefully 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 large 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 the predominance of such a bill as Medicaid, Medicare, and the Health Maintenance Organizations, for which spending is estimated at $22 billion this year.

Mr. President, of course it is. But that is by no means, and everybody knows it, the total health package this country not only ought to 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 said, "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."

Mr. President, I 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 humility, not with contempt. 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 bill, to 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, he 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.

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 Psychiatric Social Workers 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 VOTES S. 66—HEALTH SERVICES AND NURSE TRAINING BILL

1. Bill is $6,541,358 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 $4,755,039 million less than the House Bill for Nurse Training Act.
4. Senate Conferences concurred 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 working to get S. 66 signed or veto overridden.
7. Maldistribution 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 no 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.
9. The Federal Register of July 14, 1975 had a 40 page list of hospitals critically short of nurses!

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, Partial payment of community Mental Health Centers, Migrant Health Centers, Community Health Centers, Home Health Services, Mental Health for the Elderly, Disease Control (tuberculosis, polio, etc.), 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 home health care services to medically underserved populations.

Home Health Services—Provides for the last year for which information is available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount in Millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>90,051,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>1,553,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>6,926,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>7,991,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>5,251,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>8,770,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>6,578,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>2,312,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>8,947,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>18,113,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>10,975,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1,591,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>5,926,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>16,696,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>10,040,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1,492,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>5,349,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>13,670,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>4,465,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>4,086,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>8,867,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>13,681,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>16,208,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>7,781,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>6,182,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>2,955,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>4,061,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1,911,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1,405,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>18,657,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>4,704,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>37,814,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>9,449,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>599,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>7,894,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>4,840,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>3,453,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>4,726,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>3,516,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>7,318,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>3,291,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>10,366,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>25,477,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>3,208,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>2,187,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>5,275,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>8,760,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>8,102,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>119,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>3,624,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>286,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Outlying Areas</td>
<td>5,835,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S. 66 COMPARED TO PREVIOUS BILLS AND EXPENSE PUBLIC LAWS

[In millions of dollars]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last year authorized under expired legislation</th>
<th>Continuing resolution to fiscal year 1975</th>
<th>1st year authorized by bills (12/1974)</th>
<th>1st year authorized by S. 66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Training Act</td>
<td>$248</td>
<td>$119.1</td>
<td>$187.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health revenue sharing</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family planning</td>
<td>201,750</td>
<td>150,615</td>
<td>216.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community mental health centers</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>213.5</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape prevention and control</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community health centers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant health centers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Health Service Corps</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>997.35</td>
<td>769.744</td>
<td>1,093.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
4. New program.
5. Includes some other CDC programs.
6. No vetoed bill.
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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 individuals for S. 66 programs.

(Totals are for the last year for which information is available.)
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>6,182,489</td>
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<td>37,814,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>9,449,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>599,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>7,894,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>4,840,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>3,453,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>4,726,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>3,516,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>7,318,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>3,291,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>10,366,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>25,477,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>3,208,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>2,187,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>5,275,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>8,760,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>8,102,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>119,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>3,624,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>286,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Outlying Areas</td>
<td>5,835,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 3 minutes?
Mr. JAVITTS. 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 the Senator from New York, and a couple more.
As has been explained by them, Senate bill 66 authorizes the extension of various health programs including community mental health, community health centers, migrant health, and the National Health Service Corps. The bill also authorizes some 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, Mr. President, I wrote the President urging that he sign S. 66. I think that was good advice, because the programs contained in S. 66 are needed and important to the citizens of this country. As I stated before, one of the national polling companies took a poll, and it showed that the No. 1 concern of the President urging that he sign S. 66 authorizes the extension of various health programs including the one sponsored and offered by my distinguished colleague from Maryland (Mr. Mathias) and cosponsored by me relating to rape prevention.
Mr. President, it seems to me that it makes very good sense to continue the kind of programs authorized in S. 66. I strongly urge the Senate to override the President's veto.
Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Maryland. He has been an extreme—
Mr. HATHAWAY. I thank the Senator.
Mr. President, I support the bill for all the reasons raised by the Senators from Maine, Massachusetts, New York, and Maryland.
Mr. President, I rise in support of the vote to override the President's veto of S. 66. I commend the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITTS) for their statements in behalf of this most important health matter and wholeheartedly endorse their position as well as the reasons for their position.
Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I rise as ranking Republican on the Subcommittee to strongly urge the Senate to override the veto of this bill.
Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may require to the Senator from Pennsylvania.
Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I rise as ranking Republican on the Subcommittee to strongly urge the Senate to override the veto of this bill.
Mr. President, S. 66 extends for fiscal years 1976 and 1977 the nurse training authorizations contained in the Public Health Service Act. It is the President's difference in philosophy with regard to health care. The principles of S. 66 have been endorsed by both Houses of Congress by substantial votes and I am hopeful that this body, by an overwhelming vote, will show the President that we adhere to the tenants of our philosophy with regard to health care. The number of trained nurses needed will be far in excess of those which the President seems to feel will be sufficient.
In fine, Mr. President, it appears that the President bases his veto of S. 66 on inaccuracies with regard to our projected number of trained nurses today. Furthermore, when you consider the number of health care proposals now pending including national health insurance, and with adoption of only the modest proposal of national health insurance advocated by the President himself, the increased number of trained nurses needed will be far in excess of those which the President seems to feel will be sufficient.
So, Mr. President, it appears that Mr. Beall 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 they have been successful, should be removed. 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 providing mental health services in this country equitably, at a price that they can afford.
So, Mr. President, I think that it makes very good sense to continue the kind of programs that are needed and important to the citizens of this country. Therefore, Mr. President, I rise again to urge that S. 66 be overridden.
Mr. JAVITTS. 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 the floor 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 similar Bills passed by the 93rd Congress were pocket-vetoed. The distinguished colleague, Senator SCHUMER 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 health-being of the people of our Nation.

Hard as it may be to believe, the President vetoed S. 66, the Nurse Training and Improving Community Health 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 a unanimous vote. My colleagues will recall that the 95th Congress were pocket-vetoed.

This leaves our health care system in pretty shoddy shape, and, frankly, I find this veto unconscionable.

Furthermore, this bill includes vital authorizations to continue the National Health Service Corps program, which has been so successful in bringing health professionals to medically underserved communities. And it includes vital authorizations 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 vetoed last December were too high from his point of view. The pending bill has been reduced by $0.5 billion. But even our reduction is not sufficient to satisfy the executive branch. Despite the care­ful study of this case for a national response to the national health problems identified in S. 66, the White House focuses on its "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 Nordic nations can 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.

If the President 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 restrain Federal spending, and efforts 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 last year. We have reduced the levels of previous reductions by 22 percent from the levels he found unacceptable last December.

Yet, this bill is vetoed, and the Senate must now decide 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 catch-all of new spending 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 of time and effort to revise 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 austerely 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.

Nonetheless, 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 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 many Americans, then he is wrong to persist in his intention at this time. If he contends that the Congress cannot afford to provide financial support in these instances, then he is wrong to persist in his intention at this time.

