

izations bill, is the clearcut responsibility we are faced with today in seeking to provide the means to insure full educational opportunities for all handicapped children. The first step in bringing about reforms and improvements in meeting the national educational needs of our 7 million handicapped children necessitates realistic funding levels at this time. By failing to appropriate adequate funds to meet these goals, previous passage of authorization legislation appears to be idealistic rhetoric.

While all Americans focus on ways to combat recession and its adverse conditions, it is my judgment that we must look ahead, in terms of investment over the years as we compare cost of these services now versus realistic provision of future services. The investment we consider today is not simply idealization of fulfilling human potential, but realistic planning in terms of bringing self-sufficiency to our Nation's handicapped. If at this time adequate funding levels are met, in the field of education, rather than face far greater annual cost as we continue to pay billions for dependency-related programs, we will realize profit in return as these children served through our efforts today become self-supporting and productive citizens of tomorrow.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting Senator STAFFORD's amendment to add \$25 million to the committee's recommendation at the level of \$125 million, keeping in mind that this figure of a total of \$150 million is still less than 25 percent of the entitlement we approved in passing the Education Amendments of 1974. This is the time to put our money where our laws are, and I urge my colleagues to give this important measure their favorable consideration at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I just do this, so that the record is clear? I do not suggest that this is all, that it is adequate. It might turn out to be that. But the committee bill will serve about 600,000 children. That is 347,000 more than were served last year under the budget. I think we moved it up pretty fast.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the Senator yield me about 30 seconds?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, surely. I just want these figures in the RECORD.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to comment that I think we are making remarkable progress, but we are talking about 3 million children that are either deaf, blind, retarded, speech-impaired, motor-impaired, or emotionally disturbed. We are also talking about \$25 million more to reach those 3 million children that are not getting any services today.

I am prepared to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NUNN). All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD). On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ARLEN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HASKELL) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) is absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. McCLURE) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) is absent due to illness in the family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 51, as follows:

[No. 492 Leg.]
YEAS—32

Abourezk	Gravel	Packwood
Alken	Griffin	Pearson
Bayh	Hart	Ribicoff
Beall	Hathaway	Schweiker
Bentsen	Huddleston	Stafford
Biden	Hughes	Stevens
Brooke	Javits	Stevenson
Byrd, Robert C.	McIntyre	Taft
Case	Metzenbaum	Welcker
Clark	Mondale	Williams
Cranston	Nelson	

NAYS—51

Bartlett	Fannin	Muskie
Bellmon	Fong	Nunn
Bennett	Goldwater	Pastore
Bible	Gurney	Pell
Brook	Hansen	Percy
Burdick	Helms	Proxmire
Byrd.	Hollings	Roth
Harry F., Jr.	Hruska	Scott, Hugh
Cannon	Inouye	Scott,
Chiles	Jackson	William L.
Cook	Long	Stennis
Cotton	Magnuson	Symington
Curtis	Mansfield	Talmadge
Dole	McClellan	Thurmond
Domenici	McGee	Tower
Dominick	Metcalf	Tunney
Eastland	Montoya	Young
Ervin	Moss	

NOT VOTING—17

Allen	Hartke	Mathias
Baker	Haskell	McClure
Buckley	Hatfield	McGovern
Church	Humphrey	Randolph
Eagleton	Johnston	Sparkman
Fulbright	Kennedy	

So Mr. STAFFORD's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk and I ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 28, line 3, and continuing to line 4 after the words "determining the" strike the word "ownership" and insert in lieu thereof the word "disposition".

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, the Senate, some weeks ago, passed and sent to the House S. 4016, a bill relating to the disposition of and governing access to the Presidential materials of former President Nixon. This was a comprehensive piece of legislation expressing the overwhelming will of the Senate regarding these materials. S. 4016 itself, as well as its legislative history, makes it abundantly clear that the one area not covered was ownership. It was not "legislation determining ownership" of these documents, tapes, and materials.

However, section 203 as presently written provides it will remain effective until June 30, 1975, unless Congress enacts legislation determining the "ownership" of these materials.

It would effectively prevent compliance with S. 4016 if enacted. This is a result I am sure no one wants.

My amendment is a simple one. By merely changing one word "ownership" to "disposition", section 203 would cease to be effective upon passage of S. 4016 thereby permitting compliance with its provisions. It would have no other effect.

It is my understanding that the Member of the House that sponsored this provision on the floor of the House has no objection to this change of words.

I hope that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office having cognizance over this matter and the chairman of the committee will accept this amendment.

Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to make the language in this bill correspond to the language in the Senate bill S. 4106, which the Senate passed recently.

