

December 20, 1973

gram expiration date of June 30, 1977. In order for insurance to be written after June 30, 1977, congressional oversight and extension of underwriting authority will be required. This is a sound provision which will avoid artificial constraints imposed by undeterminable measures of demand for flood insurance.

Second. Deadlines for local acceptance and—the implementation of conditions to be applied in the case of nonparticipation—have been extended. The proposed new dates acknowledge the delays already experienced and make the program implementation schedule more realistic; and

Third. Specific procedures are provided to insure participation by private citizens and local officials and to guarantee full review and appeal in the determinations to be made by the Secretary.

I consider all of these substantive changes to be in the best interest of the program and urge enactment of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT).

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in wholehearted support of H.R. 8449, the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, as amended. With enactment of this legislation, we will have, for the first time, the tools necessary to establish a truly effective national flood disaster protection program. A program which, once the provisions of this legislation are fully implemented, will result in net savings of a substantial amount to the Federal Government.

Section 110 of this bill, dealing with appeals from determination of the Federal Insurance Administrator, was the subject of more testimony, discussion, coordination, and committee debate than any other provision in the bill—both in this body and in the Senate. I believe that the appeals provisions that finally resulted represent a major accomplishment which, while doing full justice to the legitimate interests of communities and individuals who may feel aggrieved at a particular determination of the Administrator, permits an effective and efficient administration of the flood insurance program.

I believe that section 110 is responsive to the major objections that have been raised concerning this legislation. It consolidates the appeals procedures earlier voted on the House floor into a more equitable, comprehensive, and manageable format—one which, while carefully protecting the interests of those affected, avoids the pitfall of permitting those unnecessary delays and self-interested procrastinations which would make the flood insurance program unworkable.

I think that one other provision in this legislation also deserves special mention. Section 208 of the amended legislation permit the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to set interest rates with respect to FHA mobile homes loans at levels needed to meet the current mobile home loan market. As a practical matter, low cost new housing—that is,

housing which a lower income family can afford to purchase without subsidy, means a mobile home in today's housing market. Until our housing subsidy programs again become operational, it is essential that credit at affordable rates remain available for the purchase of mobile homes by such families. Section 208 would make this possible.

Mr. Speaker, I most strongly urge the prompt enactment of this legislation.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. ABDNOR).

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

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Senate amendment to the Small Business Act. The bill to which this amendment was added in the Senate deals with disaster protection. This amendment addresses itself to a single disaster. A disaster that is perhaps more familiar to millions of Americans than any similar incident in our history because of the media coverage accorded it due to the romantic nature of its historical setting. To my knowledge, no single destruction of property nor transgression of rights has been so publicized as that which took place in my district, on Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota between the dates of February 27, 1973, and May 8 of this year. It is most apt to refer to what happened at Wounded Knee as a disaster. Much has already been said about the damage that has been done to respect for order and the rule of law on Indian Reservations and elsewhere. Less emphasis, however, has been given to the physical destruction which occurred when armed militants occupied the small community of Wounded Knee, forcibly occupying churches, a museum and trading post and private residences there, and during and at the end of the confrontation burning and destroying that property. That which was destroyed was in many cases the sole possession of its owner.

This amendment, through the Small Business Administration's natural disaster program, would provide innocent victims who suffered losses through no fault of theirs some relief. To better appreciate the need for this legislation, allow me to put this "disaster" in its proper context. Just over a year ago there was another disaster and great destruction of property—destruction of the taxpayers property—that took place when militant members of the American Indian Movement occupied and wrecked the Bureau of Indian Affairs Building here in Washington. The damage coming from that disaster has been cited at over \$2 million.

That is the damage to the BIA building, the lost records and the artifacts which the militants took or destroyed. They were not punished, however, rather they were paid tax dollars to go on their way. These were not South Dakota Indians for the most part, and not, for the most part, even reservation Indians. But they did take the Federal payment of over \$60,000 and many of them ended up at Wounded Knee. Having met with such success in Washington, these militants resumed their

ways of destruction. In this case, however, what they destroyed was not Government property, however, but property which in most cases belonged to Indian citizens in and near Wounded Knee. Indian citizens who were property owners and who were earning their own livings. These were people who were successful, people who followed the pattern that billions of dollars have been spent to promote by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and other Government agencies who attempt to upgrade the economic and social standing of our Indian population.