I urge my colleagues in both Houses to override this veto. Mr. President, now is the time for the Congress to assert its concern for the health status of the American people.
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 hopeless 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 carry 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. 68 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 assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will resume. The call of the roll will be in order. This is a 10-minute rollcall vote. The Senate will be in order so that the rollcall can be completed. The Senators will take their seats. This is a rollcall vote. The Senate will be in order. The clerk will resume.

The legislative clerk proceeded and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. MORGAN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON), 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. BURDICK) would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDFIELD), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PARRY), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resorted—yeas 67, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 337 Leg.]

**YEAS—67**

Abourezk  Bennett  Beall  Bentsen  Brooke
Bumpers  Byrd  Cannon  Case  Chiles
Clark  C saul  Curtis  Dole  Domencic
Eagleton  Fong  Ford  Gravel  Hart
Hart, Gary W.  Haskell  Hatch  Helms  Hollings
Kerry  Kendrick  Keating  Kennedy  Kragg
Cutter  Edgerton  Eastland  Eastland  Eastland
Fannin  Ford  Frank  Franklin  Former
Pannin  Laxalt  Laxalt

**NAYS—15**

Brock  Buckley  Byrd  Claybrook  Curtis  Fannin
Glenn  Goldwater  Glenn  Gravel  Hart
Hart, Gary W.  Haskell  Harner  Hart  Hruska

NOT VOTING—17

Bichler  Bellmon  Borden  Borden  Borden
Boren  Burdick  Church  Church  Church
Church  Church  Church  Church  Church

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote, the yeas are 67, and the nays 15. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the bill, on reconsideration, is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.


The Senate continued with the consideration of the 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 the period ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, with a time limitation on the rollcall vote of 10 minutes, the Senate will proceed to vote on final passage on H. R. 8070.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, is that the HUD appropriation bill?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Which is the HUD bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is my understanding, while we have had the rollcall on this bill, we have not used up the time. There are two Senators who would like a short colloquy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There was a unanimous-consent agreement that the vote immediately follow the vote on the override of the veto.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we be permitted to take 10 minutes that I may yield briefly to Senator Muskie and Senator DOMENICI.

Mr. MONTOYA. I object.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will suspend. The call of the roll will be in order.

The assistant legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HART), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. MORGAN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON), 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. BURDICK), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. MORGAN), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDFIELD), the Senator from California (Mr. HART), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PARRY), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITTS) would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 7, as follows:
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—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent 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 conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BEALL, Mr. HUDDLESTON, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. HUDDLESTON, as the Senate conferees 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 finance.

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 on a nondiscriminatory basis for all neighborhoods within the communities and neighborhoods from which the institutions receive deposits.

(b) The purpose of this Act is to provide the citizens and public officials of the United States with sufficient information to enable them to determine which depository institutions are willing 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 3 of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974.

(2) the term "depository institution" means a person who is in the business of making federally related mortgage loans; and

(3) the term "census tract" as established and defined by the Bureau of the Census; and

(4) the term "Board" means the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS AND PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

Sec. 4. (a) Each depository institution which has a home office that is located within a standard metropolitan statistical area, as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, shall keep and make available, in accordance with regulations of the Board, to the public for inspection and copying at each office of that institution the following information:

(A) The number and total dollar amount of mortgage loans made by that institution which were outstanding as of the close of the last fiscal year of that institution.

(B) The number and total dollar amount of mortgage loans made by that institution during each year.

(2) The information required to be maintained and made available under paragraph (1) shall also be itemized in order to clearly and conspicuously disclose the following:

(A) The number and dollar amount for each item referred to in paragraph (1), by census tract, for borrowers under mortgage loans secured by property located within that standard metropolitan statistical area.

(B) The number and dollar amount for each item referred to in paragraph (1), by county, for all such mortgage loans which are secured by property located outside that standard metropolitan statistical area.

Any item of information relating to mortgage loans required to be maintained under subsection (a) shall be further itemized in order to disclose for each such item:

(1) the number and dollar amount of mortgage loans which are insured under title II of the National Housing Act or under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 or which are guaranteed under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code; and

(2) the number and dollar amount of mortgage loans made to mortgagees who did not, at the time of execution of the mortgage, intend to reside in the property securing the mortgage loan.

ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 5. (a) The Board shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. Such regulations may contain such classifications, differentiations, or other provisions, and may provide for such adjustments and exceptions for any class of transactions, as in the judgment of the Board are necessary or proper to effectuate the purposes of this Act, and prevent circumvention or evasion thereof, or to facilitate compliance therewith.

(b) Compliance with the requirements imposed under this Act shall be enforced—

(1) section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, in the case of insured banks; and

(2) a national banks, by the Comptroller of the Currency;

(A) national banks, by the Comptroller of the Currency;

(B) insured banks of the Federal Reserve System (other than national banks), by the Board;

(B) insured banks of the Federal Reserve System (other than national banks), by the Board;

(C) banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (other than members of the Federal Reserve System), by the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

(C) banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (other than members of the Federal Reserve System), by the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

(2) section 5(d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, section 407 of the National Housing Act, and section 6 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board (acting directly or through the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation), in the case of any...
institutions subject to any of those provisions; (3) the Federal Credit Union Act, by the Administrator of the National Credit Union Administration with respect to any Federal credit union; (4) For the purpose of the exercise by any agency referred to in subsection (b) of its powers under this Act, referred to in subsection (b), a violation of any requirement imposed under this Act shall be deemed to be a violation of a requirement imposed under any other Government agency under any provision of law specifically referred to in subsection (b), each of the agencies may act independently in the exercise, for the purpose of enforcing compliance with any requirement imposed under this Act, in any other authority conferred on it by law. (d) Except to the extent that enforcement of the requirements imposed under this Act is specifically committed to some other Government agency under subsection (b), the Federal Trade Commission shall enforce the requirements. For the purpose of the exercise by the Federal Trade Commission of its functions and powers under the Federal Trade Commission Act, a violation of any requirement imposed under this Act shall be deemed a violation of a requirement imposed under that Act. All of the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission under the Federal Trade Commission Act are available to the Commission to enforce its authority by any person with the requirements imposed under this Act, irrespective of whether that person is engaged in commerce or meets any other jurisdictional tests in the Federal Trade Commission Act. (e) The authority of the Board to issue regulations under this Act does not impair the authority of any other agency designated in this section to make rules respecting its own procedures in enforcing compliance with requirements imposed under this Act.

RELATED TO STATE LAWS

Sec. 6. (a) This Act does not annul, alter, or affect, or exempt any person subject to the provisions of this Act from complying with any state or subdivision thereof with respect to public disclosure and recordkeeping by depository institutions, except that the law is inconsistent with any provision of this Act, and then only to the extent of the inconsistency determined to exist. The Board may not determine that any 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 as 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, consultation with 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 repositing institutions located outside standard metropolitan statistical areas, as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, 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 feasibility, cost, and usefulness 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 practices, such as personal business and home improvement loans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, The time for debate on this measure is limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided between the majority leader and the minority leader.

