

other provision of this Act may be used for the expenses of the Department of Justice for which funds are authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a) of this section."

Sec. 2. Section 509 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 879) is amended by striking out "(a)" and subsection (b).

Sec. 3. Section 702 of the Controlled Substances Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Notwithstanding subsection (a) of this section or section 103, section 4202 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to any individual convicted under any of the laws repealed by this title or title III without regard to the terms of any sentence imposed on such individual under such law."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Controlled Substances Act to extend for three fiscal years the authorizations of appropriations for the administration and enforcement of that Act."

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BAYH, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. COOK conferees on the part of the Senate.

DUTY APPLICABLE TO CRUDE FEATHERS AND DOWNS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move, with respect to H.R. 11452, which was passed by the Senate yesterday, that the Senate insist on its amendments, ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. LONG, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. CURTIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1975—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on H.R. 15572, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELMS). The report will be stated by title. The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15572) making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for space, science, veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by all the conferees.

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

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

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 21, 1974, at pp. H88336-H88339.)

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the pending conference report contains new budget-obligational-authority of \$21,215,812,000, which sum compares with the \$21,210,718,420 contained in the Senate bill, the amount is \$221,001,000 under the estimates and only \$5,093,580 less than reductions made in the Senate bill amounting to \$226,094,580. All conferences are a matter of give and take, but I am pleased to report that in this conference the Senate took more and gave less.

The amendment that gave the conferees the most difficulty was Senate amendment No. 2, which originally was proposed by Senator JAVITS on the floor when this bill was considered for the first time by the Senate on August 5. In order to get agreement, it was necessary to modify this amendment and we wound up with a somewhat weaker version than was proposed in the Senate bill. Nonetheless, I hope the language is clear to the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, that he should proceed to keep the section 236 program alive—that is, the program providing for rental assistance for modest income people—and obligate the unused contract authority previously made available in appropriation acts by Congress for this program.

In retaining the modified version of the Javits amendment in the bill, it is the intent of the committee of conference that the Department utilize available resources to fill the need for low-income housing which is so pressing at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, first, I should like to thank the conferees for their efforts in this regard. The amendment is tremendously useful in the cities where we find the major problems. I have learned from my talk with Secretary Lynn that the Department will go forward and implement that provision exactly as the conferees worked it out.

Mr. PROXMIER. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York. Once again, I congratulate him on having offered this amendment. It is a real contribution to providing housing which is so urgently needed for low-income people.

Mr. President, amendment No. 4 was another one that gave the conferees some difficulty. This amendment was initially offered by Senator BROOKE at the subcommittee markup and provided for an earmarking of not less than \$500 million for the payment of operating subsidies to local housing authorities. The budget estimate for these payments was \$430 million. After much discussion, the conferees agreed on the earmarking of \$450 million for this purpose. So we got 90 percent of what Senator BROOKE requested of the committee and which passed the Senate.

In connection with this amendment, the committee of conference agreed to

the language contained in the Senate report, which stated that the Housing Act of 1937, as amended by the Congress in 1970, permits the payment of limited operating funds by housing authorities to support public housing tenant organizations, and the committee of conference expects that operating subsidies appropriations in this act will be used to promote improved communication between tenants and management in public housing.

In the disbursement of these funds, the conferees admonish the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to exercise adequate budgetary and accountability safeguards to be imposed by local housing authorities or tenant organizations to insure that the funds will be used in a constructive manner.

For the appropriation items of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the conferees adopted the amounts recommended by the Senate and agreed that not more than \$3,000,000 may be used for further planning and studies on the large space telescope. The committee of conference also agreed that the SEASAT program may proceed within the funds made available in the act.

In the House version of the bill, construction money for the Systems Development Laboratory totaling \$4,880,000 was denied, but it was included in the Senate version of the bill. The Senate position prevailed in the conference. Funds were also included for the Orbiter horizontal flight test facility in the amount of \$1,940,000, instead of the \$3,940,000 contained in the Senate bill. The House, in its version of the bill, had denied any funds for this item.

Mr. President, for the National Science Foundation, the committee of conference recommends an appropriation of \$661,500,000, which is \$19,900,000 below the budget estimate. Nonetheless, this allowance is more than 20 percent above the sum that was made available to the Foundation in the previous fiscal year.

For the Veterans' Administration, the amounts contained in the Senate bill for the most part were retained by the committee of conference, with the exception of the item "General Operating Expenses," where the Senate amount of \$428,842,000 was reduced to \$420,000,000, or a reduction of \$8,842,000. The Senate had previously reduced the budget estimate for this item by \$5,570,000. The committee of conference did not take issue with the language contained on page 34 of the Senate report, wherein the committee expressed its strong views opposing any personal freezes or other personnel limitations being placed on medical care and hospital employment within the Veterans' Administration, even though there may be a Government-wide policy to do so.

Mr. President, the committee of conference also denied any funds for the line item, assistance for health manpower training institutions. The House had recommended \$30,000,000 for this item, and the Senate made a zero appropriation. However, in not allowing any funds in this fiscal year, the Senate committee pointed out in its report that it will be closely following the application process

means required for this purpose; to organize such research and investigations as may appear necessary; and to publish or otherwise disseminate the results of the research and investigations carried out under the auspices of the Council.

The principal area of concern to the Council under the Convention is the Atlantic Ocean and its adjacent seas, with primary emphasis on the North Atlantic.

At the present time, there are 17 members on the Council. They are Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and the United States.

During the 1974-75 calendar year, the total budget of the Council is approximately 1,978,000 Danish Kronors. Of this amount the United States will contribute 123,000 Danish Kronors—\$20,245. The contributions range from a low of 41,000 D.K. paid by Finland to a high of 164,000 D.K. paid individually by the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the U.S.S.R.

DATE OF ENTRY INTO FORCE

This protocol will enter into force "on the date on which all States parties to the Convention have become parties to this protocol." At the present time, all 17 countries party to the Convention have become parties to the protocol except Spain and the United States.

COMMITTEE ACTION

The Committee on Foreign Relations held a public hearing on the pending protocol on August 22, 1974. At that time testimony in support of the protocol was received from Mr. Stuart Blow, Acting Coordinator of Ocean Affairs and Special Assistant to the Secretary for Fisheries and Wildlife, and his assistant, Ms. Janice Barnes. Mr. Blow's statement is reprinted below. In an executive session following the public hearing the committee, by voice vote, ordered the protocol favorably reported with the recommendation that the Senate give its advice and consent thereto.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by Stuart Blow, Acting Coordinator of Ocean Affairs, and also a message from the President of the United States be incorporated as part of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement and message from the President are ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF STUART BLOW

Chairman, I appear before you today in support of the Protocol to the Convention for the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea. With me is Ms. Janice Barnes of my staff.

The Protocol was done at Copenhagen on August 13, 1970 and was signed in behalf of the United States on August 22, 1973. This amendment of the Convention would require a two-thirds majority vote of members of the Council for approval of its annual budget rather than the simple majority now required. It would thus provide a safeguard against the possibility that a simple major-

ity might impose a substantial budgetary increase on the entire membership of the Council. Provisions of the Convention which require acceptance by all Contracting Parties of the scheme of contributions remain unchanged.

The International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) was established as an intergovernmental organization in 1902 with its headquarters in Copenhagen. Its area of concern is the Atlantic Ocean and adjacent seas, with primary emphasis on the North Atlantic. ICES is the oldest and most respected international organization dealing with the marine environment. Its purposes are to promote and encourage research and investigations for the study of the sea, particularly those related to living resources; to draw up programs for this purpose; to organize such research and investigations as may be necessary; and to publish or otherwise disseminate the results of the research and investigations carried out under its auspices. At present there are 17 members of the Council—Belgium, Canada, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The United States originally joined ICES in 1912 but withdrew in 1917. On March 1, 1967, the Senate gave its advice and consent to rejoin the Council, and the President ratified the convention and approved accession thereto on April 24, 1967. Following the required approval by three-quarters of the States Parties to the Convention, the United States Instrument of Accession was deposited on April 18, 1973, and the Convention entered into force for the United States on that day.

The Protocol which you have before you today will enter into force on the date on which all States Parties to the Convention have become Parties to the protocol. To the best of our knowledge only Spain and the United States have not yet ratified.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of State recommends your favorable consideration of this Protocol.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 9, 1974

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Protocol to the Convention for the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, done at Copenhagen on August 13, 1970.

This Protocol amends the Convention for the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, done at Copenhagen September 12, 1964, with respect to the vote required by the Council for approving its annual budget. I transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report received from the Department of State with respect to the Protocol.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Protocol submitted herewith and give its advice and consent to ratification.

RICHARD NIXON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the protocol will be considered to have passed through its various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Protocol to the Convention for the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, done at Copenhagen on August 13, 1970 (Ex. V., 93-1).

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur at the hour of 3:30 on Wednesday, September 4.

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

NOMINATIONS ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

MR. NUNN. Mr. President, there are routine nominations at the desk, which were reported earlier. I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the nominations.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

MR. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

MR. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MR. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate adjourn the executive session and return to legislative session.

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

AMENDMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT OF 1970

MR. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask the Clerk to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H. R. 3355.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (MR. HELMS) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3355) to amend the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 to provide appropriations to the Drug Enforcement Administration on a continuing basis, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That effective July 1, 1974, section 709 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 904) is amended to read as follows:

"AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 709. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated \$105,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, \$175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977, for the expenses of the Department of Justice (other than its expenses incurred in connection with carrying out section 103(a) in carrying out its functions under this title. (b) No funds appropriated under any

¹ Danish kron = .1565 U.S. dollars.

in connection with new first year grants under subchapters II, III, and IV of Public Law 92-541, and it would give consideration to provide funds in a supplemental appropriation act if the need can be justified by those applications.

The committee of conference also approved the full \$24,400,000 requested by the Veterans' Administration for funding the new veterans' representation-on-campus program, that has been designed to insure the fast delivery of checks to veterans who are taking advantage of educational benefits afforded them under existing legislation.

Finally, Mr. President, the committee of conference agreed to the Senate language included in the bill, which grants to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board authority to assess charges and to receive advances from other agencies and to expand the dollar limitation for its proposed new headquarters building.

Mr. President, I firmly believe the Senate conferees have returned to the Senate a bill which clearly expresses the views voiced by the Senate when this bill was debated on two different occasions—namely, on August 5, when it was recommittees to the Committee on Appropriations, and again on August 16, when it was considered a second time by the Senate. It gives full recognition to the needs that must be met, but it also has taken into consideration the limited resources we have available to meet these needs in these inflationary times.

The total reduction from the budget estimate is \$221,001,000, which amounts to a little more than 1 percent of the total budget estimate of almost \$21.5 billion. But while the total reduction is a little more than 1 percent, it could have been much more, except that almost two-thirds of the budget estimates contained in the bill are for the so-called uncontrollable items, such as compensation and pensions for veterans, readjustment benefits and medical care for veterans and their dependents. In my opinion, it is a bill that carries out the desire of our President to reduce Federal spending and it is a bill, I feel confident, he will be able to sign with pleasure. Therefore, Mr. President, I urge that the conference report be adopted.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I support the conference report on appropriations for HUD, Space, Science, Veterans. As is well known, this bill when first brought to the floor was sent back to the committee for reconsideration after attempts had been made at across-the-board cuts in the bill. I am very pleased that on the one hand, across-the-board cuts were not effected on the floor of the Senate and that on the other hand cuts indeed were made of over \$85 million total by the Committee on Appropriations. I think that the principle is important that the determination of what amounts and what programs should be in an appropriations bill should initially be made by the Committee on Appropriations and extensive consideration that is given within the committee to these matters. That is

not to say that an appropriations bill cannot be properly cut on the floor of the Senate but it is to say that an across-the-board approach is probably the very poorest way to arrive at final figures in an appropriations bill.

Mr. President, it may be that in some cases we have cut too deeply in this bill; only time will tell. But, in general, I support the action of the committee in bringing this bill out at \$221 million below the budget estimates that were considered by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) is at the White House with President Ford. In order that we not hold up the consideration of the conference report, I have agreed to make certain inquiries of the Senator from Wisconsin on his behalf.

There was certain language in the Senate report accompanying the Senate HUD, Space, Science, Veterans appropriations bill for fiscal year 1975 which he understood should be discussed at this time, while the Senate is considering the conference report on this bill so that the legislative record would be clear. I am going to read certain passages from the Senate Report, on behalf of Senator MATHIAS, concerning certain programs of the National Science Foundation on which the conference report is silent. I am doing this to avoid any confusion as to the intent of Congress and to verify with Senator PROXMIRE, the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, that the language of the Senate report does indeed apply to this bill as finally enacted and sent to the President. I will read the passages:

In arriving at this figure, the Committee included only \$1 million each for the National R&D Incentive program and for the Intergovernmental Science and Research Utilization program, which are the same as the budget estimates.

The Foundation requested \$8 million for Earthquake Engineering Research in FY 75. While the Committee recognizes the importance of research in this field, it believes that \$8 million is more money than can be justified within the tight constraints of the RANN program, and directs the Foundation to reprogram some of these funds to other areas within RANN.

The Committee has not provided funding for Institutional Grants for Research Management Improvement. These funds have been provided in the past to institutions that receive considerable Federal support for research; these institutions should be able to improve their management of research grants using overhead funds.

These recited sentences, Senator MATHIAS believes, are quite clear, and he would like to ask Chairman PROXMIRE to reply as to their applicability to the bill as it is now emerged from the conference with the House.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted to agree that these sentences do apply. They apply to the bill as it emerged, and to the conference report. I have full confidence in their applicability.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. Further, Senator MATHIAS believes it is generally understood that on matters addressed in one or the other of the House or Senate re-

ports but not in both, that Government agencies generally should abide by such language if the conference report is silent on that particular subject. He believes that the later of the two reports and, of course, in the case of appropriations bills, this would always be the Senate report, generally supersedes the language accompanying an early report from the other House and, therefore, applies to a final act if the conference report is silent on the subject. A case in point should be the following language in the Senate report accompanying this bill:

The Committee recommendation includes \$5 million for Science Information Activities, which is the budget estimate. The additional \$3 million provided by the House is unnecessary in view of the fact that costly automation of major abstracting and indexing services had been completed so that an emphasis can now be placed on reducing gaps and duplication in information systems and the efficient exchange of information among the systems.

Senator MATHIAS would appreciate very much having any comment that the chairman of the subcommittee (Senator PROXMIRE) would care to make on these observations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree wholeheartedly.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin on behalf of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, because this conference report was recently adopted by the House of Representatives, and because the chairman of the House conferees had included in the RECORD a tabulation which sets out completely the action of the conference, I ask unanimous consent that the complete tabulation of the House of Representatives be incorporated in the RECORD by reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER Without objection, it is so ordered.

(For joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference, see House of Representatives proceedings of August 21, 1974, pp. H8837-H8839.)

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

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments in disagreement.

The second assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert "Provided, That none of these administrative funds may be used for the administration of the section 23 leasing program, or any replacement program, unless the available, unused balance of contract authority under the section 236 program, or any replacement program, is made available for commitment concurrent with the making available for commitment of any contract authority under the section 23 program, or any replacement program."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said

amendment, insert ", of which not less than \$450,000,000 shall be used only for the payment of operating subsidies to local housing authorities".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

Strike out "one-half" in the second line of said amendment, and insert "one-quarter".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert ", to remain available until June 30, 1976".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 28, and 32.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER THAT MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE ON H.R. 16425, TO PROVIDE FOR THE MONITORING OF THE ECONOMY AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, BE INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 16425, an act to provide for the monitoring of the economy and for other purposes, be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELMS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM THE TREATY ON EXTRADITION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND AUSTRALIA (EXECUTIVE F, 93D CONG., 2D SESS.)

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the Treaty on Extradition between the United States of America and Australia, signed at Washington on May 14, 1974 (Executive F, 93d Cong., 2d sess.), transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States, and that the treaty with accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed, and that the President's message be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELMS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty on Extradition between the United States of America and Australia, signed at Washington on May 14, 1974. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty.

The Treaty will, upon entry into force, terminate, as between the United States

and Australia, the Treaty on Extradition between the United States and Great Britain of December 22, 1931, as made applicable to Australia. This new Treaty represents a substantial modernization with respect to the procedural aspects of extradition.

The Treaty includes in the list of extraditable offenses several which are of prime international concern, such as aircraft hijacking, narcotics offenses, and conspiracy to commit listed offenses.

The Treaty will make a significant contribution to the international effort to control narcotics traffic. I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Treaty and give its advice and consent to ratification.