No wealthy people resided at Wounded Knee. Life there was simple, and material goods were scarce; nonetheless, when militant, armed members of the American Indian Movement, and their supporters entered the community and sealed it off from the rest of the world, the owners of these possessions continued to believe that they could expect protection of their property and civil rights. This they did not receive. Because they did not receive police protection which was so desperately needed, and the need for which was so evident, the few possessions many of the people in Wounded Knee had were lost. The destruction was wrought at the hands of lawless men who proclaimed their contempt for our Government, it is, of course, with these lawless parties that the ultimate responsibility for the losses lie. This is of little comfort, however, to those who lost their possessions—their homes and their cattle herds that represented a life's hard work on the rugged plains of the Pine Ridge Reservation. The responsible renegades are now scattered, and in most cases are judgment proof. Their many sympathizers who helped prolong the confrontation have not come forward to make whole those who lost so much.

While the destruction—destruction many of us helplessly witnessed on our television screens—was not the result of action of our Government, it was, to a degree a result of the inaction of our Government.

I have talked with Indian ranchers near Wounded Knee who found that their herds were being raided and that their homes and families were being threatened by the outlaws at Wounded Knee; when they asked U.S. Federal marshalls to protect them and their property, the Marshalls replied that they could give no help because those ranchers were in the "demilitarized zone" which surrounds the community of Wounded Knee. With no choice but to flee for their lives, these people watched their homes burn and their cattle herd scattered and destroyed. These people are Indians who worked long and hard to break from the patterns of unemployment and dependency which are so prevalent on our reservations even today. They saw all that they had destroyed, as Federal "law enforcement" officials looked on. All, I might add, in spite of the willingness of local law enforcement officials to enforce the law and protect property rights.

The Federal policy, of course, was justified as being one designed to avoid bloodshed and loss of life and limb. Al-

Chp 10 of Compt file

H 11810

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 20, 1973

though some of the insurgents were eventually killed by gunfire, and Federal officers were wounded and crippled in the firefights that eventually took place, we can speculate that the restrained policy of Federal officials prevented some unnecessary suffering and death. This is of little comfort, however, to those who found themselves homeless, and found their life's savings to have gone up in smoke.

Now, we have an opportunity to compensate in part those who lost so much. They can never be compensated in full for the suffering and terror they experienced, but by this amendment we can provide them with payments for the losses of property they experienced. The exact amount required to fund this amendment is unknown. But it cannot be great. The population of Wounded Knee is only less than 100. Ranchers surrounding the area lost cattle and had fences and buildings destroyed, but this is sparsely settled country and the actual numbers are few.

But to those few who are involved, this bill is everything. Imagine what this compensation will do to restore confidence in Government for those who suffered losses and those who observe their pitiful plight. Given this opportunity during this Christmas season, we must take advantage of it and, in part, right a serious wrong.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from South Dakota for his comments. I am sure that the Congress will, in the future, do what should be done to correct the situation out in his area.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 753).

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 93-65)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

It was just three years ago that I signed into law the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. Since that time, we have made significant progress toward our goal of a safe and healthy workplace for every worker in America.

Today, I am submitting the second President's Report on Occupational Safety and Health, outlining the activities which have taken place under that new Act in calendar year 1972. The achievements of that year indicate that the goals of the Act are becoming realities.

For example, many States have developed or are now in the process of developing their own occupational safety and health plans in accordance with the Act. As these plans are approved and carried out, enforcement will begin to shift from the Federal Government to the States with no loss in effectiveness.

Because public cooperation is vital to the success of the program, I am gratified by the support which has been extended to this program by the news media, by the professions, and by the general public. I am particularly pleased to note the cooperation and support which industry and labor organizations have given to these efforts.

The breadth and complexity of the Occupational Safety and Health Act have inevitably made it the focal point for controversy and criticism. I believe, however, that such criticism can be helpful as we work to improve our programs and as we modify and update its standards and regulations.

This year's report includes preliminary data from the first occupational injury and illness survey conducted under the new record-keeping procedures required by the Act. This data will be helpful in providing a basis upon which to judge the effectiveness of our efforts to reduce work-related injuries, illnesses and fatalities.

This report also reflects the added emphasis which has been placed on occupational health during the past year. Research in this area has increased in response to a growing awareness of the tragic toll taken by employee exposure to toxic substances and unhealthy physical environments.

Also included is the first report of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, a wholly independent agency created by the Act to adjudicate citations and proposed penalties issued by the Department of Labor when they are contested by employers and employees.

This detailed account provides a useful overall view of the program and its accomplishments in 1972. It offers, too, a glimpse of what lies ahead as we work to assure safe and healthful working conditions for all of our country's working men and women.