Who yields time? Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. President, 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 on the second of those two votes, but unfortunately, apparently I had not been sufficiently alert to insure that I would have the time to provide the information when it might have been most useful. As far as I know, 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 on S. 66 is authorizing legislation. As such, it is difficult to evaluate its impact on the first concurrent budget resolution. Nevertheless, 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 legislation, 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 ordain 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 is no objection; the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FUNCTION 500: HEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE C—SELECTED ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION</th>
<th>[in billions of dollars]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal year 1976</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spending legislation not yet reported to the Senate and not requested by the President:

- National health insurance (S. 3929, H.R. 6272, S. 3935, H.R. 6273, Finance Committee, Labor and Public Welfare Committee)
- Dollar amounts represent increase over President's budget request.

C. Not yet reported in Senate: Projects being considered by Labor and Public Welfare Committee (no bills yet introduced):
- Heart and lung research...
- Biomedical research...
- Communicable disease...
- General welfare...
- General education/health education/clinical laboratory regulation...

Total, spending legislation (to table A, line 11a),...

Authorization legislation:

A. Through Congress or passed Senate:

- Dollar amounts represent increase over President's budget request.

B. Reported in Senate: Note...

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 $800 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 Environmental Protection Agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, the Veterans' Administration, and eight other smaller agencies.

Six functional categories of the budget comprise the bulk of the bill. They are: commerce and transportation; community and regional development; defense; security; general science, space and technology; natural resources, environment and energy; and veterans' benefits and services. Appropriations in this bill are generally consistent with the recommendations of the Budget Committee in connection with the concurrent resolution adopted in May. But a few comments are needed to emphasize that in terms of outlays, H.R. 8070 was in line with the House resolution in the commerce and transportation function.

Finally, the last point relates to veterans' benefits and services. H.R. 8070 appropriates $17.8 billion for veterans' spending, which exceeds our target by $0.7 billion. This enormous decrease in budget authority is accounted for principally by a reduction in the Department of Veterans Affairs appropriations budget for both housing and non-housing programs. If we assume that the $0.7 billion will be appropriated, we will reach a new figure of budget authority of $18.4 billion, or $500 million over the target set in the first concurrent resolution. This figure allows for funding of none of the additional congressional initiatives in the veterans' area which have either been passed or are now pending and which would add another $700 million. Because of all of these factors the Congress may need to take another look at the budgetary process if we are to earn the congressional deficit, with no mention of the magnitude of underestimates in mandatory spending programs. The estimates of $1.4 billion for veterans' programs is a good example of this situation.

I want to stress that these underestimates originate in the executive branch, yet we on the Senate Budget Committee try to anticipate what they might be but we have really been able to develop that kind of insight.

There are those who say that we ought to eat these underestimates by cutting back on other programs in order to absorb the amount of money that is involved. To do that would—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield the Senator an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. MUSKIE. To do that in many cases would have the effect of eliminating worthwhile programs wholly as the result of pressure from an unforeseen source of budgetary procedure.

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

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes. I yield. Mr. PROXMIRE. I commend the Senator, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for bringing this to the attention of the Senate. I think it is an illustration of the great significance of the Budget Committee, which helps all of us in the Senate to take a fiscally responsible position, to know what we are doing.

A simple fact is that as to the bill that we just passed, as far as the Veterans' Administration is concerned, we are under the budget by about $7 billion. The increase over the original budget estimate which we provided is only what is required by entitlement. So we had no discretion whatsoever except with regard to this request for an additional $13 million for sending out education and pension checks, and so forth.

The point is, as I understand the Senator from Maine, that the administration has badly underestimated the deficit. It is not going to happen under the entitlement. There is nothing the Committee on Appropriations could do, in fact, nothing the Senate could do, or Congress could do, to hold it down, but the estimates have been, one might say, far too optimistic, because they estimated we would require far less than we did. Is that correct?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator has put his finger on the point. With respect to those items in the budget that were controlling, the Committee on Appropriations is within the figures. With respect to these uncontrollable items, we are caught in the pressure of underestimates that originated in the executive branch.

Mr. President, that concludes what I wanted to say at this time. I thank my good friend from Wisconsin for giving to the opportunity to make the point. I really think it is essential to give the Senate as much information as we can on what is involved in this budgetary process if we are to earn
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.

It is my impression 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 felt 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 Eagleton, 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, and we should not have proceeded without his consent, under these circumstances.

We are under a time limitation, so we will have to proceed to act on this bill one way or the other, unless we can persuade the leadership to consider laying it aside, postponing it somehow until Monday. I would support the Senator from Texas in that view, if that is his position.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may have a quorum call, without the time being charged against cloture time.

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

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. BEALL. 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 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 and with the NATO countries would prevent the execution of the House-passed resolution to resume American arms shipments to Turkey.

The Cabinet took the step in reaction to the 223-206 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 networks, came two days before the UN was to meet, said all U.S. military installations on Turkish soil would be placed under the control of the Turkish government.

A special status was designated for the strategic air base with nuclear bombers at Incirlik, near Adana. In the Incirlik incident, the United States 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 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 air defense system, Turkey becomes one of the largest nuclear powers in the world, and I would not have thought that was what Greece would want.

I would not think it would be what Israel would want, since those were very helpful at the time of the Yom Kippur war.

What the other body has done has been to damage the security of Israel, and to damage the security of the very people they 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 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.

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 another nation's position.

There is no 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 somewhat 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.

Unfortunately, the House would not follow suit, and so we are in this paltry state of having one of the key North Atlantic Alliance members, located in the most strategic position of any of the NATO countries, literally out of that alliance and refusing even to let the American installations—and we have installations on the soil of Turkey—remain there.

Therefore, 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.
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 unbalances our anchor in the Mediterranean, at the same time the other anchor in Portugal is in danger of being unbalanced.

It weakens the security of the United States. It weakens the security of Greece. I cannot hope anything for the security of the where, anywhere, and that is why I have to designate it as the most unfortunate action I have seen taken in either House of the Congress since I have been here. I do hope that some reconsideration can be found, and I speak as one who holds two decorations from the Government of Greece. I think they recognize that I am their friend. I think they recognize that I have made their fight for them in other matters, and earlier matters relating to Cyprus, in matters pertaining to relationships with Greece and other neighboring countries, and they have recognized military efforts in the past.

I can certainly, therefore, have a right to be called a true friend of Greece. But true friendship for Greece, I think, is best shown by concern for their security. And their security is as important today as never before. Turkey is already engaged in an aggressive move in Cyprus, without question, and all of us are of the Congress since I have been here.

Let us understand what we do when we play politics with foreign policy. Yes, we can rightfully say the Congress must play a greater role in the formulation and implementation of foreign policy. But if we are going to be irresponsible, and if we are going to be so afflicted by domestic political considerations, we do not deserve to play a role in the formulation and implementation of the foreign policy of the United States.

I thank my friend from Alabama. Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Texas. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BAKER. If the Senator will yield--

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields 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 Texas for yielding.

I did not hear all of the remarks by the distinguished leader in the House, 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 not be reaping the consequences of our own nuclear power. I think it is the first really new one since World War II. I believe that the prospect now is that we have acted as we have in this punitive measure toward an old ally is likely to serve that function.

This imperils Israel considerably and any purported friend of Israel would try to justify the need to vote against the reclamation of aid to Turkey.