GERALD R. FORD.

The White House, August 22, 1974.

REDUCING SWOLLEN FEDERAL SPENDING WILL NOT INCREASE UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most persistent myths held by almost everyone in and out of the Congress is that if we cut the marabout increase in Federal spending, then automatically and without question unemployment will increase.

This myth—and it is just that, a myth; it is not true—has probably been as responsible as anything else for the skyrocketing growth of government over the past few years. The idea has been that every time the Federal Government spends another 10 or 20 thousand dollars it creates another job.

The fact that this is not true should be apparent to anyone who can add. In the past 5 years the Federal budget has exploded from \$84 billion to more than \$305 billion. That colossal increase in spending should have resulted in a corresponding expansion in jobs and a reduction in unemployment. Did it?

It is true the work force increased and employment in the economy grew. But far less than it should have. Unemployment grew much more in proportion than jobs did. Indeed after a break-neck expansion of Government spending we find unemployment which was at percent 5 years ago, now at 5.3 percent.

I predict that if we reduce the rate of increase in Federal spending, and do it in the right areas—being sensitive to the employment consequences of our actions—that unemployment will not worsen as a result of the slower rate of growth in Federal spending.

Here is why: This year the Government will run a \$10 billion deficit. It will borrow \$10 billion and in doing so put more pressure on high interest rates to stay high or go higher.

If we cut spending by \$10 billion and balance the budget, the Federal Government will not borrow that additional sum, and interest rates will begin to move down.

Will that provide more jobs? Yes indeed. How?

Because the housing market that is now is a serious depression because high interest rates make it almost impossible for millions of American to buy homes will fall. This could make a difference of

as many as 500,000 more housing starts this year. That number of housing starts means 1 million additional direct jobs and probably 2 million in direct jobs.

Of course the cut in Federal spending might reduce Federal employment by a part of that up to 3 million jobs, but it is likely that the net employment effect would be positive. In addition, of course, employment would be transferred from the Government sector where productivity and discipline is so much less to the private sector where all the pressures of a market economy, the profit motive, and competition increase efficiency.

Mr. President in a recent article in U.S. News & World Report, former Chairman, of the Council of Economic Advisers, Paul McCracken—the distinguished economic expert from Michigan responds to a series of questions on this issue as follows:

Q. Is deficit spending the basic cause of our inflation?

A. Yes, because this makes it difficult for the Federal Reserve to avoid inflationary monetary policy. Heavy responsibility has to be carried by the intellectuals and economists here. The modern reactionary is the fellow who is still advocating—or at least is relaxed about—a deficit in the budget under circumstances where that kind of prescription no longer applies. He is in about the same position as the orthodox fellow back 40 years ago who, in the Great Depression, was still advocating a tax increase to balance the budget.

Q. Are you satisfied with the amount of fiscal and monetary restraint we now have?

A. Monetary policy is about right, as I interpret what the Federal Reserve is up to.

Fiscal policy is in danger of being still too stimulating. While the budget calls for outlays of about 305 billion in the year that began July 1, when you look underneath the surface you find that they could turn out to be in the range of 310 billion to 315 billion. That would be a rise of about 45 billion from the previous fiscal year, and that is far too much.

At this point, let me interpolate that although the Senate has reduced appropriations, including the two appropriations measures that we passed in just the last few minutes, the fact is that actual outlays will be reduced by only \$4 billion, and because of increased inflation, because of increases in the national debt, because of the expenditure of mandated funds impounded last year which must now be spent under court orders, because of the veterans benefits that have been increased, and for many other reasons, we will be right back up to \$310 billion.

Q. Do you go back to the interview with Mr. McCracken?

Q. Do you agree with the plan President Nixon laid out to reduce spending to 300 billion dollars?

A. Yes, but it will take absolutely Draconian efforts to get this year's outlays down to 300. The first objective here has to be to see that they don't turn out to be 310 to 315 billion.

Q. Will Draconian budget-cutting make a severe recession more likely?

A. No. Even Draconian efforts will not produce that large a reduction. Moreover, the reductions in federal outlays will show up as pluses in some other part of the economy. If we can relieve pressure on the capital markets, housing is going to respond rather fast.

Frey
Fulton
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gettys
Gialmo
Gibbons
Gilman
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grasso
Gray
Green, Pa.
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Guyer
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Harrington
Hastings
Hays
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Hinshaw
Holt
Horton
Hosmer
Hudnut
Hutchinson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Jordan
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kemp
Ketchum
King
Kluczynski
Kyros
Lagomarsino
Latta
Lehman
Lent
Long, La.
Lujan
McClory
McCloskey
McCullister
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKay
McKinney
Macdonald
Madden
Madigan
Mahon
Mallory
Mann
Martin, Nebr.
Martin, N.C.
Mathias, Calif.
Matsunaga

Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Metcalfe
Mezvinisky
Michel
Milford
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mitschall, Ohio
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizel
Moakley
Mollough
Moorhead, Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Mosher
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murtha
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Brien
O'Hara
O'Neill
Owens
Parris
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pritchard
Quie
Rallsback
Rangel
Rees
Regula
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncallo, Wyo.
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rousselot
Roy
Roybal
Ruhnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain

Sandman
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Schneebeil
Sebelius
Seiberling
Shoup
Snriver
Snuster
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Spence
Staggers
Stanton
J. William Stanton
James V. Stark
Steed
Steelman
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sudds
Sullivan
Springston
Tamm
Taylor, N.C.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Wis.
Thone
Thornat
Tiernan
Traxler
Treen
Udall
Ullman
Vander Jagt
Vander Veer
Vanik
Veysey
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walsh
Ware
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Whitson
Widall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson
Charles, Tex.
Winn
Wolf
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wyllie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young, Ga.
Young, Ill.
Young, S.C.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zwach

Annunzio
Aspin
Baker
Brasco
Carey, N.Y.
Conyers
Davis, Ga.
Donohue
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fisher
Green, Oreg.

Griffiths
Gunter
Hansen, Wash.
Hawkins
Hébert
Hogan
Hollifield
Jones, Ala.
Koch
Landrum
Leggett
McSpadden
Nedzi

Peysse
Pode
Quillen
Rarick
Rid
Rooney, N.Y.
Steele
Stephens
Stuckey
Teague
Van Deerin

NOT VOTING—37

may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 15572, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Space, Science, Veterans, and Certain Other Independent Agencies Appropriation Bill for 1975.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 93-1310)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15572) "making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for space, science, veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered, 5, 8, 10, 11, 20, 30, 34, 35, 38, 41, 60, and 61.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 9, 14, 22, 26, 27, 42, 43, 46, 48, 49, 50, 55, and 57, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$13,233,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$197,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$123,375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$65,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,130,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,413,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,425,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,626,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House

So the bill was passed.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Annunzio for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Until further notice:
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Hollifield.
Mr. Ellberg with Mr. Davis of Georgia.
Mr. Koch with Mr. Aspin.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Stuckey.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Landrum with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. McSpadden.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mrs. Green of Oregon.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Teague with Mr. Carey of New York.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Hogan.
Mr. Van Deerin with Mr. Peysse.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Gunter with Mr. Steele.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Reid.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 355

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 355) to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to promote safety by providing that defects and failures to comply with motor vehicle safety standards shall be remedied without charge to the owner and for other purposes, with the House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STAGGERS, MOSS, STUCKEY, DEVINE, and BROYHILL of North Carolina.

PERMISSION FOR MANAGERS TO FILE A CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15572

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers

recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$18,928,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$28,563,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$258,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$140,155,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$77,020,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named by said amendment insert "\$1,940,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$661,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert "more nor less"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert: "more nor less"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$65,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert "more nor less"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$45,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$420,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$223,925,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$43,796,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,050,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 4, 28, 29, 32, 44, 47, 51, 58, and 59.

EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JOE L. EVINS,
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
J. EDWARD ROUSH,
ROBERT O. TIERNAN,
BILL CHAPPELL,
ROBERT N. CHAIMO,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
BURT L. TALCOTT,
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
WILLIAM J. SCHERLE,
EARL B. RUTH,
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WILLIAM PROXMIERE,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
BIRCH BAYH,
LAWTON CHILES,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
FRANK E. MOSS,
CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, Jr.,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
HIRAM L. FONG,
EDWARD W. BROOKE,
TED STEVENS,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15572) making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for space, science, veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying report:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$13,233,000 for salaries and expenses, housing production and mortgage credit programs, instead of \$14,340,000 as proposed by the House and \$12,125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment to provide that no adminis-

trative funds may be used for the administration of the section 23 leasing program, unless the unused balance of contract authority under the section 236 program, or any replacement program, is also made available for commitment concurrent with any contract authority under the section 23 program, instead of the language proposed by the Senate.

The committee of conference is agreed that the action of the conferees is not meant to impede the section 23 program. The intent is to permit the department to utilize available resources, at the earliest date, to fill the need for low income housing to the extent other programs will not meet those needs.

The Secretary is expected to approve commitments of such available funds for new projects for the purpose contemplated by the Congress in enacting the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as indicated in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying S. 3066.

The conferees are also agreed that the provisions relating to operating cost subsidies in the new section 236 program authorized by the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 shall not apply to the unused balances of outstanding contract authority that may be committed for new projects pursuant to this act.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$2,300,000,000 for housing payments as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,425,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to insert language earmarking not less than \$450,000,000 for the payment of operating subsidies to local housing authorities. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The committee of conference agrees with the language contained in the Senate report stating that the Housing Act of 1937 as amended by the Congress in 1970 allows payment of limited operating funds by housing authorities to support public housing tenant organizations. The committee of conference expects that operating subsidies appropriated in this act will be used to promote improved communication between tenants and management in public housing. Insofar as operating subsidies are used in this manner, the conferees expect the Secretary of HUD to exercise adequate budgetary and accountability safeguards to be imposed by local housing authorities or tenant organizations to insure that these funds will be used in a constructive manner.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$23,400,000 for salaries and expenses, housing management programs as proposed by the House, instead of \$21,825,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$197,000,000 for urban renewal programs, instead of \$200,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$194,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$123,375,000 for model cities programs, instead of \$125,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$121,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Restores language proposed by the House to earmark \$1,000,000 for rehabilitation and redevelopment of the DeKalb County, Tennessee, model cities area devastated by recent tornado damage.

Amendment No. 9: Deletes language proposed by the House to appropriate \$70,000,000 for the rehabilitation loan fund, as proposed by the Senate.

August 27 1974

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$100,000,000 for comprehensive planning grants as proposed by the House, instead of \$106,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$59,000,000 for salaries and expenses, community training and development programs as proposed by the House, instead of \$37,830,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$65,000,000 for research and technology, instead of \$80,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$67,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$6,135,900 for salaries and expenses, policy development and research, instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,130,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$11,543,000 for fair housing and equal opportunity as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$5,413,000 for general departmental management, instead of \$5,580,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,412,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$3,425,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of General Counsel, instead of \$3,530,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,424,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$6,626,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of Inspector General, instead of \$6,830,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,625,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$18,928,000 for administration and staff services, instead of \$19,513,000 as proposed by the House and \$18,927,610 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$28,563,000 for regional management and services, instead of \$29,446,000 as proposed by the House and \$28,562,620 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—SPACE, SCIENCE, VETERANS, AND CERTAIN OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

American Battle Monuments Commission

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$4,512,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$4,376,640 as proposed by the Senate.

Cemeterial expenses, Army

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$258,000 for salaries and expenses, instead of \$265,000 as proposed by the House and \$257,050 as proposed by the Senate.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$2,326,000,000 for research and development as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,327,000,000 as proposed by the House. The committee of conference is agreed that not to exceed \$3,000,000 may be used for further planning for a Large Space Telescope, provided that consideration is given to substantial participation of other nations in a less expensive project to be launched at a later date. The committee of conference is also agreed that SEASAT may proceed within the funds made available under this appropriation.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates \$140,155,000 for construction of facilities, instead of \$135,670,000 as proposed by the House and \$140,155,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Designates \$77,020,000 for space shuttle facilities, instead of \$75,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$79,020,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25: Inserts language proposed by the Senate, and earmarks \$1,940,000 for initiating construction of an Orbiter Horizontal Flight Test Facility, instead of \$3,940,000 as proposed by the Senate. The committee of conference is agreed that NASA is not to proceed with the hangar project until the Air Force and NASA agree on the

total shuttle facilities plan required at Edwards.

Amendment Nos. 26 and 27: Retain language as proposed by the Senate earmarking \$4,880,000 for an addition to the Systems Development Laboratory.

The committee of conference urges the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to realign its activities among various installations so that there may be greater utilization of existing space before any new construction is undertaken.

Amendment No. 28: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment transferring up to one-quarter of one percent of the funds between the research and development appropriation and the research and program management appropriation. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

National Science Foundation

Amendment No. 29: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment authorizing not to exceed \$5,000 for official reception and representation expenses.

Amendment No. 30: Earmarks not to exceed \$35,900,000 for program development and management as proposed by the House, instead of \$36,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$361,500,000 for salaries and expenses, instead of \$666,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$654,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment making funds available until June 30, 1976, instead of making funds available until expended as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 33, 34, and 35: Earmark not more nor less than \$13,200,000 only for graduate student support, instead of not less than \$13,200,000 as proposed by the House and not more than \$12,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 36, 37, and 38: Earmark not more nor less than \$65,150,000 only for science education improvement, instead of not less than \$68,900,000 as proposed by the House and not more than \$61,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 39, 40, and 41: Earmark not more nor less than \$5,500,000 only for institutional improvement for science, instead of not less than \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House and not more than \$3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Earmarks not more than \$50,000,000 for Research Applied to National Needs as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$40,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$4,850,000 in foreign currencies for scientific activities as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Securities and Exchange Commission

Amendment No. 44: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate limiting travel expenses to not to exceed \$1,200,000.

Selective Service System

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates \$45,000,000 for salaries and expenses, instead of \$46,463,000 as proposed by the House and \$37,345,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Veterans Administration

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates \$7,283,000,000 for compensation and pensions as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$6,716,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 47: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate to appropriate \$8,750,000 for veterans insurance and indemnities.

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates \$3,137,644,000 for medical care as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,190,044,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$39,600,000 for medical and prosthetic research as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$36,700,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50: Deletes language proposed by the House to appropriate \$30,000,000 for assistance for health manpower training institutions as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate authorizing not to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses.

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates \$120,000,000 for general operating expenses, instead of \$388,130,000 as proposed by the House and \$428,842,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$221,925,000 for construction, major projects, instead of \$230,850,000 as proposed by the House and \$223,924,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates \$43,795,000 for construction, minor projects, instead of \$45,150,000 as proposed by the House and \$43,795,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates \$9,700,000 for grants for construction of State extended care facilities as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates \$2,050,000 for grants to the Republic of the Philippines, instead of \$2,100,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,037,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 57: Appropriates \$97,000 for the vocational rehabilitation revolving fund as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE III—CORPORATIONS

Federal Home Loan Bank Board

Amendment No. 58: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate authorizing not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses.

Amendment No. 59: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate to provide necessary authority for the Board to assess charges and receive advances from other agencies and expand the dollar limitation for its proposed new headquarters building.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 60: Deletes language proposed by the Senate relating to the use of passenger motor vehicles.

Amendment No. 61: Restores section number proposed by the House.

Conference total—with comparisons

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1975 recommended by the committee of conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1974 amounts, to the 1975 budget estimate, and to the House and Senate bills for 1975 follows:

	Amounts
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974	\$20, 813, 036, 000
Budget estimates of new (obligational authority (as amended), fiscal year 1975	21, 436, 813, 000
House bill, fiscal year 1975	20, 846, 332, 000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1975	21, 210, 718, 420
Conference agreement compared with—	21, 215, 812, 000
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974	+ 402, 776, 000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority (as amended), fiscal year 1975	- 221, 001, 000
House bill, fiscal year 1975	+ 369, 480, 000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1975	- 5, 093, 580

EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JOE L. EVINS,
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
J. EDWARD ROUSH,
ROBERT O. TIERNAN,
BILL CHAPPELL,
ROBERT N. CHAIMO,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
BURT L. TALCOTT,
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
WILLIAM J. SCHERLE,
EARL B. RUTE,
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WILLIAM PROXMIER,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
BIRCH BAYH,
LAWTON CHILES,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
FRANK E. MOSS,
CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR.,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
HIRAM L. FONG,
EDWARD W. BROOKE,
TED STEVENS,
MILTON R. YOUNG.,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15572

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order tomorrow to call up and consider a conference report on the bill H.R. 15572, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, space, science, veterans, and certain other independent agencies appropriation bill for 1974.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, August 19, the House passed H.R. 16102, legislation to amend the Emergency Daylight Saving Time Energy Conservation Act of 1973 to return to standard time for the months of November through February. I am recorded as not voting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, however, I was present and did vote in favor of this legislation. It appears that my coded card did not register in the electronic voting system. I would like to formally record my "aye" vote at this time.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT STUDY ACT OF 1974

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15487) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury to conduct a study of foreign direct and portfolio investment in the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 15487, with Mr. ECKHARDT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BURKE) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER).

