

I believe that at your hearings on S. 1681, the representative of SBA at that time indicated that it might be a problem in determining the degree to which these nondisplaced affected businesses should be or could be helped. But he did not say it was an insuperable problem. He recognized that there were some administrative difficulties involved.

Senator MUSKIE. Of course, what we are talking about here is not compensation for displacees, but simply the availability of a loan program in connection with natural disasters, or Federal displacement, and other reasons that are beyond the control of the Federal Government, the State government, or the businessman involved. So I think it is a little different consideration than the question of whether or not the Federal Government ought to provide these other compensations. It is a question mainly of a Federal loan program which is not matched by a State loan program for another class of people hit by adversity not of their own making.

Mr. WALKER. There is just one historical footnote to add, Mr. Chairman; that is, the original SBA title, as it appeared in S. 1681, did not include the specific provision which we have been talking about. It was incorporated during the hearings, largely at the behest of Senator Sparkman and members of the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee. I gathered at that time that they had explored this in some depth and felt it merited consideration by this subcommittee. For this reason, it is in this title.

Senator MUSKIE. All right. I guess we have the issue before us.

Senator Mundt?

Senator MUNDT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to go into two different aspects of the discussion.

First of all, Mr. Colman, I was happy to read on page 16 of your statement your continued support of the 5-year termination provision. You point out that it appears Congress provides expiration dates as a matter of course for almost all grant programs. That seems to be very significant and very well grounded.

I certainly am one who believed in stronger reviewing authority at the time you wrote this provision. I believe that these periodic reviews are very essential, very important.

I thought that we were going to do something through the Congressional Reorganization Act, Mr. Chairman. I was optimistic that we were going to provide Congress with additional trained personnel, guidelines, and other new authorities. But the House apparently has driven a knife into the back of that legislation. Nothing has happened. It took some little time in the Senate, but we finally got it through. For a while, it looked like there was an agreement in the House, but the session is nearing its busiest period, prior to adjournment, and I am pretty pessimistic that the House will act on the bill. It seems to me that what we have set out here for the function of the General Accounting Office is very essential, and even more essential in view of the lack of action in the House, to modernize the procedures of the Congress.

As you point out, and as I have observed, most of them now provide for some kind of payment. I was at the Appropriations Committee earlier this morning where the same question about termination dates,