RICHARD NIXON.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, December 20, 1973.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that the House will proceed with the consideration of conference reports on appropriation bills, and to do so on all of those which are ready, before

The House goes to any other legislative business.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 11575 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House on yesterday, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11575) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, 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 December 19, 1973.)

Mr. MAHON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers be dispensed with, since it is rather extensive.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on the defense appropriations bill, and I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to include extraneous excerpts, and I ask unanimous consent for myself to also include tables relating to this conference report.

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

There was no objection. Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, in considering a bill of any magnitude, one ought to take into consideration the fiscal picture confronting the United States. In considering a bill of the magnitude of the defense appropriations bill, it is very important to look at the entire fiscal situation confronting the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we did that in the formulation of the Defense conference report which is before us. I think, therefore, it might be of interest for me to capsule what the fiscal situation is from the standpoint of the Federal Treasury.

There were many predictions at the beginning of this session and at different times during the session as to what the Congress might do in relation to the present January budget, and the supplemental budget estimates of the President of November 15.

CONGRESS REDUCES APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

It is now apparent since we have agreed in conference on all appropriation bills that in this session of Congress on all appropriation bills we have reduced the President's request by \$3 billion. It is rather a notable thing that this marks the 21st year that the Congress has not exceeded the President's budget in appropriation bills.

Now, as the Members know, about 40

December 20, 1973

percent of spending is represented by expenditures mandated through legislation other than appropriation bills. Budget authority becoming available automatically under permanent legislation for the social insurance trust funds, interest on the debt, and general revenue-sharing accounts for the lion's share of this spending.

## THE REVISED NOVEMBER 15 BUDGET

The President in his updated budget on November 15 estimated that the spending for this year would be about \$270 billion, including \$0.6 billion in spending related to the budget amendment providing assistance to Israel.

The Executive had made a number of erroneous projections as to the fiscal situation. In other words, a very bad guess was made with respect to interest on the public debt. The interest on the public debt skyrocketed to a very much higher figure than had been anticipated. And there were certain other increased costs. So, there were some black aspects to the picture.

But revenues as of November 15 were estimated to be about \$14 billion greater than had been estimated last January, so this was a plus.

But now in view of the energy crisis and the possible slowdown of the economy, it may be that this estimate may prove to be a bit too high.

## SPENDING IMPACT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS

With respect to all spending in appropriation bills and in nonappropriation measures and in mandated spending otherwise—and I am talking of spending now, not appropriations—with respect to all spending of the Federal Government for fiscal year 1974, it now appears that spending will be approximately at the level of \$270 billion, as estimated by the President on November 15 of this year.

Now, there is a caveat to that. If Congress today or tomorrow provides for the increased social security payments, that will add \$1 billion above the President's budget. If the energy bill, which provides for certain mandatory benefit payments to unemployed workers, is approved by Congress today or tomorrow or before we adjourn, that will add another one-half billion dollars.

So it would appear, Mr. Speaker, that based upon the President's November estimate, spending may exceed that figure by about \$1½ billion, which certainly, in the context of the magnitude of Federal spending, is not too complimentary of the Congress.

Of course, I think we must all agree that the executive and the legislative branches of the Government have in many instances been overspending in recent years, including this year, and there are many of us who have opposed many of these spending programs.

Nevertheless, the total picture as to the actions of the administration and the Congress is about as I have stated.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, that figure representing the estimated spending is

considerably above the estimate as of last January, is it not, when the budget was submitted?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the estimate of spending as of last January was, as the gentlemen will remember, \$268.7 billion. As a result of the increase in the interest on the debt and as a result of congressional add-ons, as well as other matters, the President in his revised estimate in November estimated that the spending figure would be increased from \$268.7 billion to about \$270 billion.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I assume the gentleman is taking into consideration the \$1 billion that was impounded and, according to what was stated this morning in the newspaper, has now been released.

Mr. MAHON. That figure should be taken into consideration. Insofar as I know, this does not negate the statements I have just made. However, the gentleman has raised a valid point.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, has the gentleman heard the reports that I have heard that the Office of Management and Budget is having difficulty with the 1975 budget, to wit, holding it at \$300 billion?

Mr. MAHON. I have heard it said with considerable authority that the budget will undoubtedly go up. The President submitted a budget for fiscal year 1974, I believe, \$19 billion above fiscal year 1973. If the budget should go up another \$19 billion in this coming year, it will be pushing toward the \$300 billion figure. However, I would hope that the fiscal year 1975 budget which will be submitted in January or soon thereafter will be under \$300 billion.