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

Mr. Chairman, today we are presenting H.R. 15487, the Foreign Investment Study Act, to authorize a thorough survey of foreign investment activity in this country. The purpose of this bill is to develop a firm and reliable data base from which both the Congress and the Executive can derive responsive and responsible policy recommendations.

The bill is the product of unanimous judgment and deliberation by the members of my Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy. Our investigative hearings earlier this year disclosed both that there is considerable alarm about present and potential foreign investment in the United States, and that the available information against which to gage this concern is seriously deficient.

The last benchmark survey of direct foreign investment in this country was conducted in 1959, and the last one on portfolio investment took place in 1949. This bill directs the Departments of Commerce and of the Treasury to conduct an up-to-date survey of both direct and portfolio investment. All aspects of such investment are to be investigated, including its nature and magnitude; the mechanism of investment, particularly the implications of takeovers of existing firms; balance of payments consequences; the impact on employment, national security, and natural resources; geographical and sectoral distribution; and the necessity and appropriateness of periodic reporting or disclosure requirements.

Two and a half years are authorized for a full study and a final report, with an interim report due in 18 months.

Mr. Chairman, this is a responsible first step toward dealing with a phenomenon that is of increasing concern to many

Americans. Unlike many other countries, we have no screening process or exchange controls to limit the inward flow of foreign investment. We have not felt the need for them, and indeed our posture has been one of encouraging greater freedom of international investment activity, as befits a major exporter of capital. The question is whether this posture should be maintained or modified to some degree in the light of recent and reasonably foreseeable events.

The figures are nowhere near precise, but the data we have indicate that new foreign direct investment in 1973—investment that aims at control of American enterprises—shot up to \$3 billion, more than triple the level of preceding years. Analysts pointed to successive devaluations of the dollar, and the steep decline in stock market values, as factors enhancing the attractiveness of U.S. investment to European and Japanese investors. Wide publicity was given to industrial takeovers such as the acquisition of Texas Gulf by the Canadian Development Corp. Rumors grew of Japanese and other foreign interest in farmland and natural resources—rumors that were fueled by the very unavailability of accurate information that this bill seeks to correct.

Of course 1973 ended with the Arab oil boycott and, much more significantly, the quadrupling of international oil prices. This is likely to have a substantial dampening effect on foreign investment activity by the more developed countries such as England and Holland and Japan who have historically or in the recent past been most active in this country. But their balance-of-payment loss is the exporting countries' gain, and we must not gear ourselves to deal with the investment needs and interests of these newly affluent nations.

The oil exporting countries will have some \$60 billion in excess currency reserves at the end of 1974, as compared with a \$5 billion surplus in 1970. It has been calculated that at presently prevailing world prices the cumulative surplus oil revenues—those that the exporting countries cannot expend for internal purposes—may reach as much as \$400 billion by 1980. At present much of the excess is going into short-term bank deposits and various forms of portfolio investment. But this will clearly not suffice for the long run, and Iran's recent purchase of a one-third interest in Krupp is a harbinger of things to come.

Mr. Chairman, the interests of the United States in this situation do not all run in one direction. Clearly there is danger in leaving these huge oil surpluses, over-hanging and disturbing international currency markets. Properly guided, these funds can make a positive contribution to our own balance of payments, to employment, and to the circulation of capital within our economy. That is why, although I share the genuine concern that has prompted various members to introduce restrictive legislation, I believe on balance it is premature to settle on a definite policy course at this time.

The one thing we do owe the Amer-

August 21, 1974

ical people is accurate and reliable information. Rumor and reaction are not satisfactory implements for the development of sound public policy. We must draw the necessary distinctions between helpful and potentially damaging foreign investment in this country, and we must do so on the basis of solidly grounded knowledge about what is happening. This bill is a building block in that process, and I recommend its approval to the House.

I include the following:

PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND OF THE FOREIGN INVESTMENT STUDY ACT OF 1974

Hearings in January and February of 1974 by the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy held hearings on foreign investment in the United States. It was the near unanimous conclusion of both witnesses and members of the Subcommittee that existing data on foreign investment in the United States is incomplete and inadequate, particularly for the purposes of setting a rational policy.

H.R. 15487 introduced with the sponsorship of all the members of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy and reported favorably, without objection, by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Directs the Departments of Commerce and Treasury to undertake a benchmark survey of foreign investment in the United States. Commerce will conduct the survey of direct foreign investment (the last benchmark was in 1969) and Treasury the survey of portfolio investment (the last benchmark was in 1949).

The study goes beyond the collection of balance of payments statistics and concentrates on the implications for the domestic economy; it includes: extent for foreign investment, reasons for such investment; mechanisms of financing; scope and significance of take-overs; geographical and industrial distribution; effects on U.S. security, energy, natural resources, agriculture, etc.; effect on employment opportunities and labor practices; effect of current laws and regulations; need for regular reporting requirements.

Report accompanying the bill directs that established procedures for confidentiality are to be followed.

Bill authorizes the expenditure of not more than \$3 million.

Interim report to congress due 18 months after date of enactment and final report not later than 2 1/2 years after enactment.

A companion bill has already passed the Senate.

The bill has the support of the executive departments.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULVER. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. DU PONT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman just stated that the usual rule of confidentiality would apply, but I assume that when the report is completed, it will be publicly available, and the statistical tables will be publicly available?

Mr. CULVER. That is correct. They will be in an aggregate form.

Mr. DU PONT. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. CULVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. REES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. REES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate the gentleman for taking the initiative on this study. As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I have been working in the field of foreign banks doing business in the United States. I know there are problems in that foreign banks have more rights than U.S. banks in doing business here. I do not mind banks doing business in the United States and competing, but I have to see them have a competitive advantage over the local banks.

I wish to thank the gentleman.

In order to save time, I should like to insert in the Record some material about some of the problems we have been facing in the Committee on Banking and Currency.

An illustration of the need to know how financing is arranged for foreign investment is provided in the case of the purchase of First Western Bank of California by Lloyds of London. A U.S. bank interfered in acquiring First Western was prevented from doing so because the acquisition would violate the antitrust laws. It was argued that a foreign takeover would gear round the antitrust problem; would protect competition by permitting the 23d largest bank in the free world, Lloyds, to operate in the home market of the largest bank, Bank of America; and would add to the banking resources of the State and introduce additional needed bank capital.

Lloyd's did not bring in new capital, however. As reported in the Wall Street Journal July 26, it borrowed \$135 million in New York to finance the \$115 million purchase from World Airways—\$95 million of that amount was provided by U.S. banks and \$40 million by U.S. insurance companies. It is not clear that approving the purchase the Federal Reserve Board was aware of how the acquisition was to be financed. There is some question as to whether the same standards of disclosure apply to foreign banks as to U.S. banks in holding company acquisitions or whether the same standards of capital adequacy apply. There is also some question as to whether a major U.S. bank—First Western is the 76th largest bank in the United States, the 8th largest in California—should be capitalized solely with credit obtained from U.S. financial institutions at a 9-percent interest rate, regardless of the amount of resources of the foreign-based parent bank.

I think this example illustrates the need to obtain information on the financing of foreign investment as a foundation for developing a national policy.

In the area of portfolio investment, the need for information is equally significant. Several large U.S. banks which are active overseas have sold stock in the bank or its holding company to foreign banks with whom they are partners in joint ventures. The joint ventures are outside the United States but frequently the foreign bank partner has a subsidiary, branch or agency in the United States—often in the same city in which the U.S. bank is located.

For instance, First National City Bank

and Fuji Bank Ltd., Tokyo are equal partners in a management consulting firm and a leasing firm in Tokyo. Fuji Bank owns fifteen hundredths of 1 percent of Citicorp's outstanding shares and has agency operations in both Los Angeles and New York. First National City Bank in turn has extensive banking operations in Tokyo and other Japanese cities.

Other large U.S. multinational banks are also reported to have reciprocal stock holdings with foreign bank partners in joint ventures. Information on foreign portfolio investment in U.S. banks would help indicate the extent and importance of this trend and whether or not it subverts the intent of letter of U.S. law.

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

Mr. CULVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and want to take this opportunity for complimenting the gentleman from Iowa for bringing this legislation to the floor of the House. There is an obvious need for this measure.

Mr. Chairman, over a year ago in response to the growing concern of my own constituents and news headlines auguring threats to U.S. business and industry from rapidly increasing foreign investments in the United States, I request my distinguished colleague from Iowa (Mr. CULVER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, to hold hearings on the issue of foreign investment in our Nation.

Recognizing the need for fully investigating this topic, our Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy commenced hearings on the issue, taking testimony from witnesses from all segments of the American economy and from our Federal agencies.

As a result of these extensive hearings, one important conclusion was underscored . . . that our data on foreign investments was wholly inadequate.

While some of the witnesses expressed the opinion that foreign investment in the United States was beneficial to our economy, others forecasted severe problems in years to come unless we adopted strict regulations governing foreign investments.

While the course for future control of foreign investment was not a matter of agreement among committee members, our committee did recognize a compelling need for additional data and information concerning foreign investments so that our future policies could be founded upon sound economic reasoning.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support H.R. 15487, a bill I am cosponsoring which will provide us with a comprehensive collection analysis of data on foreign investments, the necessary information to make intelligent and reasonable decisions for U.S. foreign investment policy.

the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States or any of their duly authorized representatives shall, until the expiration of three years after completion of the project or undertaking referred to in subsection (a) of this section, have access for the purpose of audit and examination to all books, documents, papers, and records of such recipients which in the opinion of the Secretary or the Comptroller General may be related or pertinent to the grants, subgrants, contracts, subcontracts, loans, or other arrangements referred to in subsection (a)."

(e) Section 5 of such Act is amended by striking out "drug abuse" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "drug and alcohol abuse".

(f) Section 8 of such Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by adding after subsection (a) the following new subsection;

"(b) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education."

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate amendment as amended was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations have until midnight Friday to file reports on H.R. 1355, H.R. 5264, H.R. 7072, H.R. 8958, H.R. 15818, H.R. 15903, and S. 1794.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS TO HAVE UNTIL NOON SEPTEMBER 10, 1974, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 16371.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science and Astronautics have until noon September 10, 1974 to file a report on H.R. 16371, to further the conduct of research, development, and demonstration in solar energy technologies, to establish a solar energy coordination and management project, to provide for scientific and technical training in solar energy, to establish a Solar Energy Research Institute, to provide for the de-

velopment of suitable incentives to assure the rapid commercial utilization of solar energy, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15572, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR HUD, SPACE, SCIENCE, VETERANS

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15572) making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for space, science, veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 21, 1974.)

Mr. BOLAND (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the statement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, we bring back to the House today the conference report on the HUD, space, science, veterans' appropriation bill for 1975. As always in any appropriations conference, the conferees on this bill were faced with a number of tough issues, but I am pleased to report that we resolved all the differences.

The total amount in this conference report is \$21,215,812,000. The House passed this bill on June 26, 1974, with a total of \$20,846,332,000. Shortly after the House approved this bill, the President requested an additional \$618,962,000 for veterans' programs. The largest part of the additional request was for mandatory funding of compensation and pension increases.

The Senate passed the bill on August 16, and with the additional amount considered, approved a total of \$21,210,718,420. The conferees have brought back a report that is \$221,001,000 under the budget request.

The conference total is also \$402,976,000 above the comparable amount of new obligational authority for the agencies and departments in this bill for fiscal year 1974.

Turning to specifics, the conference agreement has approved \$3,014,519,000 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Members may recall that because of the new housing bill which is being signed into law today, and which had not been approved by Congress at the time we considered our bill,

we deferred consideration of the funds for the new community development program.

However, the conference agreement does provide \$320,375,000 for urban renewal and model cities programs to cover a 6-month transitional period until the new community development program gets under way on January 1, 1975.

This committee will consider, in the first supplemental, the balance of the \$2.5 billion requested for the community development program.

Also under HUD, the conferees were faced with two difficult issues. The first concerned the suspended section 235 and 236 subsidized housing programs. The Senate position made mandatory the commitment of all unused contract authority for these programs concurrent with implementation of the new section 23 revised leasing program. While the House conferees are concerned that the new revised leasing program will be expensive, and while we would like to see a fair test of comparative costs between the old 236 program and the new section 23 program—we did not feel that mandatory language is good legislation. The conference agreement drops the mandatory provision—but does require that the unused section 236 contract authority be made available for commitment.

The other HUD issue concerned operating subsidies available for payment to local housing authorities. The conference committee has earmarked a "floor of \$450,000,000, instead of \$500,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Frankly, the House conferees continue to be increasingly concerned with the rapidly growing cost of these subsidies. Last year they totaled \$32,000,000. This year they could reach \$500,000,000 with added energy costs. We need to get a handle on these subsidy costs, and I hope we can work with the legislative committee and the department in the hope of turning some of the public housing projects around.

A total of \$3,206,735,000 is included for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; \$666,350,000 for the National Science Foundation in addition to \$101,800,000 provided in the special energy bill; \$46,900,000 for the Federal Communications Commission; \$43,077,000 for the Securities and Exchange Commission; and \$45,000,000 for the Selective Service System. The bill also provides \$13,983,298,000 for the Veterans' Administration. This is \$444,378,000 above the 1974 appropriated level. Within the amount provided is an increase of \$12,644,000 for medical care. This increase is more than offset by the corresponding decreases in general operating expenses and in construction projects. There is no doubt, however, that the amount provided in the conference agreement will help to ensure an adequate level of quality medical care for our veterans. The House conferees feel that the compromise reached with the Senate are reasonable. This bill provides funds for many vital activities.

I will include in my remarks a table showing the action taken on each item, the comparison with 1974, and the actions of the House and Senate:

systems in alcohol and drug abuse education programs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY Mr. BRADEMAS

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BRADEMAS moves to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Act Amendments of 1974".

Sec. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 1001) is amended to read as follows: "This Act may be cited as the 'Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Act'."

(b) Section 2 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that drug and alcohol abuse diminishes the strength and vitality of the people of our Nation; that an increasing number of substances, both legal and illegal, are being abused by increasing numbers of individuals; that abuse of any substance is complex human behavior which is influenced by many forces, including school, family, church, community, media, and peer groups; and that prevention and early intervention in such behavior require cooperation and coordination among all of these elements in strategies designed to respond to carefully defined problems.

"(b) It is the purpose of this Act to encourage the development of new and improved curriculums on the problems of drug abuse; to demonstrate the use of such curriculums in model educational programs and to evaluate the effectiveness thereof; to disseminate curricular materials and significant information for use in educational programs throughout the Nation; to provide training programs for teachers, counselors, law enforcement officials, and other public service and community leaders; and to offer community education programs for parents and others, on drug abuse problems.

"(c) It is further the purpose of this Act to provide leadership to schools and other institutions in the community by supporting projects to identify, evaluate, demonstrate, and disseminate effective strategies for prevention and early intervention and to provide training and technical assistance to schools and other segments of the community in adapting such strategies to identified local needs."

"(d) Section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION PROJECTS

"Sec. 3. (a) The Commissioner of Education shall carry out a program of making grants to, and contracts with institutions of higher education, State and local educational agencies, and public and private educational or community agencies, institutions, and organizations to support and evaluate demonstration projects, to encourage the establishment of such projects throughout the Nation to train educational and community personnel, and to provide technical assistance in program development. In carrying out such program, the Commissioner of Education shall give priority to school-based programs and projects.

"(b) Funds appropriated for grants and contracts under this Act shall be available for activities, including bilingual activities, such as—

"(1) projects for the development, testing, evaluation, and dissemination of exemplary materials for use in elementary, secondary, adult, and community education programs, and for training in the selection and use of such materials;

"(2) comprehensive demonstration programs which focus on the causes of drug and alcohol abuse rather than on the symptoms; which include both schools and the communities within which the schools are located; which emphasize the affective as well as the cognitive approach; which reflect the specialized needs of communities; and which include, in planning and development, school personnel, the target population, community representation, and parents;

"(3) creative primary prevention and early intervention programs in schools, utilizing an interdisciplinary 'school team' approach, developing in educational personnel and students skills in planning and conducting comprehensive prevention programs which include such activities as training drug and alcohol education specialists and group leaders, peer group and individual counseling, and student involvement in intellectual, cultural, and social alternatives to drug and alcohol abuse;

"(4) inservice and in-service training programs for teachers, counselors, and other educational personnel, law enforcement officials, and other public service and community leaders and personnel;

"(5) community education programs on drug and alcohol abuse, especially for parents and others in the community;

"(6) programs of projects to recruit, train, organize, and employ professionals and other persons, including former drug and alcohol abusers and former drug- and alcohol-dependent persons, to organize and participate in programs of public education in drug and alcohol abuse; and

"(7) projects for the dissemination of valid and effective school and community drug and alcohol abuse educational programs.

