

Senator MUSKIE. Senator Mundt has suggested that perhaps objections to this provision in the bill might be softened if it were modified in the reorganization powers to permit amendment by the Congress of the President's consolidation plans. Before I offer or suggest involvement in that action, what is your reaction?

Senator Moss. Well, my reaction is somewhat negative to that. It seems to me if the Congress finds such a flaw in the proposal that the President sends up, then it had better turn it down and send it back saying this is not approved. I am sure that out of that, with conferences with the leadership of the Congress and the leadership involved, the executive branch might well make an amendment and send it back again for second consideration. But I am afraid if we get into the situation of the President sending it up and then on the floor, we begin to offer a lot of amendments rather than simplify and streamline what we are talking about, we may come out with something as complex when it is finished as when it was sent up in the first place.

After all, the idea here is to try to consolidate and simplify and streamline as much as we can. That is presumably what the President's proposals would do. The Congress still has to appropriate the money, we still have to look at the overall program, and I would not favor giving the amendatory power to the Congress on the President's proposals.

Senator MUSKIE. I would like to make two observations of my own, simply to make them a part of the record where they will be readily available for discussion by the committee and the subcommittee in the markup session. I think the point you make is very valid.

Second, I think if we allow this amendatory process, the 90-day period for action by the Congress would have to be eliminated. The process being what it is, I do not think by consolidating the power to legislative recommendation, you can expect realistically to get it completed within the 60 or 90 days that might be permitted for congressional action.

Also, one of the purposes in trying to do this in the way a reorganization plan is handled is to minimize the political difficulties involved in eliminating the identity of programs which have a built-in constituency in the Congress and elsewhere.

For example, in the water and sewer field, we have the so-called Aiken program for water and sewer projects. This is in the Department of Agriculture for communities of under 5,500. The Department of Interior has the big waste treatment grant program, which benefits all communities, including communities of the size I have just referred to. We have in the Department of Commerce the supplemental grants for these programs under the Economic Development Administration. HUD has the associated programs to construct sewers.

There is one other I have left out, but in any case, in all of these programs, there are built-in constituencies within the agencies, within the classes of beneficiaries, within the Congress. If you were to challenge all of these to exercise their initiative in diluting any recommendation for consolidation that the President would propose to the Congress, I think you would virtually destroy the prospects for consolidation.