What we have done is to imperil Israel; we have impeded the intelligence-gathering capability of the United States; we have alienated an old ally; we have virtually destroyed the southern flank of NATO, and we have endangered the 6th Fleet. Having done what the House has done, having done what we do in the Congress have done, I think we should give very serious consideration to withdrawing the 6th Fleet from the Mediterranean. With Turkey driven away, with Greece out of the command structure of NATO and denying us home porting, with the instability of the Italian situation, with the numeral is under the effective control of the Communists and the Azores potentially to be denied to us, we must withdraw our defense perimeter, ultimately, if the worst comes to the worst and we believe that it will not—our Atlantic Seaboard. We have, in addition to everything else, jeopardized the gallant men and ships of the 6th Fleet.

We set ourselves to understand what we do when we play politics with foreign policy.
July 26, 1975

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

25159

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 humanitarian aid to supply defensive weapons to Jordan—In light of these developments I begin to wonder whether or not the Congress of the United States has prepared itself correctly to face this responsibility 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 concerned for 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 any treaty made under the United States. In 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 that the 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've 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 as a single, strong, and respected voice for 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.

Today, Mr. President, and I very much hope, the other body will still resind their action on the Turkish aid cutoff and that we can repair the damage that has been done. I think we can. I voted against the aid cutoff, notwithstanding there are distinguished Tennesseans who counseled me to the contrary, not to inject an undue personal consideration deserving of special treatment for the friend in a time of need.

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, moral, and 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, that they are assuming command of American installations there does not mean what it might mean, and that over this weekend and beyond we can find out where they are and to what end and that 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.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged against us this time.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, this measure, S. 1281, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1978, 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," which is a misnomer, the" redlining, " which is a misleading term, because it wrongly suggests that banks or savings and loan associations have secret maps with red lines drawn around certain undesirable neighborhoods.

We are not concerned with whether anybody has drawn red lines on maps, but the committee does have very persuasive evidence that mortgage money is very hard to get in older neighborhoods, in many cities and even suburbs. During 4 days of hearings last month, the committee heard extensive testimony from witnesses representing communities in all parts of the country. We heard from community leaders, public officials, members of Congress, and simply from citizens of these neighborhoods. And they told a consistent, familiar story:

Many, if not most lenders—banks and savings and loan associations alike—tend to be chartered to lend mortgage money in older urban neighborhoods. Let me be clear, I am not talking about slums, but sound, attractive, convenient neighborhoods, which are now becoming even more attractive to many people be-
cause of the energy shortage and the high cost of new housing.

Unfortunately, many lenders fail to appreciate the attractiveness of this sort of housing. Furthermore, on a year-by-year basis, 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 achieved.

But our financial institutions seem to discriminate these older communities, especially if they happen to be integrated, or adjacent to neighborhoods that need improvement.

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 deposits from precisely those neighborhoods that need improvement are not to be made available for loans, the same lender is charged with serving a community does have an obligation to give some service to that community. He should not arbitrarily reject a loan application from sound credit risks on sound houses simply because he does not like the neighborhood, or because he fears it may at some future time decline. Often the lender turns in to the reality, because it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. When the neighborhood cannot get mortgage credit, property values drop; new home owners cannot get in because they cannot get mortgages. Eventually, the neighborhood starts to deteriorate and so the lender can say: Eventually, I told you so.

I want to address some of the objections to S. 1281, because I have seldom seen a more panic reaction by an industry to such a benign, simple, easy proposal.

First, we are told that we have the cause and effect backwords. Lenders do not cause the decline; they merely react to it. Well, that is a half-truth. Obviously, there are multiple causes of urban decline. But when a lender rejects a sound loan application from a sound credit risk on a sound house, he clearly accelerates the decline of the older neighborhood.

The industry mail I am receiving insists that redlining does not exist, that lenders only decide whether to approve loans based on perfectly objective criteria. Now, anybody who has attempted to get a loan in recent years in a city neighborhood that was built before World War II knows that this just is not true. As Senator Gann, our esteemed and distinguished member of the committee, who has been involved in this and diligent on this bill, as he has on every bill we had since he has been a member of the Senate Banking Committee, as he said repeatedly during our hearing:

Anybody who says redlining does not exist insults my intelligence.

Senator Gann is absolutely correct.

The committee even found that upper middle income, elegant suburbs like Oak Park, Ill., have trouble finding mortgage credit. Houses were built 50 years ago, and the neighborhood has become integrated. This is a proud community, with a unique architectural heritage and a tradition of home ownership. I dare say, some of the 50-year-old homes in places like Oak Park will outlive this crackerbox housing built last year. But even in Oak Park, the local savings and loan associations want very high downpayments and short payback terms, if they make loans at all. One such institution told a customer that the Oak Park branch accepted deposits, but did not make loans. According to one of our witnesses, that institution actually deleted the "and loan" from its sign.

And the story is the same on the West Side of Milwaukee, in whole sections of St. Louis, Cleveland, Indianapolis, Baltimore, Washington, Los Angeles, Boston, and most of America's older cities.

So redlining does exist, and though it certainly is not the cause of urban decline, it does contribute to the already unwise neighborhoods into slums.

Then, we heard that this bill would be terribly expensive, that it would work to hurt the very people it was designed to help, because the costs would be passed along to consumers, and would result in higher interest rates. We asked the American Bankers Association to study the question, and they recently reported back that the average cost would be about $200 per bank per year and a few cents really for each mortgage.

There is no question about it. The cost is minimal and, as I say, this is not the estimate of the Senator from Wisconsin; this is the estimate of the American Bankers Association, which would certainly be disinclined to underestimate the cost.

Incidently, the trade daily, "The American Banker" recently published a fascinating article entitled "California Experience Challenges Anti-redlining Arguments Used by Lenders." I will include the entire article in the Record, but here is one paragraph from this financially oriented paper that editorially opposes this bill.

Two of the arguments which have been used by mortgage lenders to oppose anti-redlining measures elsewhere in the nation are being seriously questioned by California legislators, regulators and consumer activists after an examination of existing practices here.

The existing practice is the fact for 10 years, State-chartered savings and loans have been required by California law to report by census tract their loan origination patterns. This is a requirement that includes disclosures yearly. The cost, for monthly reporting, is only $2,000 annually for the largest institution in the State. And the article goes on to quote the executive direct of the State trade association, the California Savings and Loan League, that the cost of prospective census tract disclosure would be "very low."

With there is quite a difference between the existing California requirement, and S. 1281. The California reports are only for the State regulatory authorities, and they are not made public. Nor is the California experience, that the industry's...
true concern is not the minimal cost, but the embarrassment once this data is publicly 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, which nearly boycotted the entire city of Washington, D.C. at the loan window. I think it is the potential embarrassment and the accountability to depositors that the industry truly fears, just as they so strenuously opposed truth in lending.

It is worth noting that California officials are now considering whether to make public the information collected under State law, and similar regulations which were just issued by the Massachusetts Banking Commissioner; mortgage disclosure legislation has been introduced in several State legislatures, and is farthest along in Illinois, where it is part of Governor Dan Walker's program. There is also a movement in California to acquire mortgage disclosure by all banks that want to do business with the city. So it is imperative that Congress act, so that it is not a race between State officials and the accountability of requirements that encourage institutions to play off Federal against State regulators.