It has been discussed with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, with the chairman of the subcommittee and, I believe, they have agreed to accept the amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment, and I am perfectly willing to accept it if the distinguished Senator from Washington will.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back? The Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

November 20, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 19755

my amendment, it would presumably be with the objective of holding down Federal spending. But should we force these children who have been denied the benefits that are available to all other children, to continue to be denied such benefits and thus bear the heaviest burden of our Nation's economic difficulties. To do so would be tantamount to piling injustice upon injustice, and I do not believe that is the will of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues for their full support for this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield time to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have great sympathy with the purpose that my friend from Vermont has in mind. I doubt if there is a Member of this Senate who has more reason to sympathize. I have a brother, whom I have maintained for all of his life, who has been handicapped and could have been, with some of these attentions that we are giving now, able to lead a useful and productive and happy life.

But, Mr. President, let me say just a couple of things.

In the first place, on this matter of State grant programs, the House jumped the budget by nearly \$40 million, and our committee increased the House bill by \$40 million more, making a total of \$125 million. Right on the same page in this supplemental are many of these other appropriations for the handicapped. The deaf-blind centers have \$12 million; the early childhood projects \$14 million; the specific learning disabilities program \$3,250 million; the regional resource centers which participate in this, over \$9 million; the innovation and development program, almost \$10 million. All of this is under education for the handicapped, and all of this is in this supplemental bill.

I could go on reading the list, but when we get to the total of the appropriations that are in this bill for handicapped children, it comes to \$324,609,000. That is more than we have ever appropriated before.

On this matter of entitlement, it is a good word, but entitlement means that a legislative committee has decided to appropriate money and it is entitled, so we have no control over it. We could not have gone to what he calls a complete entitlement. I believe I understood him to say that maybe a third of the children handicapped in some way are already not receiving special attention. But certainly, more children than ever before—I would say almost double—under this appropriation will be taken care of.

For that reason, sympathetic as I am, I do not see how the Senate can find its way to overturn its committee. I trust that it will not do so, because I am afraid that it will endanger the whole program and we might come out with less.

I do not want to take time away from my friend. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, here again, no one will deny the fact that we want to take care of every handicapped child in the United States, wherever he is. But sometimes, we have to have regulations to find out who is handicapped. It is easy for us to find the people who are physically handicapped, but we are getting into a field now where some of these people are suggesting that the regulation should be revised to include perhaps a boy in a junior high school or a girl who did not get very good grades—some of us were in that position. That means that we are a little handicapped mentally, does it not? We did not get good grades.

We are trying to figure out how to do this. HEW typically is still dragging their heels—I shall agree with that. They are in the process of writing regulations. This means that the money probably would not get to the States until after the beginning of the year, anyway. The committee bill represents adequate 6-months' funding for this program, so we can look at it again.

The Senator from New Hampshire mentioned that the bill contains \$125 million. That is an increase of \$78 million over the President's budget request.

The committee bill is about three times—three times—what the States got last year. Now, that is about as fast as we can move until we can find out more clearly where we are going.

I appreciate, as all of us do, the motives of the Senator from Vermont. I know there are some other children who ought to be served, and I think we ought to serve them well when we do and not just appropriate money for some State to start out, not knowing exactly what the regulations are. It is easy for a State and for us to know about the handicapped. But when we get into this field that I am talking about, I just do not know how much money we need, or how far we should go. We shall find that out.

In the meantime, with this \$78 million over the budget, and three times what the States got last year, I think we moved pretty fast and were very conscious of the situation.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, as the Senate considers appropriations under the special supplemental measure, H.R. 16900, I would like to express my deep concern for the provisions in this bill dealing with the education of the handicapped children.

As we know, the House Appropriations Committee made something less than a wholehearted response to this new entitlement for handicapped children. The House measure contains only \$85 million in actual funding to carry out provisions of the Mathias amendment contained under ESEA, title VI-B of the Education Amendments of 1974 (Public Law 93-380) which I cosponsored and strongly supported. As my colleagues will recall, in passing this measure, entitlement at full appropriations would mean approximately \$660 million for the remainder of fiscal 1975. The Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended an actual

appropriations of \$125 million for fiscal 1975. Though this figure does represent a respectable increase over prior appropriations, it is exceedingly modest when compared to the entitlement figure of \$660 million, and certainly falls far short when compared to the actual need nationwide. Therefore, I commend my distinguished colleague, Senator STAFFORD, for his efforts to provide for realistic funding, and join with him in cosponsoring his amendment to increase the appropriations by another \$25 million, for a total of \$150 million.