"(c) In addition to the purposes described in subsection (b) of this section, funds in an amount not to exceed 10 per centum of the sums appropriated to carry out this Act may be made available for the payment of reasonable and necessary expenses of State educational agencies for assisting local educational agencies in the planning, development, and implementation of drug and alcohol abuse education programs, including such projects as—

"(1) inservice training of education personnel,

"(2) technical assistance to local school districts,

"(3) creative leadership in programming for indigenous minorities, and

"(4) training of peer counselors.

"(d) (1) Financial assistance under this section may be made only upon application at such time or times, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Commissioner deems necessary, and only if such application—

"(A) provides that activities and services for which assistance under this title is sought will be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

"(B) provides for carrying out one or more projects or programs eligible for assistance under subsections (b) and (c) of this section and provides for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of such projects or programs;

"(C) sets forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this section for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds

that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available by the applicant for the purposes described in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, and in no case supplant such funds; and

"(D) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require, and for keeping such records and affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure to correctness and verification of such reports.

"(2) An application from a local educational agency for financial assistance under this section may be approved by the Commissioner only after the applicant has submitted the application to the State educational agency. The State educational agency shall, not more than thirty days after the date of receipt of the application, submit to the Secretary in writing its comments on the application. A copy of such comments shall be submitted at the same time to the applicant.

"(3) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulation, be subject to the requirements set forth in subsections (d)(1) and (d)(2).

"(e) (1) The Commissioner may use funds in an amount not exceeding 1 per centum of the funds appropriated to carry out this section for a fiscal year for independent analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the drug and alcohol abuse education programs assisted under this section.

"(2) The Commissioner shall, not later than March 31 of each calendar year, submit an evaluation report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the House Committee on Education and Labor and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Such report shall—

"(A) contain the agency's statement of specific and detailed objectives for the program or programs assisted under the provisions of this Act, and relate these objectives to those in the Act.

"(B) include statements of the agency's conclusions as to effectiveness of the program or programs in meeting the stated objectives, measured through the end of the preceding fiscal year.

"(C) make recommendations with respect to any changes or additional legislative action deemed necessary or desirable in carrying out the program or programs.

"(D) contain a listing identifying the principal analyses and studies supporting the major conclusions and recommendations, and

"(E) contain the agency's annual evaluation plan for the program or programs through the ensuing fiscal year for which the budget was transmitted to Congress by the President, in accordance with section 201(a) of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 (31 U.S.C. 11).

"(f) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this section \$26,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, \$30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and \$34,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977. Not less than 60 per centum of the amount appropriated for a fiscal year under this section shall be used for drug and alcohol abuse education programs and projects in elementary and secondary schools."

"(d) Section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. (a) Each recipient of Federal assistance under this Act, pursuant to grants, subgrants, contracts, subcontracts, loans, or other arrangements, entered into other than by formal advertising, and which are otherwise authorized by this Act, shall keep such records as the Commissioner shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY, HUD—SPACE—SCIENCE—VETERANS APPROPRIATION BILL, (H.R. 15572)

[Note.—All amounts are in the form of appropriations unless otherwise indicated]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974* (2)	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1975 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill (4)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill (5)	Conference action (6)	Conference action compared with—				
						New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974 (7)	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1975 (8)	House bill (9)	Senate bill (10)	
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT										
Housing Production and Mortgage Credit										
Salaries and expenses, Housing production and mortgage credit programs.....	\$5,246,000	\$14,340,000	\$14,340,000	\$12,125,000	\$13,233,000	+\$7,987,000	-\$1,107,000	-\$1,107,000	+\$1,108,000	
Government National Mortgage Association										
Payment of participation sales insufficiencies.....	19,821,000	22,883,000	22,883,000	22,883,000	22,883,000	+3,062,000				
Total, Housing Production and Mortgage Credit.....	25,067,000	37,223,000	37,223,000	35,008,000	36,116,000	+11,049,000	-1,107,000	-1,107,000	+1,108,000	
Housing Management										
Housing payments.....	2,020,000,000	2,425,000,000	2,425,000,000	2,300,000,000	2,300,000,000	+280,000,000	-125,000,000	-125,000,000		
Salaries and expenses, Housing management programs.....	24,521,000	\$23,400,000	23,400,000	21,825,000	23,400,000	-1,121,000			+1,575,000	
Total, Housing Management.....	2,044,521,000	2,448,400,000	2,448,400,000	2,321,825,000	2,323,400,000	+278,879,000	-125,000,000	-125,000,000	+1,575,000	
Community Planning and Development										
Urban renewal programs.....	600,000,000		(*) 200,000,000	194,000,000	197,000,000	-403,000,000	+197,000,000	-3,000,000	+3,000,000	
Model cities programs.....	150,000,000		(*) 125,000,000	121,250,000	123,375,000	-26,625,000	+123,375,000	-1,625,000	+2,125,000	
Rehabilitation loan fund.....			(*) 70,000,000					-70,000,000		
Open space land programs.....	25,000,000					-25,000,000				
Community development.....		\$325,000,000					-325,000,000			
Comprehensive planning grants.....	75,000,000	110,000,000	100,000,000	106,700,000	100,000,000	+25,000,000	-10,000,000		-6,700,000	
Salaries and expenses, Community planning and management programs.....	10,359,000					-10,359,000				
Salaries and expenses, Community development programs.....	23,004,000					-23,004,000				
Salaries and expenses, Community planning and development programs.....		\$42,200,000	39,000,000	37,830,000	39,000,000	+39,000,000	-3,200,000		+1,170,000	
Total, Community Planning and Development.....	883,363,000	477,200,000	534,000,000	459,780,000	459,375,000	-423,988,000	-17,825,000	-74,625,000	-405,000	
Federal Insurance Administration										
Flood insurance.....	20,000,000	\$50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	+30,000,000				
Policy Development and Research										
Research and technology.....	65,000,000	70,000,000	60,000,000	67,900,000	65,000,000		-5,000,000	+5,000,000	-2,900,000	
Salaries and expenses, Policy development and research.....		6,320,000	5,000,000	6,130,400	6,130,000	+6,130,000	-190,000	+1,130,000	-400	
Total, Policy Development and Research.....	65,000,000	76,320,000	65,000,000	74,030,400	71,130,000	+6,130,000	-5,190,000	+6,130,000	-2,900,400	
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity										
Fair housing and equal opportunity.....	9,777,000	11,900,000	10,900,000	11,543,000	11,543,000	+1,766,000	-357,000	+643,000		
Departmental Management										
General departmental management.....	6,161,000	5,580,000	5,580,000	5,412,600	5,413,000	-748,000	-167,000	-167,000	+400	
Salaries and expenses, Office of general counsel.....	3,253,000	3,530,000	3,530,000	3,424,100	3,425,000	+172,000	-105,000	-105,000	+900	
Salaries and expenses, Office of inspector general.....	6,708,000	\$6,830,000	6,830,000	6,625,100	6,626,000	-82,000	-204,000	-204,000	+900	
Administration and staff services.....	11,650,000	19,810,000	19,513,000	18,927,610	18,928,000	+7,278,000	-882,000	-585,000	+390	
Regional management and services.....	20,224,000	\$30,160,000	29,446,000	28,562,620	28,563,000	+8,339,000	-1,597,000	-883,000	+380	
Total, Departmental Management.....	47,996,000	65,910,000	64,899,000	62,952,030	62,955,000	+14,959,000	-2,955,000	-1,944,000	+2,970	
Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	3,095,724,000	3,166,953,000	3,210,422,000	3,015,138,430	3,014,519,000	+81,205,000	-152,434,000	-195,903,000	-619,430	
Funds Appropriated to the President										
Federal Disaster Assistance Administration										
Disaster relief.....	\$432,600,000	\$200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	-232,600,000				
Total, Title I.....	3,528,324,000	3,366,953,000	3,410,422,000	3,215,138,430	3,214,519,000	-313,805,000	-152,434,000	-195,903,000	-619,430	

Footnotes at end of table.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY, HUD—SPACE—SCIENCE—VETTRANS APPROPRIATION BILL (H. R. 15573) (Continued)

[Note.—All amounts are in the form of appropriations unless otherwise indicated]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974*	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1975	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill	Conference action	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1975	House bill	Senate bill
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
TITLE II—SPACE, SCIENCE, VETTRANS, AND CERTAIN OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES									
American Battle Monuments Commission									
Salaries and expenses	\$ 4,160,000	55,465,000	\$ 4,512,000	\$ 4,176,000	4,112,000	4,112,000	55,465,000	—	4,112,000
Department of Defense—Civil									
Demerital Expenses, Army									
Salaries and expenses	24,078,000	267,000	265,000	257,050	258,000	25,820,000	—9,000	257,000	250
Federal Communications Commission									
Salaries and expenses	40,155,000	46,847,000	46,900,000	46,900,000	46,900,000	46,765,000	83,000	—	—
National Aeronautics and Space Administration									
Research and development	2,189,307,000	2,341,580,000	2,327,360,000	2,326,580,000	2,326,580,000	+137,273,000	-15,000,000	-800,000	—
Construction of facilities	101,100,000	151,490,000	135,670,000	140,155,300	140,155,000	+39,055,000	-11,335,000	+4,485,000	300
Research and program management	744,600,000	749,624,000	740,000,000	740,600,000	740,000,000	-4,600,000	-9,624,000	—	—
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration	3,035,007,000	3,242,694,000	3,203,050,000	3,206,735,300	3,206,735,000	+171,728,000	-35,959,000	+3,685,000	—
National Science Foundation									
Salaries and expenses	544,660,000	681,400,000	666,800,000	654,730,000	661,500,000	+116,840,000	-19,900,000	-5,300,000	-6,750,000
Scientific activities (special foreign emergency program)	3,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	4,810,000	4,850,000	+1,850,000	-150,000	-150,000	—
Total, National Science Foundation	547,660,000	686,400,000	671,800,000	659,540,000	666,350,000	+118,690,000	-20,050,000	-5,450,000	-6,750,000
Renegotiation Board									
Salaries and expenses	4,805,000	5,195,000	5,163,000	5,163,000	5,163,000	+258,000	-37,000	—	—
Securities and Exchange Commission									
Salaries and expenses	36,227,000	42,131,000	43,077,000	43,077,000	43,077,000	+6,850,000	1,940,000	—	—
Selective Service System									
Salaries and expenses	51,760,000	47,163,000	46,463,000	37,305,000	45,000,000	-8,760,000	-2,163,000	-1,463,000	500,000
Veterans' Administration									
Compensation and pensions	6,743,800,000	7,283,000,000	6,716,200,000	7,283,000,000	7,283,000,000	+539,200,000	—	-566,800,000	—
Readjustment benefits	3,353,000,000	2,676,000,000	2,676,000,000	2,676,000,000	2,676,000,000	-677,000,000	—	—	—
Veterans insurance and indemnities (By transfer)	(6,000,000)	8,750,000	—	8,710,000	8,750,000	+8,750,000	—	+8,750,000	—
Medical care	2,859,173,000	3,175,000,000	3,190,044,000	3,187,674,000	3,187,644,000	+328,471,000	-12,644,000	-2,400,000	—
Medical and prosthetic research	75,500,000	89,600,000	86,770,000	89,000,000	89,000,000	+13,500,000	—	+2,230,000	—
Assistance for health manpower training institutions	25,000,000	—	30,000,000	—	—	-25,000,000	—	-30,000,000	—
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	34,063,000	37,508,000	37,508,000	37,508,000	37,508,000	+3,445,000	—	—	—
General operating expenses	333,623,000	434,412,000	388,130,000	428,842,000	420,000,000	+86,377,000	-14,412,000	+31,870,000	—
Construction, major projects	68,343,000	230,850,000	230,850,000	223,974,500	223,925,000	-155,522,000	-6,925,000	-6,925,000	—
Construction, minor projects	40,018,000	45,150,000	45,150,000	43,755,500	43,796,000	+3,778,000	-1,354,000	-1,354,000	—
Grants for construction of State extended care facilities	—	10,000,000	10,000,000	9,700,000	9,700,000	—	-300,000	-300,000	—
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	2,000,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,057,000	2,010,000	—	50,000	-50,000	111,000
Payment of participation sales insufficiencies	4,400,000	1,828,000	1,828,000	1,828,000	1,828,000	-2,572,000	—	—	—
Loan guaranty revolving fund (limitation on obligations)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	—	—	—	—
Vocational rehabilitation revolving fund	—	100,000	100,000	97,000	97,000	97,000	3,000	3,000	—
Total, Veterans Administration	13,538,920,000	13,993,698,000	13,414,680,000	13,992,125,000	13,983,298,000	+444,378,000	-10,400,000	-568,618,000	18,928,000
Total, Title II, Space, Science, Veterans, and Certain Other Independent Agencies:	17,286,717,000	18,069,800,000	17,435,910,000	17,995,579,990	18,001,293,000	+716,581,000	-68,500,000	-565,383,000	-5,713,000
By transfer	(6,000,000)	—	—	—	—	(6,000,000)	—	—	—
TITLE III—CORPORATIONS									
Department of Housing and Urban Development:									
Federal Housing Administration:									
Administrative expenses	(15,445,000)	(13,880,000)	(13,803,000)	(13,801,000)	(13,803,000)	(-1,642,000)	(-77,000)	—	—
Nonadministrative expenses	(176,796,000)	(191,730,000)	(190,500,000)	(190,500,000)	(190,500,000)	(-13,004,000)	(-1,240,000)	—	—
Government National Mortgage Association: Administrative expenses	(7,772,000)	(8,080,000)	(8,080,000)	(8,083,000)	(8,080,000)	—	—	—	—
Footnotes at end of table.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Conference action compared with—

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974* (2)	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1975 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill (4)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill (5)	Conference action (6)	Conference action compared with—		House bill (9)	Senate bill (10)
						New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974 (7)	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1975 (8)		
TITLE III—CORPORATIONS— Continued									
Federal Home Loan Bank Board:									
Administrative expenses.....	(\$9,700,000)	(\$10,470,000)	(\$10,400,000)	(\$10,400,000)	(\$10,400,000)	(+\$700,000)	(-\$70,000)		
Nonadministrative expenses.....	(18,530,000)	(20,800,000)	(20,736,000)	(20,736,000)	(20,736,000)	(+\$2,206,000)	(-\$64,000)		
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, Administrative expenses.....	(740,000)	(776,000)	(772,000)	(772,000)	(772,000)	(+\$32,000)	(-\$4,000)		
Total, Title III, Administrative and Nonadministrative expenses.....	(228,983,000)	(245,736,000)	(244,291,000)	(244,291,000)	(244,291,000)	(+\$15,308,000)	(-\$1,445,000)		
Grand total, titles I, II, and III: New budget (obligational) authority. By transfer.....	20,813,036,000 (6,000,000)	21,436,813,000	20,846,332,000	21,210,718,420	21,215,812,000	+402,776,000 (-\$6,000,000)	-221,001,000	+\$369,480,000	+\$5,093,580
Limitation on corporate funds to be expended.....	(228,983,000)	(245,736,000)	(244,291,000)	(244,291,000)	(244,291,000)	(+\$15,308,000)	(-\$1,445,000)		

* Includes all supplementals.
 1 Includes \$3,140,000 in H. Doc. 93-311.
 2 Includes \$950,000 in H. Doc. No. 93-311.
 3 Budget included \$2,300,000,000 for a proposed Better Communities Act program, which was amended in H. Doc. No. 93-311 to \$2,500,000,000 for Community Development, including \$200,000,000 for Urban Renewal, \$125,000,000 for Model Cities, and \$100,000,000 for special transitional grants to the new program. Only \$325,000,000 (\$200,000,000 for Urban Renewal and \$125,000,000 for Model Cities) is reflected as considered at this time and \$2,175,000,000 is deferred for later consideration after authorizing legislation is finalized. The House considered \$395,000,000 of the proposed Community Development program which, in addition to the \$325,000,000 estimate, included \$70,000,000 for the Rehabilitation Loan Fund.
 4 Includes \$9,500,000 in H. Doc. No. 93-311.
 5 Includes \$15,000,000 in H. Doc. No. 93-311.
 6 Includes \$170,000 in H. Doc. No. 93-311.
 7 Includes \$860,000 in H. Doc. No. 93-311.
 8 Carried in the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriation Act, 1974.
 9 Includes \$100,000,000 in H. Doc. No. 93-311.
 10 Carried in the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1974.
 11 Carried in the Public Works for Water and Power Development and Atomic Energy Commission Appropriation Act, 1974.
 12 Excludes \$4,693,000, a comparable amount shown in the report accompanying the Special Energy Research and Development Appropriation Bill for 1975.