Section 1281 contains State preemption language, so if a State chooses to enact a more stringent disclosure law, that would apply, Governor Walker, who has sponsored a State law for Illinois, has testified that Federal legislation is also needed. State institutions do not shift to Federal charters.

In closing, Mr. President, I want to say that S. 1281 is not credit allocation legislation, though if it fails, credit allocation might become necessary. All we are doing is to provide some accountability by institutions chartered to serve communities, to the neighborhoods they are supposed to serve.

Financial institutions are not chartered simply to make as much money as they can. Since the Great Depression, banks have not been permitted to play the type of commercial games which have been separated from investment banks. Banks are not supposed to compete 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 institutions. They have certain privileges, such as Federal insurance and a partial monopoly. In exchange for these privileges, they have obligations. One such obligation is to serve their service areas. It is this principle, derived from Washington, whether a bank is doing this, and I know of no case where any of the Federal regulators have moved against a lender for redlining, even though mortgage discrimination 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.

At any rate, the facts have been done this in California for several years now—for 10 years, and we know, on the basis of that experience, that the cost is minimal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "California Experience with the Federal Mortgage Disclosure Act: 1973-1975" be printed in the Record.

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

[From the American Banker, June 12, 1975]

CALIFORNIA EXPERIENCE CHALLENGES ANTI- REDLining Argument By Lenders

(San Francisco—Two of the arguments which have been used by mortgage lenders to oppose anti-redlining measures elsewhere in the nation are being seriously questioned by California legislators, regulators and community activists after examination of existing practices here.

The arguments which have become suspect in their eyes are that a disclosure of mortgage lending patterns would be prohibitively expensive operation, and that a mortgage lender cannot profitably lend under circumstances in which he feels discriminate in.

Whatever other arguments mortgage lenders may use against geographic disclosure, according to sources close to the administration of Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr., the particular argument that such disclosure would be prohibitively expensive and force up mortgage and other lending rates is one that will be given little credence 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 those disclosures have indicated 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 convert all of their existing computerized loan data into a census tract printout capacity for a one-time cost of $14,000. Smaller institutions without the computer capacity might, they contend, have "put in a lot of paperwork, but nothing significant" to accomplish the same task.

The cost for transmitting monthly census tract breakdowns on a quarterly basis, the study contends, is $200 annually for the largest institutions, and about $1800 for a medium-sized institution (about $150 million in deposits).

Although unwilling to comment on specific figures until they have seen the study, consumer activists, who were present, say the cost of disclosure would depend upon whether or not they were making existing loans or simply loans made in the future.

If S&LS were required to disclose the location by census tract of all loans by reporting the locations on a single individual basis, said Dean Cannon, executive director of the California Savings and Loan League, the cost definitely would be "very expensive."

However, he said, "if S&LS were only required to disclose the dollar amount of future loans by census tract, it is likely the cost the S&LS would bear..."

State-chartered S&LS in California, he said, did not experience large outlays or competitive disadvantages when they were required to make geographic disclosure, because they were required to disclose only those loans made after the regulation became effective.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "California Experience with the Federal Mortgage Disclosure Act: 1973-1975" be printed in the Record.

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

[From the American Banker, June 12, 1975]

CALIFORNIA EXPERIENCE CHALLENGES ANTI- REDLINING ARGUMENTS USED BY LENDERS

(By Geoff Broutillette)
consultation to potential customers, a step which the bank considers essential to the program's success.

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 which rest, but not necessarily 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 have made deposits.

In some cities, neighborhood groups have organized to persuade their local lending institutions to make more mortgage credits available in their areas. They contend that their need for loans should be able to make an educated judgment about where they will deposit their savings based on the probability of their being able to get mortgages 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 not 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, they overlook an 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. 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 must make an effort by being perfectly frank in 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 point 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 table to 4 or 5 other witnesses that I believe that the financial institutions were then willing to loan. So redlining is only one 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 say 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 mortgage officials of 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 extra work on a lot of people and increase costs for the consumers.

I also felt very strongly that the hearings were inadequate. They were very one-sided in favor of this legislation. We had only 3 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 those 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 I 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 the mortgage loan and savings and loan in the country. Fortunately the committee changed this and it was amended to include some 265-odd SMSA's 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 how much would be saved by every city that gets a loan, the committee testimony, because no one could answer the questions accurately. There were prophecies, there were prophecies that feelings about what people thought would happen, but no actual data.

One study that was talked about a great deal, a district of Washington,
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. Cities must go in like I was mayor of Salt Lake City, and put in more curbs, gutters and sidewalks and sewers, as I have already mentioned. The most important element in all of this revitalization process is a spirit of community cooperation. There must be cooperation from the city government, the financial institutions, the business community, and the local citizens to maintain a viable community. I am afraid the thrust of S. 1281 is in the direction of confrontation, rather than cooperation.

Another fear I have is that S.1281 is the first step toward credit allocation. I cannot emphasize this point enough. The next would be to say that at least 20 percent of deposits must be invested in a certain area. This is certainly borne out by testimony before the Senate committee by proponents of the legislation. For example, the representative of the U.S. Conference of Mayors testified at the hearings that S.1281 is "an essential first step." He recommended that other steps include requirements that institutions "lend minimal percentages of their assets" to inner-city communities in which they are located." A proponent of the bill from the metropolitan Washington, D.C., area characterized it as a "good beginning." Other steps he recommended included the granting of charters and the requests for charters on the basis of "equal opportunity and a commitment of service to minority and poor neighborhoods. These programs ultimately would end up in a quota allocation of credit. Quota systems are a form of credit rationing. This means we would be taking from someone, the small businessman or the suburban homeowner and giving to someone else, in this case the inner city home buyer.

A free market approach would be to create incentives for savings and investment. It should not be forgotten that it takes five or six savers to support each home mortgage borrower. Through these programs we would achieve the accumulation of sufficient capital in the private sector to fill all credit worthy needs and rationing would not be necessary. The ability of the borrower to compete for funds should be increased through support programs, the spreading of the lending risks through mortgage insurance programs, and the development of comprehensive programs to improve urban neighborhoods.

A considerable amount can be done to increase the pool of private capital for home mortgages. The tax laws need to be examined to increase the incentives for savings.

More imaginative ways can be developed to attract investors to finance home mortgages. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board has outlined a number of suggestions. Mortgage backed securities can be used to attract funds not normally available to housing. By utilizing mortgage backed securities, which are in fact funds collateralized by a pool of home mortgages, pension funds or insurance companies can be attracted to invest funds in housing. A mayor or Governor could specify exactly what type of collateral he wanted—location, type of property, age and condition of property, downpayment requirements, minimum and maximum loan amounts, credit quality, amortization period, and loan/income ratios. Lenders would package these for a State and other pension funds at a relatively low cost. This would be a much more desirable and appropriate arrangement than demanding "in" institutions rather than dissipating their energies and resources on reporting requirements.

As mayor of one of America's finest cities, I know firsthand that there are many things that need to be done and can be done to preserve the urban neighborhoods. Success lies not in Federal bureaucracy and allocations produced by confrontation, but in a voluntary, cooperative effort between local government officials, the financial institutions, the business community and local community, and civic and church groups. Unless we pull together and come up with...
imaginative programs which address the underlying causes, we will not save the cities.