My own State of Maryland is illustrative of the fact that there are a great many handicapped children who are not receiving an appropriate education. Data collected for the 1971-72 school year by the Maryland Department of Education indicates that 57,380 handicapped children, out of a total of 123,639 children were not receiving a public education designed to meet their needs. Projections made by the department, for the 1972-73 school year, predicted that the total number to be served would be little different than the 1971-72 school year level of service. As emphasized in a letter from the Council for Exceptional Children, which I have received, the situation of our State, as in many States throughout the Nation, is made more critical as a result of a decision in a class action right to education lawsuit, Maryland Association for Retarded Children against State of Maryland handed down last May, in which the court proclaimed that all children have the right to an education which must be provided by September 1975. This decision set aside the compliance date of 1979 originally mandated by the law.

In the face of legal requirements to meet the educational needs of service to all handicapped children, it is clear that past funding levels have fallen far short of meeting program goals.

As Senator MATHIAS pointed out during his remarks before the Senate on May 20:

It would be unfair and untrue to contend that our State and local education programs are neglecting handicapped children. During the school year 1972-73, for instance, State and local expenditures for education of the handicapped amounted to an estimated \$2.4 billion. During that same period, the Federal share—which includes funds spent under the Education of Handicapped Act, ESEA title I and III, Headstart, vocational education, the Higher Education Act, Federal schools for the deaf, research and instructional support—reached \$315 million or only 12 percent of the total annual special education expenditures of \$2.7 billion.

Keeping in mind that this 12-percent figure includes moneys spent for research, teacher training, and special projects, not just classroom services, the insufficiency of these funds is of even greater concern when we consider the fact that upon closer examination, the 1972-73 expenditures for Federal special education represented only 5 percent of the total Federal education budget.

Incumbent upon us in meeting the goals projected, as we passed the author-

November 20, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S 19757

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment (putting the question).

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the risk of some raised eyebrows here, I send to the desk an amendment to add \$480,000 to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 5, line 18, after the words "Salaries and Expenses" insert the following: "\$6,080,000, including".

Mr. MAGNUSON. My amendment is designed to solve a serious problem which is frustrating the rights of widows and injured Federal workers in receiving the benefits to which they are entitled under Federal law. We did not take action to correct this unconscionable situation during hearings on the appropriation, because it was just during the recess that the problem was brought to my attention. The office of workers compensation programs of the Employment Standards Administration in the Department of Labor currently has a national backlog of 48,000 unresolved claims for compensation from injured Federal workers. This is the highest it has been since the inception of the program in 1916. While in my own State, I learned that the Seattle district office alone has a backlog of over 2,000 unresolved claims. Seattle and the other 11 regional offices are falling further and further behind. At present, it is not uncommon for a compensation claim to take literally years to be resolved, leaving crippled Federal workers and their families without any income whatsoever in the interim. My amendment will increase the budget of the office by \$480,000. This money will add 74 positions nationally on a temporary basis, provide for overtime for existing employees and additional technical assistance to the district offices. I have been assured that if this amendment is adopted, the backlog can be reduced in the next 6 months to 18,000 cases, the level of the backlog in 1971 and the lowest in the past 10 years. At the close of the fiscal year, the administration expects other longer range improvements in management will begin to take effect to keep the backlog low and eventually eliminate it.

I urge favorable consideration of this amendment on behalf of the tens of thousands of injured Federal workers and their families who are now struggling with this intolerable situation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is that \$480,000 or 480,000 new employees we are talking about?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No, we are talking about 74 temporary employees.

If the Senator from New Hampshire will accept my amendment, it is an emer-

gency matter, and the administration expects some longrange improvements to take care of this backlog, but the claims are legal, they are there.

With the apparent approval of the Senate, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. There are several reasons I would like to vote for the supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 16900.

The most important reason I would like to vote for it is that it contains funds for Federal aid to impacted areas. I have supported this program for 9 years—and I support it now.

It is a just program because the Federal Government, I feel, has an obligation to those localities in which the cost of local government has been increased, or the revenues from local property taxes decreased, as a result of Federal Government action or facilities.

So I support the impacted aid program.

But it represents only 7 percent of the total amount in this legislation.

I support other items in the supplemental. But I cannot support the total figure.

The total supplemental appropriation bill, including many different programs and agencies, is \$8.7 billion.

As much as I favor many of the items in the bill, particularly the funding of Federal aid to impacted areas, I feel that, in this time of high inflation and runaway Federal spending, I cannot vote for the huge total which this bill represents. The funding level is too high.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Third reading.

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.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and the nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is, Shall the bill pass. The yeas and the nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HASKELL), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), the Senator from West

Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HASKELL), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. McCLURE), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) is absent due to illness in the family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 18, as follows:

[No. 493 Leg.]