13 Excludes \$4,435,000 which was considered in the Special Energy Research and Development Appropriation Bill for 1975.
 14 Excludes \$31,600,000, a comparable amount shown in the report accompanying the Special Energy Research and Development Appropriation Bill for 1975.
 15 Excludes \$101,800,000 which was considered in the Special Energy Research and Development Appropriation Bill for 1975.
 16 Amended budget estimates in S. Doc. No. 93-96 as follows:

Item	Original estimate	Amendment	Revised request
Compensation and pensions.....	\$6,716,200,000	\$566,800,000	\$7,283,000,000
Veterans insurance and indemnities.....		8,750,000	8,750,000
General operating expenses.....	391,000,000	43,412,000	434,412,000

The original budget estimate for Veterans insurance and indemnities of \$6,000,000 to be derived by transfer is deleted by the amended budget estimate in S. Doc. No. 93-96.
 17 Includes \$10,490,000 increase in limitation in H. Doc. No. 93-311.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report outlines pretty well what the changes were in conference, and I would be delighted to answer any questions which may be propounded by any member of the committee.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Mr. Speaker, and I did have a question on amendment No. 25 relating to the construction funds for the Orbiter Horizontal Flight Test Facility at Edwards Air Force Base in California.

The House, as we recall, authorized or the conference agreed to a \$3.9 million authorization. The House Committee on Appropriations did not appropriate any money, and I do want to commend the committee for coming back with an appropriation of \$1.940 million for initiating construction.

I am concerned about some of the language, such as that NASA is not to proceed with the hangar project until the Air Force and NASA agree on the total shuttle facilities plan required at Edwards.

Once that agreement is reached, I have no argument with the agreement, but once that agreement is reached, if NASA determines that they can reprogram the money to build the larger facility that has been authorized and I think is made possible by the language as to the program, nothing in this language

would prohibit that larger facility from being constructed; is that correct?

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman is exactly correct.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KETCHUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Like the chairman of the subcommittee on which I served, I do appreciate the fact that the conference committee has seen fit to put in the \$1.9 million language in the amendment. What did disturb me, as it apparently has the gentleman from Florida, is that the committee on conference has agreed that NASA is not to proceed until the Air Force and NASA agree on the total shuttle facilities plan required at Edwards.

I wonder whether the gentleman might elaborate a bit on that statement.

I only ask it because tomorrow night, at 9 o'clock, I will be at the NSA Flight Center at Edwards, and I would like to hear what this means.

Mr. BOLAND. As the gentleman has correctly stated, there is language in the report which indicates that the committee of conference has agreed that the NASA shall not proceed with the project until there is a total shuttle facility plan agreed on with the Air Force at Edwards.

As the gentleman well knows and as the gentleman from Florida knows, all of them are concerned about the scope of the overall facilities requirements at Edwards. There is a real possibility that

the Air Force will use Edwards for some of its shuttle operations. All that the conferees are asking is that the Air Force and NASA get together on what particular facilities are required at Edwards.

I am sure the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Florida agree that what we do not want is a surfeit of facilities there, where we could be developing two separate shuttle facilities—one for the Air Force and one for NASA.

That is all we require, that they get together and make a determination as to what particular facilities are required for both the NASA and Air Force shuttle capability. Then they can go ahead and proceed with the facilities.

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

My question goes to my interpretation of amendment number 50. In regard to of amendment No. 50. In regard to the language proposed, this deletes a proposed appropriation of \$30 million for assistance for health manpower training institutions as proposed by the Senate?

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman will remember, I discussed this previously with some of the Members. I am concerned, of course, particularly about funding under subchapters 2, 3, and 4, and the information which I have from the Veterans' Administration is that

there are no funds to go ahead and approve a proposed medical institution in California.

However, I am concerned because I understand there was some implication in the conference that there was money in the pipeline. I am wondering if the gentleman would make some comment here concerning what the possibilities would be for a new look-see in the case of a supplemental appropriation.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman's question, let me say that the gentleman has talked to me, and I know he has also talked to other members of the subcommittee. I commend the gentleman for his particular interest in this matter.

We think it is an important program, and we have appropriated, I believe, some \$45 million over the past couple of years for these programs.

The gentleman from California is rightly concerned about the amounts which have been appropriated for titles II and III for this particular program.

The information that we have from the Veterans' Administration is that of the \$45 million that has been appropriated heretofore for this program only \$8,483,000 was obligated in the last fiscal year, and another \$1,018,000 to date this year. It is true, as the gentleman knows, that there has been some indication on the part of the VA as to where these particular facilities will be located or how the amounts which have been appropriated will be spent. I think there were some five institutions which have already been approved by the Veterans' Administration: one in Texas, one in Tennessee, one in West Virginia, one in Ohio, and one in South Carolina.

However, there are sufficient funds here for the Veterans' Administration to make a determination of whether or not a facility should be available in California or whether Fresno, Calif., is an area that ought to be considered with the application of funds that are already available.

As the gentleman indicated, we did in our own subcommittee appropriate \$30 million for this program. It was not a budgeted request. When it went over to the Senate, the Senate took out the \$30 million on the basis of the argument I am now giving to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I do want to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts and his subcommittee for the \$30 million which the House did, of course, put in. I am most grateful for that. I am, of course, concerned that it has been stricken.

I can understand the explanation. I understand there is some question, and I appreciate the explanation. Hopefully, if in fact that position is not exactly correct, after we look at the pipeline, then hopefully, of course, we can take a new look at the supplemental.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the committee would be delighted to take another look at this. I am sure we can be helpful to the gentleman from California.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, am I correct in stating that this bill now totals \$21,215 million and that amount is some \$402 million above the spending for the same general purposes last year?

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, are the amendments which were adopted in the committee entirely germane to the bill?

Mr. BOLAND. Yes, all amendments are germane to the bill.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT), the ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, today marks the culmination of the major effort of our HUD-Space-Science Veterans' Appropriations Subcommittee. It has been a long year for us. We have looked at new programs, we have reviewed old programs, and we have carefully examined each of the budget requests presented to us. The conference report before the House today is the result of those labors.

I compliment my able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) who is the chairman of our subcommittee. There is great diversity on the committee, rural and urban interests, North and South, East, and West, every point of view is represented. This broadness of representation is valuable in gaining perspective on the pros and cons of the various issues before us. But the divergent views, often held with great tenacity, are usually difficult to reconcile.

The chairman's spirit of compromise and the willingness of the members of this committee to work out our differences so that we can present a report which each can support and defend is commendable. I would also like to say that our committee is served by an outstanding staff. Homer Skarin and the other members of the staff have done an excellent job and have served the committee in the most professional manner. Their efforts have been a great assistance to all members of the committee in the performance of our duties, and that support and assistance is deeply appreciated. I should also say that Mike Hugo of the minority staff has been an able and effective assistant to those of us on this side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday your committee completed a short but arduous conference with the other body in which we had to settle more than 50 differences in the legislation. Several of those differences revolved around beliefs strongly held and well defended by individual Members of the other body. Many involved basic principles of the parliamentary and legislative processes. Several were of critical importance to major new undertakings or to the successful continuation of already popular programs.

In several instances we deferred proposals which were earnestly championed by the executive branch. Some of the deferrals may well be regretted in the future, but your conferees concluded that the necessity for fiscal constraint far outweighed some attractive and perhaps beneficial new long-range programs.

Mr. Speaker, although I intend to vote "aye" on this report, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise, I am seriously disappointed in, and strongly deplore, two provisions which we were forced to agree to. The matters are relatively minor, and should not be permitted to jeopardize prompt passage of this conference report. This bill contains urgently needed funds for the Veterans' Administration the largest VA budget in history. The Congress is continuing its long record of richly deserved generosity to our veterans of all our wars.

The budget for NASA provides for research and development in space that has higher and higher Earth applications each year. The space shuttle will eventually pay for itself through new technology, in addition to the priceless new knowledge and contributions to science and industry.

However, the NASA budget also includes one of the classic examples of bad legislative technique that the other body has required in a long time. After we had considered the figures available to us, and passed the bill, the other body had the opportunity to see new figures which indicated that the area of Research and Program Management would need additional funds. Despite the fact that they had new figures and realized that additional funds would be needed, they proceeded and acted on a bill that they knew was too low in this area. The result was that on the floor an amendment was offered and accepted which gives NASA transfer authority between their "no-year" R. & D. appropriation, and their "annual" administrative appropriation. We had no choice but to retain this in conference, because if we had not accepted, the certain result would have been an almost immediate need for NASA to reduce their workforce to the detriment of their mission and the injury to their personnel.

This transfer authority is particularly odious to me because it was not necessary. Once the other body saw the need to increase the Research and Program Management account, and they both saw the need and had the votes to do it, then the proper way to handle the problem would have been to amend the bill and raise the R. & P.M. budget. This transfer authority destroys the integrity of the individual accounts and reduces the oversight power of the Congress. At a time when our colleagues on the Defense Subcommittee are finally reining in this practice with the Pentagon I see no valid reason to institute it with NASA. I serve notice that I will fight any attempt to continue this transfer authority beyond this year.

Within the National Science Foundation budget we were forced to utilize another very poor legislative technique, that of spending floors and ceilings. Because the authorizing legislation man-

dates certain spending levels which we cannot fund because of the need for fiscal restraint and because of the need for allocation of our scarce financial resources, we found that we had to resort to using simultaneous floors and ceilings. I do not like this concept, and I find it most difficult to support, I joined this Appropriations Committee because I felt that it would give me the opportunity to help control spending.

What good does it do us to urge administrators to use good management techniques when we impose spending floors on them? There is no benefit to be gained from achieving economies, because he must only spend the money again by our mandate.

We found that we had the same problem with the HUD budget. The other body added a provision to this bill which placed a floor of \$500 million on operating subsidies, while the authorizing legislation, passed only a few days ago, contained a spending ceiling on the same item, at the same amount. I ask you, how can we expect any administrator to spend exactly \$500 million over the course of a year, and hit the final figure exactly on the penny? Unfortunately, in order to obtain agreement to the conference we were forced to maintain a spending floor for this area, but at least at a reasonable level, of \$450 million.

Our budget recommendation will allow HUD to begin to get our very important housing industry moving again. Housing is truly essential to both our society and our economy.

Housing provides shelter which is as basic as food, clothing and education. Housing also provides jobs—good jobs in construction. Housing provides jobs in the supply of materials, furnishings, fixtures and services. These are all good jobs, essential jobs to the economic welfare of our Nation. It is important that there be no further delay, we must move now to get the housing industry moving again. Housing provides joy, convenience, protection, privacy, family unity, and much, much more.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I merely wish to compliment the subcommittee on the excellent work they have done on the space program and on the veterans program, and I have just one little, short question to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The American Battle Monuments Commission has recently been placed under the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in the past few years I have visited numerous cemeteries in Europe, and they are being kept up beautifully, but I was disappointed to see that there was a small cut in the amount of money to be afforded to the Commission. Every cemetery over there is short one or two employees.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Texas that they are very fine cemeteries. I am sure the

gentleman from Texas will be delighted to learn that we have restored the cut that had been proposed in the funds.

Mr. TEAGUE. I thank the gentleman. Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report on H.R. 15572, the HUD, Space, Science, and Veterans appropriations. It is a \$21 billion package, but it carries the unappropriated liability for the new housing bill which must be dealt with in a supplemental appropriation. The housing liability for the last 6 months of this fiscal year will undoubtedly amount to over \$1 billion.

Absent the housing financing the bill is up 2 percent from last year and about 1 percent under the budget for this year. With the housing supplemental, it will be up at least 8 percent for the year.

I normally vote against increases of this size, but the needs of housing are as important a priority as we now have. Therefore I support the bill. Nevertheless, I do not recede from my insistence that the overall budget be cut at least \$5 billion. We can meet our highest priorities and still make the needed cuts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 379, nays 3, answered "present" 1, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 518]
 YEAS—379

Abdnor	Broyhill, N.C.	Daniel, Robert
Abzug	Broyhill, Va.	W., Jr.
Adams	Buchanan	Daniels.
Alexander	Burgener	Domintick V.
Anderson,	Burke, Calif.	Dantelson
Anderson,	Burke, Fla.	Davis, S.C.
Calif.	Burke, Mass.	Davis, Wis.
Anderson, Ill.	Burleson, Tex.	de la Garza
Andrews, N.C.	Burlison, Mo.	Delaney
Andrews,	Burton, Phillip	Dellenback
N. Dak.	Butler	Dellums
Annunzio	Byron	Denholm
Archer	Camp	Dennis
Arends	Carney, Ohio	Dent
Armstrong	Carter	Derwinski
Ashbrook	Casey, Tex.	Devine
Ashley	Cederberg	Dickinson
Bafalis	Chamberlain	Diggs
Barrett	Chappell	Dingell
Bauman	Chisholm	Dorn
Beard	Clancy	Downing
Bell	Clark	Drinan
Bennett	Clausen,	Dulski
Bergland	Don H.	Duncan
Bevill	Clawson, Del	du Pont
Blester	Clay	Eckhardt
Bingham	Cleveland	Edwards, Ala.
Blackburn	Cochran	Edwards, Calif.
Boggs	Cohen	Ellberg
Boland	Collier	Erlenborn
Bolling	Collins, Ill.	Esch
Bowen	Collins, Tex.	Eshleman
Brademas	Conable	Ewins, Tenn.
Bray	Conlan	Fascell
Breckinridge	Conte	Findley
Brinkley	Conyers	Fish
Brooks	Cotter	Fisher
Broomfield	Coughlin	Flood
Brotzman	Cronin	Flowers
Brown, Calif.	Culver	Flynt
Brown, Mich.	Daniel, Dan	Foley
Brown, Ohio		

Ford	McEwen	Runnels
Forsythe	McFall	Ruppe
Fountain	McKay	Ruth
Fraser	McKinney	Ryan
Frelinghuysen	Madden	St Germain
Frenzel	Madigan	Sandman
Froehlich	Mahon	Sarasin
Fulton	Mallary	Sarbanes
Fuqua	Mann	Satterfield
Gaydos	Maraziti	Scherle
Gettys	Martin, N.C.	Schneebell
Gialmo	Mathias, Calif.	Schroeder
Gibbons	Mathis, Ga.	Sebelius
Gilman	Matsunaga	Seiberling
Ginn	Mayne	Shibley
Goldwater	Mazzoli	Shoup
Gonzalez	Meeds	Shriver
Goodling	Melcher	Shuster
Grasso	Metcalfe	Sikes
Green, Pa.	Mezvinsky	Sisk
Grover	Michel	Slack
Gubser	Milford	Smith, Iowa
Gude	Miller	Smith, N.Y.
Guyer	Mills	Snyder
Haley	Minish	Spence
Hamilton	Mink	Stagers
Hammer-	Minshall, Ohio	Stanton
schmidt	Mitchell, Md.	J. William
Hanley	Mitchell, N.Y.	Stark
Hanrahan	Mizell	Steed
Hansen, Idaho	Moakley	Steelman
Harsha	Mollohan	Steiger, Ariz.
Hastings	Montgomery	Steiger, Wis.
Hawkins	Moorhead,	Stokes
Hays	Calif.	Stratton
Hechler, W. Va.	Moorhead, Pa.	Stubblefield
Heckler, Mass.	Morgan	Studds
Heinz	Mosher	Sullivan
Henderson	Moss	Symington
Hicks	Murphy, Ill.	Talcott
Hillis	Murphy, N.Y.	Taylor, Mo.
Hinshaw	Murtha	Taylor, N.C.
Hogan	Myers	Teague
Holfield	Natcher	Thompson, N.J.
Holt	Nichols	Thomson, Wis.
Holtzman	Nix	Thone
Horton	Obey	Thornton
Hosmer	O'Brien	Tiernan
Howard	O'Neill	Towell, Nev.
Huber	Owens	Treen
Hudnut	Farris	Udall
Hungate	Fassman	Ullman
Hunt	Patten	Vander Jagt
Hutchinson	Pepper	Vander Veen
Ichord	Perkins	Vanik
Jarman	Pettis	Veysey
Johnson, Calif.	Peyster	Vigorito
Johnson, Colo.	Pickle	Waggonner
Johnson, Pa.	Pike	Waldie
Jones, Ala.	Poage	Walsh
Jones, N.C.	Preyer	Wampler
Jones, Okla.	Price, Ill.	Ware
Jones, Tenn.	Price, Tex.	Whalen
Jordan	Pritchard	White
Karh	Quie	Whitehurst
Kastenmeier	Railsback	Whitten
Kazen	Rangel	Widnall
Kemp	Rees	Williams
Ketchum	Regula	Wilson, Bob
King	Reuss	Wilson,
Kluczynski	Rhodes	Charles H.,
Koch	Riegler	Calif.
Kuykendall	Rinaldo	Wilson,
Kyros	Roberts	Charles, Tex.
Lagomarsino	Robinson, Va.	Winn
Landgrebe	Robison, N.Y.	Wolff
Latta	Rodino	Wright
Lehman	Roe	Wyatt
Lent	Rogers	Wydler
Long, La.	Roncallo, Wyo.	Wyllie
Long, Md.	Roncallo, N.Y.	Yates
Lott	Rooney, Pa.	Yatron
Lujan	Rose	Young, Fla.
Luken	Rosenthal	Young, Ga.
McClory	Rostenkowski	Young, Ill.
McCloskey	Roush	Young, S.C.
McCollister	Rousselot	Young, Tex.
McCormack	Roy	Zablocki
McDade	Roybal	Zion