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, ILL., JULY 5, 1975.**

Mr. STANLEY ENLUND,
Chairman of the Board, First Federal Sav­nings and Loan of Chicago and
One South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR Mr. ENLUND: As a long time depositor of Savings and Loan associations, I am hopeful that when I introduce my bill 1281 as it is presently written.

In this case, if laws are passed against what I have called "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. Brocks): 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? Why has there not been more of the obvious implications that will en­danger the savings of your depositors? And, not of the obvious, but that is from the combined membership of all Sav­ings and Loan associations?

And, of course, the hidden agenda, the only questions so that it becomes a part of the objec­tions cannot be expected to endanger the funds of their depositors.

In that fashion, the practice of real­estates, and the Savings and Loan associations, have been falling 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—no personally, but institutionally—the Savings and Loan associations need to even at­tempts effective counter measures. Why have there been no hard-hitting advertisements about the anti-redlining campaign? Why has there been no statement of the obvi­ous implications that will endanger the sav­ings of your depositors? And, not of the obvious, but that is 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.

He goes on:

**ABOUT REDLINING—SOME HARD AND BASIC FACTS TO CONSIDER**

The very first question 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 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 loan­ing and bad lending by these institutions over all the state or nation. It is a fact, and without a doubt, that in many cases, 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.

This 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 be expected to endanger the funds of which they are trustees to accomplish this purpose.

I feel very strongly that we must not adopt S. 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[]
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 of the thrift institutions, possibly to an unreason-able extent. Many of these thrift institutions are located in standard metropolitan statistical areas in which there has been no demonstration that the problem of redlining exists. Clearly, it is the home-buying consumer that will be forced to bear the increased costs caused by the 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 20 standard metropolitan statistical areas to determine the feasibility and usefulness of requiring all mortgage lending institutions to make public disclosure of their geographic lending patterns, will allow Congress to make a careful analysis with respect to the benefits of mortgage disclosure. I believe that the proper approach would be to limit this bill to the metropolitan areas in which redlining is thought to exist.

I commend my distinguished colleague from Utah for introducing this amendment and I am supporting it for another reason: The financial institutions which are affected by this bill are in a fiduciary relationship to their depositors and owe them a legal duty of investigating its deposits prudently. This amendment will allow a careful analysis to insure that financial institutions will not be required to bear this fiduciary duty by being required to make unreasonable loans either to unqualified borrowers or on inadequate security. This essential fiduciary relationship, worth billions of dollars placed in trust by millions of Americans, must not be jeopardized by requirements which have not been completely studied and proven effective and both give a concern for the protection of the deposits. The amendment will protect the tremendous scope of investments and safeguard the fiduciary relationship which the law requires.

Mr. President, while I fully support the amendment offered by Senator Garn, I am submitting an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah. My amendment would eliminate the possibility that any thrift institution would be required to disclose the location of their mortgages by census tract. By limiting the reporting requirement to 70 standard metropolitan statistical areas, we will be spared the heavy burden of manually relating every mortgage to a census tract. For example, in Dade County, Florida, to map out each mortgage on a 1/30th of an inch scale, the macrogeographic map is in 19 inches by 26 inches. This map has some main streets and avenues indicated by name and number but many smaller streets of the same significance in the indication of street or avenue identification. Since the assign-
Some of the witnesses who testified on June 26 apparently commented on the difficulty of obtaining and using material for addressing the addresses by census tract. I believe Mr. Wittes described the problems associated with such difficulties with regard to Chicago, because of the rather large volume of tract maps for Chicago, which was the point out that the Chicago City Planning Commission has developed a census tract code book, and I am familiar with the BW databases that have been consulted, the manual would have been available and would have greatly facilitated whatever work they have had to do.

From a technical standpoint, it is feasible for any local organization to make use of the GBF/DIME files and related materials to code census tract addresses. This would provide a geographic base file which contains an address and integral geographic characteristics into which large cities and their suburbs have been divided for statistical purposes. The first tracts were delineated for census purposes, and over 100,000 tracts have been identified by the Census. The average tract has about 1000 persons, and is originally laid out so as to achieve some uniformity of population characteristics, status, and living conditions. Tract boundaries generally conform to municipal and other political subdivision boundaries. Sometimes they also conform to other locally-designated areas within a city, such as health districts. Tract boundaries need not always coincide with census tract boundaries, except where a ZIP code area is equal to the boundaries of a particular municipality. In such a case, several tracts may equal one ZIP code area.

The Bureau has taken full advantage of computer programs for processing file data, listing techniques, and graphic presentations of data. Using the computers is obviously very desirable, but changes are kept to a minimum in order to permit data comparisons over two or more censuses. Tract boundaries are never changed, but changes are kept to a minimum in order to permit data comparisons over two or more censuses. Tract boundaries are rarely, for example, subject to change. Zip code addresses which are subject to name variability, and includes a match code which identifies geographic base files to local data files. It also permits the addition to the file of other elements, such as geographic code to accommodate additional geographic information. To give just one illustration of local use, one community, in planning for the use of community development funds, sent out a questionnaire to citizens, based on water billing. The addresses for water bills were run through one of these computer programs in order to locate the addresses by census tract, thus providing a way to analyze the questionnaires through these socio-economic characteristics of census tracts.

Finally, although the Bureau's GBF/DIME files system has some unique advantages, integration of concepts and procedures can be and have been applied in similar developments quite independently of the Bureau's own work, which is aimed principally toward the decennial census operation. Census tracts are relatively small geographic areas into which large cities and their environs have been divided for statistical purposes. Census tract boundaries are selected by local communities, under the guidance of the Census. The first tracts were delineated for 8 cities for the 1910 census, and over 100,000 tracts have been identified by the Census. The average tract has about 4,000 persons, and is originally laid out so as to achieve some uniformity of population characteristics, status, and living conditions. Tract boundaries generally conform to municipal and other political subdivision boundaries. Sometimes they also conform to other locally-designated areas within a city, such as health districts. Tract boundaries are never changed, but changes are kept to a minimum in order to permit data comparisons over two or more censuses.
second degree. Otherwise, they could not. They would be precluded by virtue of the fact 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 any other degrees, 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, what is it he is 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 is 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 part is the quorum demanded?

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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I am strongly opposed to S. 1281, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975. It is characteristic of a trend on the part of Congress these days to regulate everything in sight and to impose unnecessary burdens and costs on businesses which are only passed on to consumers, thus increasing what they must pay for goods and services.

The intent of some of the regulatory bills approved in recent years has been laudable, since there generally was a problem which needed correcting. But in all too many instances, the degree of regulation has been unnecessary, imposing intolerable administrative and cost burdens on business and industry, and the areas of concern more properly and efficiently might have been addressed by State or local governments, or by the private sector.

I wish to associate myself with the comments of Senators Tower, Garn, Helms, and Morgan, members of the committee which originated this bill. In following an additional study before passage of S. 1281, these Senators noted:

"The statistical data provided under the bill could be abused and utilized to jeopardize the solvency of financial institutions and the safety of deposits. It is a step away from a free market allocation of credit which has helped the American home owner and toward mandatory credit allocation by the government. Finally, there simply was insufficient data on the social and economic costs of the legislation. The many small banks and thrift institutions which do not utilize computers would be loaded with an unnecessary burden. Our primary concern is for the consumer—particularly who will ultimately bear the costs of these schemes."