YEAS—65

Abourezk	Fong	Moss
Aiken	Gravel	Muskie
Bayh	Griffin	Nelson
Beall	Hart	Packwood
Bellmon	Hartke	Pastore
Bennett	Hathaway	Pearson
Bentsen	Hollings	Pell
Bible	Hruska	Proxmire
Biden	Huddleston	Ribicoff
Brock	Hughes	Schweiker
Brooke	Inouye	Scott, Hugh
Burdick	Jackson	Stafford
Byrd, Robert C.	Javits	Stevens
Cannon	Long	Stevenson
Case	Magnuson	Symington
Clark	McClellan	Taft
Cotton	McGee	Talmadge
Cranston	McIntyre	Tunney
Dole	Metcalf	Weicker
Domenici	Metzenbaum	Williams
Dominick	Mondale	Young
Ervin	Montoya	

NAYS—18

Bartlett	Fannin	Roth
Byrd,	Goldwater	Scott,
Harry F., Jr.	Gurney	William L.
Chiles	Hansen	Stennis
Cook	Helms	Thurmond
Curtis	Mansfield	Tower
Eastland	Nunn	

NOT VOTING—17

Allen	Haskell	McClure
Baker	Hatfield	McGovern
Buckley	Humphrey	Percy
Church	Johnston	Randolph
Eagleton	Kennedy	Sparkman
Fulbright	Mathias	

So the bill (H.R. 16900) was passed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which H.R. 16900 passed.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

S 19758

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

November 20, 1974

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CASE, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. MATHIAS, and Mr. BELLMON conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make clerical and technical changes in the engrossment of the Senate amendments.

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

TRANSPORTATION SAFETY ACT OF 1974

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 15223.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15223) to amend the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 and the Hazardous Materials Transportation Control Act of 1970 to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the request of the House for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses 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. MAGNUSON, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. BEALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER TO HOLD ERDA NOMINA- TIONS AT THE DESK

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at such time as the ERDA nominations are received, they be held at the desk.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORTS UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to file reports until midnight tonight.

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

ORDER FOR SUNDRY ADMINISTRA- TION COMMUNICATIONS SUBMIT- TED PURSUANT TO THE BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING ACT TO BE HELD AT THE DESK TEMPORAR- ILY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that sundry administrative communications submitted to the Senate pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act be held at the desk temporarily.

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

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 3418 TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the votes on the override of the two vetoes tomorrow, the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 3418, a bill to establish a Federal Privacy Board, and for other purposes.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 12 noon tomorrow.

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

ORDER FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TO- MORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order tomorrow, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend beyond the hour of 12:30 p.m., with statements limited therein to 5 minutes each.

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

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, on November 15, a letter was sent to the Members of the Senate dealing with the Export-Import Bank conference report. This letter was signed by the Senator from Virginia, by the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON).

The letter urged that the conference report be rejected, and it gave various reasons.

Mr. President, I rise today to correct one figure which was in error in the seventh paragraph resulting from a wrong addition, where it says that the Export-Import Bank loaned \$956,400,000.

That figure should be \$884,400,000.

Another point in that same paragraph that needs to be clarified is that the letter says that the Export-Import Bank loaned the figure just mentioned.

The more exact wording should be "assisted in financing." The Export-Import Bank loans for these items mentioned in this paragraph totaled \$308,550,000, based on the press releases by the Export-Import Bank. I point out that most of these loans were at a 7-percent interest rate.

I thought these two points should be clarified for the record.

The signers of this letter regret that the figure was slightly incorrect. It makes no substantial difference, but we do want the exact figure.

I want to say also that nothing in this letter, so far as the Senator from Virginia is concerned, should be construed in any way as a reflection on the able president of the Export-Import Bank, Mr. Casey.

I think he is an excellent man, and I am pleased to work with him. We have a difference of view on some of these matters pertaining to Export-Import Bank; but so far as the Senator from Virginia is concerned, the item I am particularly interested in is putting a ceiling on the amount of loans that may be made to Russia. Mr. Casey, the president of the bank, if I judge him accurately, does not want a blank check, but it is the State Department that has insisted upon a blank check.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the revised letter written by the five Senators I mentioned.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., Nov. 15, 1974.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We intend to move to reject the Export-Import Bank conference report when it comes before the Senate shortly after Congress reconvenes.

The conference report nullifies every major Senate action to strengthen Congressional oversight of the Bank's activities and paves the way for an immediate multi-billion dollar U.S. investment in Soviet energy development.

The Senate put an overall ceiling of \$300 million on Ex-Im Bank loans to the Soviet Union—the conference committee eliminated this ceiling, saying the President could set any limit he chooses.

The Senate adopted an amendment prohibiting Ex-Im Bank support of Soviet fossil fuel project without prior Congressional approval—the conference committee deleted it.

The Senate required prenotification to Congress of any Ex-Im Bank credit transaction of \$60 million or more—the conference committee excluded loan guarantees