NAYS—3

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

NOT VOTING—51

Crane	Gross	Symms
	Stanton,	
	James V.	
Addabbo	Burton, John	Green, Oreg.
Aspin	Carey, N.Y.	Griffiths
Badillo	Corman	Gunter
Baker	Davis, Ga.	Hanna
Biaggi	Donohue	Hansen, Wash.
Biatnik	Evans, Colo.	Harrington
Brasco	Frey	Hebert
Breaux	Gray	Helstoski

Landrum	Patman	Steele
Leggett	Podell	Stephens
Litton	Powell, Ohio	Stuckey
McSpadden	Quillen	Traxler
Macdonald	Randall	Van Deerlin
Martin, Nebr.	Rarick	Wiggins
Nedzi	Reid	Wyman
Nelsen	Rooney, N.Y.	Young, Alaska
O'Hara	Skubitz	Zwach

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Aspin.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Gunter.
 Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Powell of Ohio.
 Mr. Donohue with Mr. Baker.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Blatnik.
 Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Harrington.
 Mr. Breaux with Mr. Leggett.
 Mr. John L. Burton with Mr. Litton.
 Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Davis of Georgia.
 Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Frey.
 Mr. Nedzi with Mr. McSpadden.
 Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Gray.
 Mr. Podell with Mr. Skubitz.
 Mr. Reid with Mr. Traxler.
 Mr. Stephens with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
 Mr. Van Deerlin with Mrs. Griffiths.
 Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
 Mr. Hanna with Mr. Nelsen.
 Mr. Corman with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
 Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Quillen.
 Mr. Badillo with Mr. Zwach.
 Mr. Rarick with Mr. Wiggins.
 Mr. Randall with Mr. Steele.
 Mr. Patman with Mr. Wyman.
 Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Young of Alaska.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: On page 2, line 13, insert: "Provided, That none of these administrative funds may be used for the administration of the section 23 leasing program, or any replacement program, unless the available, unused balance of contract authority under the section 235 and section 236 programs, or any replacement programs, is made available for commitment, and committed, concurrent with the commitment of any contract authority under the section 23 program, or any replacement program, in amounts proportionate to the amounts committed under said section 23 program, or any replacement program."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOLAND moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "Provided, That none of these administrative funds may be used for the administration of the section 23 leasing program, or any replacement program, unless the available, unused balance of contract authority under the section 236 program, or any replacement program, is made available for commitment concurrent with the making available for commitment of any contract authority under the section 23 program, or any replacement program."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: On page 4, line 2, insert: "of which not less than \$500,000,000 shall be used only for the payment of operating subsidies to local housing authorities."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOLAND moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "of which not less than \$450,000,000 shall be used only for the payment of operating subsidies to local housing authorities."

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. RUTH. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, the House bill contained a report including \$430 million for operating subsidies for housing. Not only did the Senate insist on \$500 million for operating subsidies, but \$450 million as an amount that must be spent. As I stated earlier, the function of the Committee on Appropriations is to appropriate funds.

To me, the function of the Appropriations Committee is to appropriate funds, not to insist on expenditures. I object strongly, both in principle and in reality.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I share the gentleman's concern with respect to this particular amendment. As the gentleman from North Carolina has indicated, this is an earmarking for operating subsidies which is included in the housing payment appropriation of \$2,300,000,000.

As the gentleman so correctly states, it is not good policy to establish a floor because it does force a department—it could force the department to over-allocate more funds than necessary at particular time. Under the budgets of the local housing authorities, payments are made at various times during the fiscal year, and if there are substantial funds left in the housing payment account just before the end of the fiscal year, then the department could be forced to spend money; and it could very well overallocate.

As the gentleman recognizes, he raised this question, as all of us did, in the conference. The gentleman from Florida raised the same question. As the gentleman recognizes, we had a considerable discussion about it but the Senate did not yield.

Mr. RUTH. If I could mention this at this time, I have a great deal of respect for the chairman, and I think the conference was conducted in a very fine manner. What does the Chairman think of this as a policy for appropriations?

Mr. BOLAND. Insofar as the Chairman's opinion of it is concerned, I share the concern of the gentleman from North Carolina. I have my own objections to a "floor" for a particular program.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I share the same concern the gentleman from North Carolina has and the chairman of the committee. I think we are setting a very dangerous precedent in specifying a floor on this kind of spending.

I hope that somehow we can get away from it. And whether there is a way we are able to defeat this or not, I hope we can get away from it.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Florida for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I certainly concur with them.

I think it is bad legislative policy. It not only happened with NASA, but also with the National Science Foundation, which has three floors in the Foundation budget which are just as objectionable from a legislative, procedural and parliamentary point of view, and there are others in the authorizing legislation which create a confusing situation for the Congress, at least.

I want to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of our committee, for working out the compromise. We either accepted these or we would have had no conference report in a timely fashion; it is that simple. I think we did the right thing at this time.

Mr. BOLAND. I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: On page 14, line 22, insert the following:

GENERAL PROVISION

Not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the appropriations made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act for "Research and development" and "Research and program management" may be transferred to either of the other mentioned appropriation, but not to exceed the amount authorized therefor by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1975 (Public Law 93-316).

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOLAND moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike out "one-half" in the second line of said amendment and insert: "one-quarter".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 29: On page 15, line 16, insert: "not to exceed \$5,000 for official reception and representation expenses;"

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOLAND moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.
The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:
Senate amendment No. 32: On page 15, line 23, insert: to remain available until expended:

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOLAND moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "to remain available until June 30, 1976".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment number 44: On page 17, line 15, insert: "not to exceed \$1,200,000 for travel expenses and,"

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOLAND moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 47: Page 19, line 1, insert:

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, national service life insurance, servicemen's indemnities, service-disabled veterans insurance, and soldiers' and sailors' civil relief, \$8,750,000, to remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOLAND moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 51: Page 21, line 13, insert: "not to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses;"

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOLAND moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 58: Page 28, line 22, insert: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$1,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses:"

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOLAND moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 59: Page 29, line 6, insert: "Provided further, That the dollar limitation of section 18(c) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act is further increased by the cumulative assessments and interest-bearing or other advances for purposes thereof, which shall include related commercial facilities, hereby authorized to be required by the Board as nonadministrative expenditures of agencies under administration or supervision of the Board or of a body composed of its members, all of which are hereby included in the references therein to agencies under the Board's supervision, and the Board is hereby authorized to adjust as it deems equitable the interest on advances now or hereafter outstanding thereunder or hereunder:"

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOLAND moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to, and to include tables, charts, and other extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

CONCERNING SUBPENAS ISSUED IN UNITED STATES VERSUS JOHN N. MITCHELL, ET AL.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I again call up House Resolution 1341, which was at the desk and which was earlier reported, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The resolution follows:

H. RES. 1341

Whereas in the case of United States of America against John N. Mitchell et al. (Criminal Case No. 74-110), pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, subpoenas duces tecum were issued by the said court and addressed to Representative Peter W. Rodino, United States House of Representatives, and to John Doar, Chief Counsel, House Judicial Subcommittee on Impeachment, House of Representatives, directing them to appear as witnesses before said court at 10:00 a.m. meridian on the 9th day of September, 1974, and to bring with them certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives. Therefore, be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of

justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That the House of Representatives under Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution has the sole power of impeachment and has the sole power to investigate and gather evidence to determine whether the House of Representatives shall exercise its constitutional power of impeachment; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in a court of justice, or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such action thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpoenas duces tecum, when the said court, through any of its officers or agents, have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of all memoranda and notes, and the files of the Committee on the Judiciary, of interviews with those persons who subsequently appeared as witnesses in the proceedings before the full Committee pursuant to House Resolution 803, such limited access in this instance not being an interference with the Constitutional impeachment power of the House, and the Clerk of the House is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents and papers in possession or control of the House of Representatives that the court has found to be material and relevant (except that under no circumstances shall any minutes or transcripts of executive sessions, or any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto, be disclosed or copied) and which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as however, the possession of said papers, documents, and records by the House of Representatives shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under any Members, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoenas aforementioned.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I see no reason why the House ought not support this resolution. It calls for a rather narrow compliance, with a subpoena served upon Chairman Rodino by Mr. Haldeman's counsel. As I understand it, the House, by this resolution, would authorize counsel for Mr. Haldeman to take copies of the staff interview notes regarding the nine witnesses who appeared as live witnesses before the impeachment inquiry to the extent that the court finds such notes to be material and relevant to its proceedings.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot quite understand the particular value of those notes. Certainly they are not very good evidence. They were made by staff personnel following the interviews, summarizing the interviews, and so far as I know, no person interviewed ever agreed to the substance of the statements in the staff memoranda.

Mr. Speaker, the entire record of the impeachment inquiry proceedings has been printed and made available to the public. Now, I would be concerned if I thought this was the first of a horde of subpoenas that are going to be served upon the committee asking for all manner of information in connection with the impeachment inquiry. However, I cannot conceive that that will be the case since, as I say, the inquiry is a matter of public record and what has been subpoenaed in this instance really does not constitute the best evidence in a judicial proceeding.

I do not think that we will be violating the precedents of the House or, with that understanding, opening ourselves up to an undue request for information by litigants in courts.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would merely like to state that this matter has now been very seriously considered by counsel of the Committee on the Judiciary, by those who conducted the impeachment inquiry, and by members of the committee itself, both on the majority and minority side.

After this very, very deliberate consultation, we decided that it would be appropriate to provide this very limited access to those materials which are being subpoenaed. However, it is only being done with the understanding, as is provided in the resolution, that in this case it in no way violates or intrudes upon the sole power of impeachment by the House of Representatives. The resolution gives this access only in this narrow case. And it will only be done after the court determines materiality and relevance.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore can repeat what I stated earlier: it is the wish of the persons named in the subpoenas to accommodate by granting the limited access explicitly authorized by the terms of this resolution.

After consulting with counsel on both sides of the aisle it was agreed that this limited availability would be appropriate. However, the House by this resolution makes very clear that it has the sole power of impeachment and the sole power to gather evidence in an impeachment inquiry. Only because this narrow access, by the very terms of the resolution, does not interfere with the House's constitutional power am I in support of its passage.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report on H.R. 13999, National Science Foundation Authorization Act, 1975.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 13999, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1975

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 13999) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement. (For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 1974.)

Mr. TEAGUE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be considered as read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, following is a brief but complete summary of the legislative history of H.R. 13999.

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF H.R. 13999 ACTIONS BY 93rd CONGRESS Passed House April 25 (2-8). Passed Senate amended May 16 (voice vote). Conference reported, August 19. Senate agreed to Conference report, August 19 (voice vote).

SUMMARY OF CONFERENCE REPORT The Conference would authorize funding as follows:

Table with 5 columns: Conference, House, Senate, Administration, and compared with. Rows include Support of research and administrative operations, Excess foreign currencies, and Total.

The Conference proposes authorization for major items as follows: (1) Scientific Research Project Support, \$358.7 million; (2) National and Special Research Program, \$91.9 million; (3) National Research Centers, \$52.5 million; (4) Science Information Activities, \$6.3 million; (5) International Cooperative Activities, \$8.0 million; (6) Research Applied to National Needs, \$148.9 million; (7) Intergovernmental Science Programs, \$2.0 million; (8) Institutional Improvement for Science, \$12.0 million; (9) Graduate Student Support, \$15.0 million; (10) Science Education Improvement, \$70.0 million; (11) Planning and Policy Studies, \$2.7 million; (12) Program Development and Management, \$39.5 million.

The major differences between the House and Senate involved the following two

categories. The first category, Science Research Project Support: the House approved \$354.0 million and the Senate, \$363.7 million; the conference agreed on the figure of \$358.7 million which is \$5.0 million less than requested by the Administration. The sixth category, Research Applied to National Needs: the House approved \$139.1 million and the Senate, \$130.7 million; conferees agreed on the figure requested by the Administration, \$137.9 million.

A number of minima were placed under certain programs in order to insure that funds not be taken from these programs for support of other research. The minima are specified in Section 2 of the Conference Report and are explained in detail in the Statement of Managers on page 5 of the Conference Report. In all there are 10 minima of major proportion except the floor of \$70.0 million placed under category 10, Science Education Improvement.

With regard to non-funding differences between the House and Senate versions, the conferees agreed to remove the so-called "student unrest provision" from the House version on the grounds that this same effect is achieved in the Appropriations Act by similar language directed to persons receiving NSF grants who caused disruption or damage to their institutions. Conferees also agreed to remove a provision in the House bill prohibiting any fetal research with funds authorized on the grounds that this provision became unnecessary due to the provision of the "Protection of Human Subjects Act" (P.L. 93-348), and has always been moot as far as NSF is concerned since it has never supported such research and does not do so now. Finally, the conferees agreed to strike language contained in both versions of the bill with regard to coordination of solar energy research. The conferees prescribed the essence of both versions in the Statement of Managers, which requires a special coordination in this important area between the Foundation, NASA, and other appropriate agencies.

H. Report 93-995. S. Report 93-848. Conference Report 93-1302.

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

Mr. TEAGUE. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I must ask if there are any amendments placed in the bill in conference, and, if so, were they germane? Are they germane to the bill?

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, there are no amendments which are not germane to the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the statement of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE).

We on the minority side of the Science Committee urge approval of this conference report on the National Science Foundation—NSF—Authorization Act for fiscal year 1975, which approves an expenditure of \$807.5 million plus \$5 million in excess foreign currencies. In arriving at this figure the conferees virtually split the difference between the House and Senate bills. The current amount is \$24.3 million more than authorized by the House and \$22.3 million less than authorized by the Senate.

The compromise reached by the conferees reflects their judgment regarding the proper emphasis in NSF's programs. The NSF supports a great variety of pro-

August 16, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 15161

the old "surpluses" with which the United States used to feed millions of the world's hungry people is gone; our national generosity of spirit is in corresponding scarcity. In specific political terms, the competition for scarce food-aid resources has become severe. For instance, Egypt got almost nothing in Food for Peace commodities last year. But this year it has taken literally Mr. Nixon's Cairo pledge to give its food requests "special priority attention" and it is asking for commodities whose value is greater than the total which the United States expects to spend on Food for Peace for all countries put together. That would leave—in a word—nothing for Bangladesh.

Certainly people are hungry in both countries. But the strictly humanitarian reasons for offering food free or cheap to Bangladesh are being weighed within the United States Government against the additional political reasons for sending food to Egypt. Other countries have their legitimate claims, too. A balance will have to be struck. Though it is unfair to blame it all on the United States, the new administration's decision will probably leave the governments of both Egypt and Bangladesh dissatisfied, many people in Egypt hungry, and many people in Bangladesh dead.

[From the Washington Star-News,
Aug. 13, 1974]

BENGALI TRAGEDY

Bangladesh in the best of times lives on the edge of disaster. The country founded in the 1971 breakaway of East Pakistan has a densely concentrated population of 75 million, growing by about 2 million a year. Food shortages are chronic and growing, foreign earnings have declined with lessening demand for the country's jute and tea and industrial production has never returned to pre-secession levels, remaining 40 percent below capacity for lack of spare parts and raw materials. Henry Kissinger's description of the fledgling nation as an "international basket case" has been borne out by its first two and a half years of independence.