Mr. President, all of us in the Congress are greatly concerned about unemployment, about our economic problems, and about stabilizing costs of goods and services.

If we are truly interested in putting people back to work in and moving people off public benefit programs and into productive roles in this society, we ought to do everything in our power to remove unnecessary Federal regulations and expensive requirements from business and industry. Every dollar a business must spend buying forms or otherwise acting to comply with the cost of regulations is a dollar that will not go for employee wages, for expansion, or for more inventory.

In addition to the direct costs of complying with various Government regulations, business and industry must spend huge sums of money to keep up with paperwork. A recent report prepared by David M. Towrer, a partner in the law firm of Lowenthal, Towrer, and Berman, of Washington, reports that American businesses must file more than 2 billion pieces of paper with various Federal agencies every year. This activity consumes an estimated 130 million man-hours, and costs about $1.8 billion. The Government then spends another $18 billion to print, mail, and store all of this material.

Consumers pay for all this regulation through higher prices. A classic example of how bureaucratic meddling can drive up consumer costs was the requirement that automobile seat belts and ignition systems be connected to a buzzer to "force" drivers to wear seat belts. Gratefully, widespread public opposition forced the abandonment of the seat belt/ignition interlock nonsense, but not before this ridiculous requirement cost the American people hundreds of dollars in higher automobile costs.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject S. 1281. Moreover, I hope it will review some of the previous laws of this Congress and make it a concerted effort to repeal unnecessary regulatory legislation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be treated as original text for the purpose of amendment and that no point of order lie against amendments from the floor to that committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute will be agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Will be treated as original text.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And as agreed to, will be treated as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. TOWER. That means that it can be amended in the second degree, in two more degrees?

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, up to the point that a point of order would lie against it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.
is required to be maintained and made available.

On page 13, line 19, strike out "shall" and insert "may".

On page 13, line 24, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following sentence which contains 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 Brooke 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 the making of 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 depository institutions 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 investment by institutions that do a substantial amount of mortgage lending in an area, so the argument spells out exactly who is covered—banks, mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations, and credit unions.

Third, we are modifying the disclosure requirement so that it is essentially prospective. Witnesses from the financial institutions told us that it would be disproportionately costly if they were required to go back over outstanding 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 requirement by allowing it to be 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 not have 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 the 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 substantive 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 his time, 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 the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin be agreed to.

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. 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.

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 not been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

On page 2, in line 17, strike out "$2,347,-000" and insert "$1,997,000."

On page 3, in 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 (a) 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 the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1976, through February 29, 1976, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingency funds of the Senate for personnel, and (5) with prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned or the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

The expenses of the committees referred to in subsection (a) shall include, but not be limited to, investigations of (1) national ocean policy and transportation and regulation, and (2) tourism. The investigation of national ocean policy shall be conducted in accordance with, and subject to the provisions of S. Res. 222, 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.

Sent. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $2,347,000, of which amount not to exceed $200,000 shall be available 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).

Sent. 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.

Sent. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from 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. 94-318), 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, to make additional expenditures for investigations which had not been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

On page 2, in line 17, strike out "$2,347,000" and insert "$1,997,000."

On page 3, in 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:
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 on March 30, 1977, to expend not to exceed $1,643,800 for the same or similar purposes. The committee extended the general authorization to the defense department head of the Navy under that authorization as of February 28, 1975 (funds returnable to the Treasury), will be approximately $90,000.

The investigations referred to above would include, but not be limited to, investigations of (1) national ocean policy, (2) transportation and regulation, and (3) tourism. 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 investigation of tourism would be conducted in accordance with Senate Resolution 347, Ninety-third Congress, agreed to October 10, 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. 94-320), explaining the purposes of the measure.

The amendment to provide for a study or investigation of an annual rate. The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

EXCEPTS
PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION
Authority for special pay for nuclear-trained naval officers expired on June 30, 1975, as an estimated payment for one year of $15,000 to each naval officer qualified for duty in connection with the supervision, operation and maintenance of 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 for the purpose of the study was submitted to the Senate until June 9, 1976. This allowed inadequate time for the committee to fully consider this proposal. However, the naval officers who will receive this legislation in their future work in the nuclear propulsion plants will have received some of the most vital and important jobs in the entire Defense Department. These jobs in the operation of our ballistic missile submarines, our nuclear attack submarines and the nuclear surface ship fleet. The committee does not believe pay for these personnel should be held up while new pay proposals are considered.

The Defense Department proposed legislation would have created an entirely new system of incentive pay for these officers. Preliminary investigation revealed little evidence that the proposed system would insures 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. It is not clear how this proposed system would relate to the overall review of military pay policy currently underway in the Defense Department. In light of these considerations, the committee recommends a 2-year extension of the existing pay system while other approaches are developed and considered.

PRIOR LEGISLATION ON SPECIAL PAY FOR NAVY NUCLEAR TRAINED OFFICERS

During 1969-74, the officer input to naval nuclear propulsion training was more than doubled due to rapid expansion of the nuclear submarine fleet. In 1969, many of these officers, having reached the end of their minimum obligated service, chose to leave active duty service. The Navy found the remaining officers in these numbers to man certain important nuclear department head positions on submarines.

To slow 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 year of military service, paid in full after the initial service obligation and before completing 10 years of commissioned service. Authority for this program was to expire in 1978.

This bonus pay succeeded in slowing the resignation rate for nuclear submarine officers. In Public Law 92-581, in 1972, Congress extended the authority to grant the bonus to the 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, 1975.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate extend the authority for this purpose to the end of FY 1976. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 94-215), explaining the purposes of the measure.

The amendment to provide for a study or investigation of the resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 72) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary for inquiries and investigations, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments as follows:

On page 3, in line 11, strike out "$4,391,400" and insert "$4,400,000".

On page 2, in line 20, strike out "$429,500" and insert "$422,000".

On page 3, in line 25, strike out "$815,100" and insert "$795,100".

On page 3, in line 8, strike out "$310,000" and insert "$250,700".

On page 3, in line 10, strike out "$831,800" and insert "$834,500".

On page 3, in line 15, strike out "$256,500" and insert "$258,700".

On page 3, in line 21, strike out "$293,500" and insert "$217,300".

On page 3, in line 24, strike out "$272,000" and insert "$359,700".

On page 4, in line 4, strike out "$400,000" and insert "$320,300".

On page 4, in line 19, strike out "$428,000" and insert "$400,000".

On page 5, in line 3, strike out "$58,800" and insert "$58,700".

On page 5, in line 7, strike out "$220,000" and insert "$307,300".

On page 5, beginning in line 12, strike out: Sec. 16. Not to exceed $70,000 shall be available for a study or investigation of revision and codification.

On page 5, in line 14, strike out "17" and insert "18".

On page 5, in line 14, strike out "$380,000" and insert "$374,300".

On page 5, in line 20, strike out "18" and insert "19".

On page 5, in line 23, strike out "19" and insert "19".

On page 6, in line 5, strike out "20" and insert "19".

On page 6, in line 7, 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:

S. Res. 72
Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 136(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with the standing rules of the Standing Rules of the Senate so far as applicable, the Committee on the Judiciary, on committees, or their chairman, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, for the purposes stated and within the limits imposed by the respective sections, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (9)
## Table: Appropriation Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcommittee</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Authorized (Estimate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Practice and Procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Law and Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judiciary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- As amended by S. Res. 358, agreed to Aug. 23, 1974, which authorized the committee $12,500 (increase from $10,000 to $15,000 in supplemental funds for the Subcommittee on Representation of Citizen Interests; and further amended by S. Res. 408, agreed to Oct. 10, 1974, which authorized the committee $81,100 (increase from $77,800 to $408,000) in supplemental funds for the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure.

### Related Sections
- Section 15 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $25,000 would be available for a study or investigation of the effectiveness of the United States Marshals Service in accordance with section 504 of the Criminal Justice Act of 1970.
- Section 17 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $150,000 would be available for a study or investigation of juvenile delinquency, of which amount not to exceed $30,000 could be expended for the procurement of individual consultants or organizations thereof.
- Section 19 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $10,000 would be available for a study or investigation of the effectiveness of the United States Marshals Service in accordance with section 504 of the Criminal Justice Act of 1970.
- Section 20 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $2,000,000 would be available for a study or investigation of the effectiveness of the United States Marshals Service in accordance with section 504 of the Criminal Justice Act of 1970.
- Section 21 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $5,000,000 would be available for a study or investigation of the effectiveness of the United States Marshals Service in accordance with section 504 of the Criminal Justice Act of 1970.
- Section 22 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $10,000,000 would be available for a study or investigation of the effectiveness of the United States Marshals Service in accordance with section 504 of the Criminal Justice Act of 1970.
- Section 23 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $25,000,000 would be available for a study or investigation of the effectiveness of the United States Marshals Service in accordance with section 504 of the Criminal Justice Act of 1970.
- Section 24 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $50,000,000 would be available for a study or investigation of the effectiveness of the United States Marshals Service in accordance with section 504 of the Criminal Justice Act of 1970.
- Section 25 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $100,000,000 would be available for a study or investigation of the effectiveness of the United States Marshals Service in accordance with section 504 of the Criminal Justice Act of 1970.
- Section 26 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $200,000,000 would be available for a study or investigation of the effectiveness of the United States Marshals Service in accordance with section 504 of the Criminal Justice Act of 1970.
- Section 27 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $300,000,000 would be available for a study or investigation of the effectiveness of the United States Marshals Service in accordance with section 504 of the Criminal Justice Act of 1970.
- Section 28 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $400,000,000 would be available for a study or investigation of the effectiveness of the United States Marshals Service in accordance with section 504 of the Criminal Justice Act of 1970.
- Section 29 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $500,000,000 would be available for a study or investigation of the effectiveness of the United States Marshals Service in accordance with section 504 of the Criminal Justice Act of 1970.
- Section 30 of the resolution would provide that not to exceed $600,000,000 would be available for a study or investigation of the effectiveness of the United States Marshals Service in accordance with section 504 of the Criminal Justice Act of 1970.
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 March 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 has amended Senate Resolution 72 by reducing the total request amounts from $4,891,400 to $4,057,700, a reduction of $333,700. The distribution of the reduction among the respective purposes is shown in the following tabulation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sec. No.</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
<th>Approved Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Administrative practice and procedure</td>
<td>$429,500</td>
<td>$5,900</td>
<td>$422,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Agriculture and forestry</td>
<td>815,100</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>833,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Aquatic life and ocean resources</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Constitutional rights</td>
<td>381,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>381,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Criminal law and procedure</td>
<td>119,300</td>
<td>-3,700</td>
<td>122,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Immigration and naturalization</td>
<td>223,500</td>
<td>-6,200</td>
<td>217,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</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 26, 1975**

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business 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 TRANS­ACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS ON MONDAY OBJECTED TO

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, after the leaders 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. It should not take long.

Mr. President, I wish to 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.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMMITTEE TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be granted permission to have until midnight tonight, July 26, 1975, to file the conference report on H.R. 6674, the military procurement authorization bill.

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

DISAPPROVAL OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS ON THE ISLAND OF DIEGO GARCIA

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration, without any action thereon at this time, of S. Res. 160.

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.

**SENATE 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...
space distort our view of realities of the situation here on Earth.

The news media, especially the television networks, seemed to think this mission was historic—and from a show business point of view, it probably was.

However, I have a feeling that history itself will judge this mission as rather meaningless.

What the mission showed was Russia's willingness to fully cooperate with the United States in this important area of international space exploration. And it will be remembered that this mission, with a compatible docking mechanism, was not too long ago that the Soviet Union was gloating over the fall of South Vietnam—a fall that Russia contributed to by greatly increasing its military supplies to the North, rather than using its influence to keep the unsteady peace which had cost so many American lives. And it will be remembered, with a covetous eye at both Portugal and India, that small minority suppress the majority.

The now-distant memories of Berlin and Hungary and Czechoslovakia and other countries unfortunate enough to come under the Soviet's sphere of domination; the recent memories of Vietnam; and the current situations in Portugal and India—these are things that all Americans should keep constantly in mind.

The peaceful handshake in space made good television, but Russia's strong-arm tactics here on earth will continue to bear close watching.

I have no objection to the passage of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there opposition 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 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 effort.

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, on last Thursday evening—I believe it was—with the safe return of the three American astronauts, the Apollo-Soyuz space mission officially ended.

I join in offering congratulations to these courageous explorers, but I caution against our letting the handshake in

Whereas, the 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.

SENATE RESOLUTION 223—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION DECLARING A VACANCY IN THE OFFICE OF U.S. SENATOR FOR THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. HUGH SCOTT, Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution to declare vacant the seat in New Hampshire and for placing on the ballot for payment of annual salary to each of the two contestants up to the date of the adoption of the resolution, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk reads 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 commencing January 3, 1976, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I object to the consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The resolution will go over under the rules.

The resolution is as follows:

S. Res. 223

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 saving 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, 1976, is hereby declared vacant as of September 26, 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 a portion of the annual salary of a United States Senator from January 3, 1976, through the date of the resolution, said 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.
July 26, 1975

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 pro rated 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 just the difference 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 of the fact 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 12.

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. PRESIDENT (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—not necessarily in the order stated, nor do they constitute the entire list of measures which remain to be acted upon:

- The military training student loads, and student controls on domestic crude oil, residual oil, and so forth.
- Funds are hereby authorized for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, 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, $2,997,000,000; for the Air Force, $4,524,000,000, of which amount not to exceed $54,000,000 is authorized for the procurement of only long 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 lead items for the B-1 bomber aircraft do not constitute a production decision or a commitment for the production of such aircraft.
    - MISSILES
      - For missiles: for the Army, $431,000,000; for the Navy, $60,000,000; for the Marine Corps, $52,900,000; for the Air Force, $1,765,000,000, of which $265,000,000 shall be used only for the procurement of Minuteman III missiles.