The Bengali people's regular quota of hardship is increased periodically by natural and man-made calamities. A typhoon and tidal wave from the Bay of Bengal in 1970 took a staggering 200,000 lives. The fight with the Pakistani government over secession, ended by the Indian-Pakistani war of December 1971, created millions of refugees and caused incalculable destruction and social upheaval.

Now Bangladesh is in the midst of another crisis of almost unbelievable proportions—monsoon-caused floods that the government calls "the worst in memory." Deaths this time have been estimated in the hundreds rather than the hundreds of thousands, but other measurements of the disaster are on a typically Bangladesh scale. Twenty million people are homeless and 2 million isolated by flood waters, half the agricultural land has been inundated and losses are put at \$600 million. Without drinking water, people are starting to die of cholera.

Bangladesh has received large amounts of foreign aid, including that from the United States, in the struggle to become economically viable. Dacca now has appealed to the international community for additional infusions of governmental and private relief to provide shelter, food and medicine for refugees and to start another difficult recovery task. An immediate and generous response should be forthcoming.

ENERGY TRANSPORTATION SECURITY AND CONSUMER SPOKESMEN'S CREDIBILITY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, next week the Senate will be considering H.R. 8193, the Energy Transportation Secu-

rity Act of 1974. I was a sponsor of the S. 2089, which is identical to H.R. 8193, as it was introduced in the House of Representatives. My colleague Senator JACKSON and the Senators from Maryland, J. GLENN BEALL and CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS joined as cosponsors of S. 2089.

The principal opponents of this legislation, the multinational oil companies, have charged that enactment of this legislation would be harmful to American consumers. I must say that this group along with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce which is waging a strong campaign against this legislation is a curious one to be speaking for the consumer while at the same time both are fighting against S. 707, the bill to establish an independent Consumer Protection Agency.

What makes their professed advocacy on behalf of the consumer by opposing H.R. 8193 even more puzzling is the fact that the Consumer Federation of America has written to Senator LONG, the chairman of the Commerce Committee's Merchant Marine Subcommittee endorsing H.R. 8193.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Carol Tucker Foreman, executive director of the Consumer Federation of America to Senator LONG be printed in the RECORD.

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

Washington, D.C., Aug. 13, 1974.

Honorable RUSSELL B. LONG,
U.S. Senator
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LONG: I am writing to you in regard to H.R. 8193, the Energy Transportation Security Act of 1974.

Consumer Federation of America is composed of 185 local, state and national consumer and consumer-related organizations, including citizen action consumer organizations, credit union leagues, rural electric cooperatives, labor and farm organizations. The total constituency of our member groups is 30 million Americans.

At the July 1973 annual meeting of Consumer Federation of America, our membership adopted a resolution calling for "a new national policy on fuels and energy . . . to insure an adequate energy supply at reasonable prices, which also insures effective protection of the environment." It appears that H.R. 8193 would make a valid contribution to such a policy.

First, H.R. 8193 will contribute to an adequate supply of fuel at reasonable prices. The experience of the past year has shown that when we are totally dependent upon other nations for vital materials and services, we may suffer the effects of unjustifiably high prices set upon their goods and services. The oil producing nations, by their 1973-74 embargo and subsequent price increase have subjected our economy to severe dislocations. Now producers of other vital materials such as bauxite are threatening similar action. There is no reason to believe that the nations under which oil tankers are registered might not impose a similar embargo on the use of their ships in order to raise transportation prices to outrageous levels.

Therefore, the potential long term benefits of the legislation appear to justify its passage. There have been charges that the short run effect of this legislation would be to increase prices to consumers. The Committee has acted to prevent oil shipped in American flag vessels from costing the consumer more in the short run. The avoidance of increased cost to the consumer is achieved by allowing

a waiver of \$0.15 per barrel of the oil import fee when crude oil is carried on U.S. flag vessels providing that the cost savings are passed on to the ultimate consumer. The cost to the U.S. Government of this waiver should be recovered in higher taxes paid by U.S. oil companies as a result of inability to continue the transfer pricing that has allowed them to shift profits to foreign controlled companies that pay no U.S. tax.

However, Consumer Federation of America would find this legislation much more appealing if the Congress would act simultaneously to require a Federal Trade Commission investigation of the structure, conduct and performance of the petroleum tanker industry. The anti-competitive aspects of this industry because of its control by major oil companies demand remedial action.

Second, Consumer Federation of America finds that the environmental protection aspects of this legislation are consistent with our policy statement. We strongly support the provisions of this legislation requiring that all U.S. flag tankers contracted for construction after December 31, 1974 or delivered after December 31, 1978 be constructed and operated using the best available pollution prevention system including a segregated ballast double bottom system.

Sincerely,

CAROL TUCKER FOREMAN,
Executive Director.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I urge all Senators to review this endorsement by the Federation which is composed of consumer organizations, large and small, from all over the United States and consider its record on behalf of America's consumers against that of the major oil companies and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

RECESS FOR 15 MINUTES

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 15 minutes.

There being no objection, at 11 a.m., the Senate took a recess for 15 minutes; whereupon, at 11:15 a.m., the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ALLEN).

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1975

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of H.R. 15572, which the clerk will state by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 15572) making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for space, science, veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the

pending measure was before the Senate 11 days ago, having been reported previously by the committee on August 1, 1974. At that time, we had a lengthy debate on the measure. We discussed many aspects of it. We had, of course, a full committee report, the bill was available, the full hearings were available, which they still are. The Senate finally took action, recommitting the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions that the committee should consider all the amendments that were pending to the bill.

When the recommitment motion was considered by the Senate, I offered an amendment at that time to instruct the committee to make reductions of at least \$300 million in the bill. My amendment was defeated by a vote of 49 to 27 and the recommitment vote that followed was almost unanimous.

Mr. President, while the committee was unable to reduce the pending measure by \$300 million, I am pleased with the action the committee has taken.

We took that action on the basis of a recommendation made by the chairman of the committee, Senator McCLELLAN, and developed a compromise which none of us, of course, as with all compromises, was completely happy with. But I think it was fair, and certainly balanced.

The committee has recommended new budget—obligational—authority of \$21,210,718,420, which is \$226,094,580 below the budget estimate considered by the committee, and \$364,386,420 above the sum recommended in the House bill. But, Mr. President, I hasten to point out that the committee considered estimates totalling \$618,962,000 which were not considered by the House. Consequently, the sum recommended by the committee is actually \$254,575,580 less than the House allowance, when you compare the similar requests before the House and the Senate.

The reduction below the budget estimates represents a cut of a little more than 1 percent in the overall budget and a reduction of a little better than 2.7 percent in the controllable items included in the budget.

I am disappointed that we could not have made a greater reduction in the overall budget. We have to recognize that two-thirds of this budget is the Veterans' Administration—veterans' pensions, veterans' benefits, veterans' health care—that all of us recognize we simply cannot reduce.

It would be wrong to cut it, it would be a violation of contract authority. It would be improper, and I think nobody in the Senate would want to reduce a veteran's pension or the benefits that a veteran needs to continue his education. If we do it, we should do it by legislation, not by appropriation action.

The committee action is a result of compromise. There were those members who wanted to cut less than is recommended. There were others who felt that the reduction should be greater. But as I previously indicated, I am satisfied with the committee compromise, even though I did not get the total reduction I sought.

Mr. President, more than 65 percent of

the sum recommended by the committee of new budget—obligational—authority is for the Veterans' Administration aggregating \$13,992,126,000. Of this sum \$7,283,000,000 or more than 50 percent is for compensation and pensions for veterans, their widows and their survivors.

For readjustment benefits for veterans, \$2,676,000,000 is recommended and for the medical care of our Nation's veterans, \$3,187,644,000 is included in the bill.

Title I of the bill, which includes items for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the committee is recommending \$3,015,138,430. This sum is \$80,585,570 less than the amount appropriated last year, it is \$151,814,570 less than the estimate and finally, it is \$195,283,570 below the sum recommended by the House.

For the space programs, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,206,735,300, which is \$171,728,300 more than the sum appropriated last year and is \$35,958,700 less than the estimate, but, it is \$3,685,300 more than the sum recommended by the House.

For the National Science Foundation, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$659,600,000, which is \$111,940,000, or almost 20 percent greater than the sum appropriated last year. However, the committee recommendation is below the budget estimate by \$26,800,000 and below the House amount by \$12,200,000.

Why is the figure over last year's by such a large amount? That is, of course, because there is a great deal of indirect energy research money in this bill, and we all recognize that that is essential if we are to develop the kind of independence in the energy area which we all so much want.

Mr. President, the committee has concurred with the House and has recommended an increase above the budget for both the Federal Communications Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission, in order to insure that these very important watchdogs of the public welfare will be able to meet more effectively their demanding and expanding work loads.

I might point out that in both cases, both of these commissions raise almost as much money as their budgets, so they really do not cost the general taxpayer any significant amount.

For the Selective Service System, the pending measure contains \$37,345,000, which is \$9,818,000 below the estimate and \$9,118,000 below the House allowance.

In addition to the money items contained in the bill, the committee has included amongst the general provision, a new section 406, which places a limitation on the use of vehicles.

The committee has also concurred with the House and included language incorporating a flat 10-percent reduction from the sum requested by the Department and agencies for the payment of space rental levied by the General Services Administration.

Mr. President, that concludes my remarks on the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be

agreed to en bloc, and that the bill, as thus amended, be regarded, for purposes of amendment, as original text; provided, that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, in line 2, strike out "\$14,940,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$12,125,000: *Provided*, That none of these administrative funds may be used for the administration of the section 23 leasing program, or any replacement program, unless the available, unused balance of contract authority under the section 235 and section 236 programs, or any replacement programs, is made available for commitment, and committed, concurrent with the commitment of any contract authority under the section 23 program, or any replacement program, in amounts proportionate to the amounts committed under said section 23 program, or any replacement program."

On page 3, in line 21, strike out "\$2,425,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$2,300,000,000, of which not less than \$500,000,000 shall be used only for the payment of operating subsidies to local housing authorities."

On page 4, in line 4, strike out "\$23,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$21,825,000".

On page 4, in line 16, strike out "\$200,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$194,000,000".

On page 5, in line 6, strike out "\$125,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$121,250,000".

On page 5, beginning in line 7, strike out the semicolon and the following language: of which \$1,000,000 shall be available only for rehabilitation and redevelopment of the DeKalb County, Tennessee, model cities area devastated by recent tornado damage.

"REHABILITATION LOAN FUND"

"For the revolving fund established pursuant to section 312 of the Housing Act of 1964, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1452b), \$70,000,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 5, in line 18, strike out "\$100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$106,700,000".

On page 5, in line 24, strike out "\$89,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$87,830,000".

On page 6, in line 15, strike out "\$80,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$87,900,000".

On page 6, in line 21, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$8,130,400".

On page 7, in line 3, strike out "\$19,900,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$11,543,000".

On page 7, in line 10, strike out "\$5,580,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,412,600".

On page 7, in line 13, strike out "\$3,530,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,424,100".

On page 7, in line 16, strike out "\$6,830,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,825,100".

On page 7, in line 20, strike out "\$19,513,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$18,927,610".

On page 7, in line 24, strike out "\$29,446,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$28,562,620".

On page 9, in line 2, strike out "\$4,512,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,376,640".

On page 9, in line 23, strike out "\$265,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$257,050".

On page 11, in line 5, strike out "\$2,327,380,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,326,580,000".

On page 11, in line 11, strike out "\$135,670,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$140,155,300".

On page 12, in line 9, strike out "\$75,080,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$79,020,000".

On page 12, in line 23, after the word "Center" insert a comma and the following:

"(I) \$3,940,000 for construction of an Orbiter Horizontal Flight Test Facility, Flight Research Center".

August 16, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

On page 13, in line 3, strike out the word "and".

On page 13, line 4, after the word "for;" insert the following: "and (19) \$4,880,000 for an addition to the Systems Development Laboratory (SDL) at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL);"

On page 14, in line 22, after the word "vehicles;" insert the words "not to exceed \$5,000 for official reception and representation expenses;"

On page 14, in line 24, strike out "\$35,900,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$38,500,000".

On page 15, in line 4, strike out "\$666,800,000," and insert in lieu thereof "\$654,750,000 to remain available until expended".

On page 15, in line 6, strike out the word "less" and insert in lieu thereof the word "more".

On page 15, in line 6, strike out "\$13,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$12,700,000".

On page 15, in line 6, strike out the word "only".

On page 15, in line 7, strike out the word "less" and insert in lieu thereof the word "more".

On page 15, in line 7, strike out "\$68,900,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$61,400,000".

On page 15, in line 8, strike out the word "only".

On page 15, in line 9, strike out the word "less" and insert in lieu thereof the word "more".

On page 15, in line 9, strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,000,000".

On page 15, in line 10, strike out the word "only".

On page 15, in line 11, strike out "\$40,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000,000".

On page 16, in line 6, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,850,000".

On page 16, in line 19, after the word "and" insert the words "not to exceed \$1,200,000 for travel expenses and."

On page 17, in line 5, strike out "\$46,463,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$37,345,000".

On page 17, in line 23, strike out "\$6,716,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,283,000,000".

On page 19, in line 2, strike out "\$3,190,044,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,187,644,000".

On page 19, in line 16, strike out "\$86,770,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$89,000,000".

On page 19, beginning at line 17, strike out the following language:

"ASSISTANCE FOR HEALTH MANPOWER TRAINING INSTITUTIONS

"For pilot programs for assistance in the establishment of new State medical schools, grants to affiliated medical schools, assistance to public and nonprofit institutions of higher learning, hospitals and other health manpower institutions affiliated with the Veterans Administration to increase the production of professional and other health personnel, and for expansion of Veterans Administration hospital education and training capacity as authorized by 38 U.S.C. Chapter 82, \$30,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1981."

On page 20, in line 16, after the word "law;" insert the words "not to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses;"

On page 20, in line 22, strike out "\$388,130,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$428,842,000".

On page 21, in line 5, strike out "\$230,850,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$223,924,500".

On page 21, in line 18, strike out "\$45,150,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$43,795,500".

On page 22, in line 1, strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$9,700,000".

On page 22, in line 6, strike out "\$2,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,037,000".

On page 23, in line 12, strike out "\$100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$97,000".

On page 28, in line 1, after the word "expenses;" insert the following: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$1,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses;"

On page 28, in line 9, after "(12 U.S.C. 1421-1449):" insert the following new language: "Provided further, That the dollar limitation of section 18(c) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act is further increased by the cumulative assessments and interest-bearing or other advances for purposes thereof, which shall include related commercial facilities, hereby authorized to be required by the Board as nonadministrative expenditures of agencies under administration or supervision of the Board or of a body composed of its members, all of which are hereby included in the references therein to agencies under the Board's supervision, and the Board is hereby authorized to adjust as it deems equitable the interest on advances now or hereafter outstanding thereunder or hereunder:"

On page 31, beginning at line 22, insert the following new language:

"Sec. 406. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency may be expended for the transportation of any officer or employee of such department or agency between his domicile and his place of employment in violation of section 5(c) (2) of the Act of July 16, 1914, as amended (31 U.S.C. 638a)."

On page 32, line 3, strike out "406." and insert in lieu thereof "407".

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, the chairman of the committee, has demonstrated his usual efficiency and attention to business by having brought this bill back to the floor so promptly, and I can testify to the energy with which he attacked the problems that were presented after the bill was recommitted, and his insistence on very prompt committee attention to the questions that were raised in the previous debate.

I think it is only fair for me to say, however, that we have it back before us so promptly that we have beaten the printer, and the committee report is not upon Senators' desks. I have been requested by some Senators on our side to say that I do not believe we can bring this bill to a resolution until the committee report is in fact on the desks of Members of the Senate, in accordance with the usual practice.

Of course, the chairman, the manager of the bill, as well as myself, have become rather familiar with these figures by having lived with them so long, and I think there is no reason whatever why we should not make a record at this time on some of the points. But proceeding without the reports available to the general membership, who have not had that opportunity, does present some problems.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield on that point, I appreciate that, and I think that may be the right course.

I call attention, however, to the fact that we did have considerable debate on this bill before, and the committee report, which covered 98 percent of the bill in its present form, was available. We also had the bill available before. We are confronted, of course, with an unusual situation; but if any Senator wishes to have the bill delayed, that is certainly

his right and privilege, and I would respect it.

Mr. MATHIAS. I thank the Senator. As I say, I have no personal problem with this matter, as the Senator from Wisconsin does not, because we have had ample opportunity to discuss all of these figures and become familiar with the programs that will be funded by them. But I can also understand the reluctance of other Senators who may be called upon to vote on rollcalls on this question, on programs which will have an effect on the entire Nation, as well as, perhaps, a particular effect on their States. Therefore, I have simply put the Senate on notice that that situation does exist.

I think every one of us has got to be personally aware of what inflation does to this country. I know that I had occasion to go to the grocery store the other night and watch money just melt away. The money that used to buy a whole bagful of groceries barely filled up the bottom of the bag during the current week. So inflation is not some theory, some economist's term; it is a very real, personal problem that every one of us shares.

The floor manager, I think, has laid down in very explicit terms the kind of governmental restraint that will be necessary to deal with the problem of inflation. Again, what we do here cannot be just a theory. It has to be a fact. We cannot just talk about what we are going to do about inflation; we have to actually do some things.

I think this bill does represent a determined effort on the part of the Appropriations Committee to do some very real things. I offered some amendments to the bill in committee which proposed some cuts. They were not necessarily in the same dollar amounts as those which had been proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin or those that were ultimately suggested by the distinguished chairman of the full committee (Mr. McCLELLAN).

I must say that I think, as we make these cuts, we have to understand exactly what we are doing, that sometimes we can be penny-wise and pound-foolish, and that investments which may look to ultimate economies—economies in energy, for example, through the development of research programs in the National Science Foundation and in NASA—I think that that kind of reduction, if carried too far, can be inflationary, because it is depriving us of the greater productivity which might flow from those programs.

So there are value judgments to be made as we pursue our course in trying to bring inflation under control. Is a cut here going to reduce the amount of currency which is spiraling around and heating up the economy, or is a cut there going to actually reduce our future productivity and, therefore, be in fact inflationary instead of deflationary? That has been my concern. And I feel that some of the individual cuts that we have made perhaps fall in the latter category—that in NASA, in the National Science Foundation and, indeed, in some of the programs under HUD, we are perhaps approaching the point or even passing the point where, instead of being economy minded and fighting inflation,

S 15164

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 16, 1974

we may be actually encouraging inflation because we are decreasing productivity.

However, I think in the overall picture we are reaching a figure which, however I may disagree on individual items, is one which is a desirable target to shoot at. So I am supporting this bill, and I am urging other Members of the Senate to support the bill.

I think that there needs to be some technical ability to transfer funds, which is traditional in this area, and I am happy to yield the floor at this time for the introduction of such amendment.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to H.R. 15572 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 14, after line 11, insert the following paragraph:

"GENERAL PROVISION"

"Not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the appropriations made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act for 'Research and development' and 'Research and program management' may be transferred to either of the other mentioned appropriation, but not to exceed the amount authorized therefor by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1975 (Public Law 93-316)."

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, this amendment is really a small and almost, what one would call, a technical amendment; but it does have the purpose of giving NASA a degree of flexibility in meeting the cut that has now been imposed on its fiscal year 1975 budget.

This amendment would not add any funds to the bill.

The amendment will provide NASA with flexibility to make limited transfers of funds between two appropriation categories in order to accommodate the most critical needs of a balance program.

The transfer would be limited to one-half of 1 percent of the total budget appropriation. Consequently, that is a very minimal amount.

The NASA budget request was cut by \$35,958,700 in the Appropriations Committee action yesterday. That is, this bill is nearly \$36 million below the amount that had been approved the first time the committee reported and before the bill was recommitted.

This is a substantial reduction when viewed against the continuing reductions that this agency has faced over the past few years. We all recognize that NASA has been declining in personnel and in funding steadily for the last 4 or 5 years and now is far, far reduced.

Therefore, Mr. President, this amendment is designed to provide the flexibility to organize and implement the best possible program for fiscal 1975 within the amount of funds being provided in this bill.

I might say, Mr. President, it is a painful thing to absorb a cut of this amount and, sitting as an ex-officio member with the committee yesterday, I voted against a cut this deep, but the cut prevailed

and, therefore, NASA will be shorn of nearly \$36 million which it vitally needs.

I think the Congress should grant this authority which will enable the agency to transfer between the Rand D and the Rand PM appropriation categories one-half of 1 percent of the amount of moneys that are appropriated. Providing this flexibility will enable NASA to deal with this cut with the least damage possible to the overall program of the agency.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. First, I want to commend the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS). I do not know anybody who has been more diligent in working with an agency or with a subcommittee or with a committee than the Senator from Utah, the chairman of the Space Committee.

We have had this Space Committee in existence for a number of years. There have been several chairmen, but Senator MOSS is certainly, by far, the hardest working, the best informed, and the most vigorous in representing the interests as well as the criticisms of the agency.

I would like to make sure I understand this amendment. As I understand it, it would provide about \$11.5 million that could be transferred from research and development to research and program management, and the reason for this, one reason for it is because there is an additional \$6.5 million of obligations in effect that research and program management has to cope with above the original budget, and if this transfer authority is not provided, it would be very difficult or impossible to meet those obligations; is that right?

Mr. MOSS. That is correct.

Besides being limited to this one-half of 1 percent, which is approximately the amount that the Senator says, the amendment also provides that the amount transferred into the other program may not exceed the authorized amount. In other words, there will be no place where there would be any breach of the authorization of moneys, and this would simply allow it to be moved between programs because of the need, as the Senator says, because of commitments and the need for flexibility.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Well, I think this is necessary.

Frankly, I feel—and I suspect the Senator from Utah may, too, feel—that we should be very careful in permitting too much flexibility in transferring or the whole purpose and responsibility of Congress can be frustrated. We can make an appropriation in one area and, if the executive branch wants to spend it in another, we are just spinning our wheels. We are not exercising the kind of authority and responsibility we should exercise.

But this is very limited. It is only limited to one-half of 1 percent. It is for an express purpose because these additional obligations have come along and, I think, because the Senator from Utah has explained it so carefully, I think I can certainly support this one, although I think, as the Senator might agree, we

should be very careful in making any kind of a precedent.

Mr. MOSS. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that the budgetary purpose is to determine where the moneys are to be spent, and I do not favor opening that up to the executive to override the judgment of Congress. In this instance, with the cut coming, with the obligations that exist and, as the Senator points out, with the very limited authority of one-half of 1 percent, I think it is the sensible thing to do. I am pleased that the Senator feels it is an acceptable amendment.

I would like to report also, Mr. President, that the following Senators join in this amendment: Senators SPARKMAN, ALLEN, CURTIS, GOLDWATER, and BEALL, all of whom would like to be shown as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MATHIAS. I fully support the amendment. In fact, if the distinguished Senator had not offered it, I would, but I am happy to support it on his motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 1 p.m. today.

There being no objection, at 11:46 a.m., the Senate recessed until 1 p.m., whereupon, the Senate reassembled at 1 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HUDDLESTON).

ORDER FOR FILING CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 821

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to file the conference report on S. 821 at any time prior to midnight tonight.

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

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

August 16, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 15165

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES, APPROPRIATIONS, 1975

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15572) making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for space, science, veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. 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. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 can call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. CLARK), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK) and the Senator from

Iowa (Mr. CLARK) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. BEALL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. MCCLURE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMINICK), and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 365 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Abourezk	Hruska	Percy
Alken	Huddleston	Proxmire
Allen	Hughes	Randolph
Bartlett	Humphrey	Roth
Brock	Jackson	Schweiker
Byrd	Javits	Scott, Hugh
Harry F., Jr.	Kennedy	Scott,
Byrd, Robert C.	Magnuson	William L.
Case	Mathias	Sparkman
Church	McClellan	Stafford
Curtis	McGovern	Stennis
Dole	McIntyre	Stevens
Eagleton	Metcalf	Stevenson
Fannin	Metzenbaum	Symington
Fong	Mondale	Talmadge
Griffin	Moss	Tower
Gurney	Nelson	Tunney
Hansen	Nunn	Weicker
Haskell	Packwood	Williams
Hatfield	Pastore	Young
Helms	Pell	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—40

Baker	Cook	Inoue
Bayh	Cotton	Johnston
Beall	Cranston	Long
Bellmon	Domestic	Mansfield
Bennett	Dominick	McClure
Bentsen	Eastland	McGee
Bible	Ervin	Montoya
Biden	Fulbright	Muskie
Brooke	Goldwater	Pearson
Buckley	Gravel	Ribicoff
Burdick	Hart	Taft
Cannon	Hartke	Thurmond
Chiles	Hathaway	
Clark	Hollings	

So the bill (H.R. 15572) was passed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist 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 Presiding Officer appointed Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. CHILES, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. CASE, Mr. LONG, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. YOUNG conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business and then recognize the Senator from Arkansas?

CONSUMER PROTECTION—AGENCY FOR CONSUMER ADVOCACY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUDDLESTON). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 707) to establish a Council of Consumer Advisers in the Executive Office of the President, to establish an independent Consumer Protection Agency, and to authorize a program of grants, in order to protect and serve the interests of consumers, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri to call up a conference report.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICEMEN, FIREMEN, AND TEACHERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on H.R. 15842, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUDDLESTON). The report will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15842) to increase compensation for District of Columbia policemen, firemen, and teachers; to increase annuities payable to retired teachers in the District of Columbia; to establish an equitable tax on real property in the District of Columbia; to provide for additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by all the conferees.

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

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

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 15, 1974, at pages H8438-H8448.)

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, this conference report is an attempt to bring the salaries of the District of Columbia policemen, firemen and teachers abreast with today's inflated cost-of-living.

The last salary increase for District of Columbia police and firemen was approved August 29, 1972. Since that time the consumer price index for the Wash-

S 15166

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 16, 1974

ington, D.C. metropolitan area rose over 16 percent.

This conference report amends the present salary schedule for police and firemen and provides an increase across the board of 16 percent in the pay schedule.

Teachers in the District of Columbia are subject to the same increases in the cost-of-living. This conference report will increase the salaries of teachers by 10 percent on September 1, 1974. A second increase of an additional 3 percent will occur on January 1, 1974.

So that the Government of the District of Columbia can finance these salary increases, the conference report revises the real property tax in the District of Columbia. This revision contains authorization for a tax rate structure that will yield sufficient revenues to cover the salary increases for police, firemen and teachers.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 15842.

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

The report was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me very briefly?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. For the information of the Senate, there will be no more rollcall votes today.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ACTION ON DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1975

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to inform the Senate that the Committee on Appropriations has reported a defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1975 that totals \$82,079,358,000 in available funds. This amount includes \$5 billion in transfers.

The bill as reported is \$4,978,139,000 or 5.7 percent less than the President's amended budget request of \$87,057,497,000. It is also \$1,314,212,000 under the amount passed by the House and will result in an estimated reduction of \$2.7 billion in actual outlays during fiscal year 1975.

I believe that the reductions which the committee has made in defense appropriations this year compare quite favorably with those made in fiscal year 1974 and in fiscal year 1973, the year I assumed the chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and its Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations.

In fiscal year 1973, the Senate reduced the President's budget request by 4.5 percent. That included \$1.3 billion in transfers.

In fiscal year 1974, the Senate reduced the President's budget request by 4.7 percent. That included \$0.5 billion in transfers.

In view of the fiscal disarray in which the Nation finds itself today, I am con-

vinced that the reductions made by the committee are prudent and responsible.

I might say, Mr. President, that my personal feeling is that if we have erred at all in making these adjustments, we may have, in one or more instances, made more substantial cuts than we should have made. But we have made every effort to make reasoned reductions in defense spending, and the appropriations which we recommend will provide the Nation with an adequate defense.

The amount agreed upon by the committee is the product of months of hearings. The committee, in its deliberations, studied, considered, and weighed, as best it could, all aspects of military security in an insecure world before making the reductions and arriving at the amounts reflected in the bill.

I might add at this point that the full committee this morning considered the bill as it had been recommended to us by the subcommittee. We have worked on this measure now for some 4 or 5 months. I was very gratified that after weighing it and considering the amendments that were discussed and after everything had been said as to what the subcommittee had recommended, the full committee increased the amount of our recommendations by only \$16 million. I myself offered the amendment to do that, because we felt it was prudent, wise, and judicious to restore that much of the cuts the subcommittee had recommended.

This appropriation will not please everyone. No measure we could report would satisfy everyone. Some will say the reductions we have made in budget requests are too great. Others will contend that they are too little. We hope, and we believe, that we have struck a proper balance.

This bill represents the considered and reasoned decisions of many Members of the Senate who are most familiar with the issues and problems involved. It is my hope that the Senate will accept and support the recommendations of the committee except possibly in a few instances where it may be demonstrated that some change or modification should be made.

As President Ford said in his appearance before Congress last Monday evening.

Inflation is our domestic public enemy No. 1.

The inflationary spiral has produced skyrocketing prices at the supermarket, slowed industrial production and created growing concern both at home and abroad about the future stability and purchasing power of the dollar.

Even as we discuss the defense appropriation, inflation is taking its toll.

We will lose \$6 billion to inflation even before we start to spend the money appropriated in this bill.

We will lose some \$3 billion in inflation from the money appropriated during prior years before we can spend it.

Indeed, if we wanted to stay even with last year, it would require a total budget of \$86 billion, taking into account a yearly rate of inflation of 11.5 percent.

In recent weeks, Mr. President, we have heard suggestions from all sides for

a massive reduction in the budget to bring inflation under control.

Dr. Arthur F. Burns, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, has called for a \$10 billion cut. William Simon, the Secretary of the Treasury, has reportedly presented a list of potential reductions totaling \$20 billion. Dr. Herbert Stein, who recently resigned as Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has called for a return to the "old fashioned religion" of reduced government spending.

Mr. President, I think these suggestions are made in good faith. But when you take the appropriation bills and the budget requests and take into account world conditions of today, with the insecurity of peace and the potential threats that simply cannot be disregarded, it is imperative that we not reduce unduly or too substantially our military posture so that our strength would not be a deterrent. We must maintain a military strength of deterrent proportions.

There have also been some attempts on the floor of the Senate to slash appropriations bills across-the-board by flat percentages rather than by selective elimination and reductions.

What I am trying to say, Mr. President, is we cannot balance the budget just by taking the defense bill and saying we will take from defense whatever it takes to balance the budget. We cannot do that and act prudently or responsibly.

We should certainly strive for economy in Government, but fiscal responsibility requires that budget reductions be made in a coherent, unified and responsible manner. Indiscriminate across-the-board budget cuts—the meat-axe approach—meet none of these criteria.

In reality, instead of resulting in reduced governmental spending, this method of budget reduction—simply across-the-board cuts—actually encourages larger appropriations ultimately. If everyone knows that his budget request is going to be automatically cut by a fixed amount, a percentage amount, it is obvious that these requests will be inflated to cover the planned reduction. In effect, this means that possibly no reduction will be made at all.

Before I go any further, I want to say something about the across-the-board cut on this bill. Mr. President, I hope the committee has acted with sufficient responsibility in this area so that an across-the-board cut will not find favor with the Senate. If there are items, however, where there is a conscientious belief that they could stand a greater reduction, we will welcome reducing amendments and let them be discussed and determined on their merits.

There may be amendments—and I am sure there probably will be some—which ask for an increase. Mr. President, we in the Appropriations Committee find this a continuous thing. People want the budget balanced but they also want a little increase here, another increase there, and our task is not an easy one. It is one where we have to give and take, and we have undertaken to do that in the budget that we have presented.

I recently received a letter and an

1 Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as
2 amended, for space and services.

3 *SEC. 406. No funds appropriated by this Act may be*
4 *transferred to or expended by or on behalf of the Central*
5 *Intelligence Agency.*

6 *SEC. 407. None of the funds provided in this Act to any*
7 *department or agency may be expended for the transportation*
8 *of any officer or employee of such department or agency be-*
9 *tween his domicile and his place of employment in violation*
10 *of section 5(c)(2) of the Act of July 16, 1914, as amended*
11 *(31 U.S.C. 638a).*

12 ~~SEC. 406.~~ 408. No part of any appropriations contained
13 in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the
14 current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

15 This Act may be cited as the "Department of Housing
16 and Urban Development; Space, Science, Veterans, and
17 Certain Other Independent Agencies Appropriation Act,
18 1975".

Passed the House of Representatives June 26, 1974.

Attest:

W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk.

Calendar No. 1023

98th CONGRESS
2d Session

H. R. 15572

[Report No. 93-1056]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for space, science, veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes.

JUNE 27, 1974

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AUGUST 1, 1974

Reported with amendments