However, it is a very serious and sobering aspect of our political life that our budgets tend to get larger from year to year. Somehow or other we have to do a better job of dealing with this problem than we have in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to place in my remarks at this point a well prepared statement with regard to the budget situation, and a table setting forth the appropriations business of the session:

## CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON THE FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET

## I. HIGHLIGHTS

*Appropriation Bills Reduced in Excess of \$3.0 Billion*

Congress, in its actions on appropriation bills, reduced budget requests for fiscal year 1974 in excess of \$3.0 billion.

*A Standoff on Total Spending*

It seems rather clear at this point that completed congressional action at the conclusion of this session will result in about a standoff with the revised Executive budget estimate for total spending of \$270 billion. But if Congress before adjournment approves the proposed Social Security increases and approves the mandatory unemployment benefit provisions of the energy legislation, that would add about \$1.5 billion to the \$270 billion.

## II. CONGRESS REDUCES APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR 1974

The \$3.0 billion congressional reduction of the budget in appropriation bills includes the effect of the conference agreements on the Defense, Foreign Assistance, and the 1974 Supplemental Appropriations Bills. It is a remarkable fact that with these actions

Congress will have reduced the budget through the appropriations process in each of the last 21 years.

*House and Senate Action on Appropriation Bills*

House-approved appropriation bills for fiscal year 1974 were under the budget by \$3.5 billion. Senate-approved appropriation bills for fiscal year 1974 were under the budget by \$2.6 billion.

*Priority Setting in Appropriation Bills*

The total figures on congressional action on appropriation bills reflect literally thousands of changes in the budget, both increases and decreases. But it is easy to see that Congress did set priorities through the appropriations process. The largest increases were \$1.4 billion on the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare bill and about \$440 million on the HUD-Space-Science-Veterans bill. The largest decreases were about \$3.5 billion for Defense and \$1.2 billion for Foreign Assistance.

## III. TOTAL SPENDING FOR FISCAL 1974

The President's January estimate for total Government spending was \$268.7 billion. On November 15 that figure was revised upwards to \$270 billion.

The revised November 15 outlay estimate included the effect of the following and other developments:

(In billions)

1) Budget amendment for assistance to Israel.....	+ \$0.6
2) Congressional increases.....	+ 2.9
3) Significant increases in uncontrollable:	
Interest on the debt.....	+ 2.9
Medicaid cost increases.....	+ .6
Disaster assistance.....	+ .6
4) Significant decreases in uncontrollable:	
Outer Continental Shelf rents and royalties (offset against outlays).....	- 2.9
Farm price supports.....	- 1.2
Sale of financial assets.....	- .9
Stockpile sales.....	- .9

*Impact of Congressional Actions on Spending*

During the session the President has signed into law legislation including certain congressional additions to the budget. The November 15 estimate of \$270 billion included \$2.9 billion in congressional increases. Since November 15 the net effect of completed congressional action on the budget has been a reduction of about \$100 million in outlays for fiscal year 1974. So, actions by Congress to date have not exceeded the \$270 billion figure.

There are pending, however, certain non-appropriation bills that would mandate spending of more than \$2 billion—most significantly the Social Security increases and the unemployment provisions of the energy legislation. Pending legislation will carry over to next session, and it may be that much of it will be enacted. It should be made clear, however, that such increases would be over and above the \$270 billion.

## IV. SPENDING INCREASES IN NONAPPROPRIATION BILLS

Spending was, of course, reduced through congressional action on appropriation bills. The spending increases that resulted from congressional action have been due to actions on nonappropriation bills. Significant examples of such actions are included in the following list:

(In millions)

Food stamp amendments (P.L. 93-86).....	+ 724
Repeal of "bread tax" (P.L. 93-86).....	+ 400
Federal employee pay raise, Oct. 1, 1973 (S. Res. 171).....	+ 358
Welfare—medicaid amendments (P.L. 93-66).....	+ 122

Unemployment benefits extension (P.L. 93-53) +116  
 Veterans national cemeteries (P.L. 93-43) +110  
 Social Security—liberalized income exemption (P.L. 93-66) +100

V. DRAMATIC INCREASE IN REVENUES

The most dramatic shift in the budget has been on the revenue side. The President has revised his \$266 billion January estimate by \$14 billion up to \$270 billion. This

turn of events wiped out the original Unified Budget deficit of \$12.7 billion projected in January. The November 15 budget revisions indicate a balanced unified budget for fiscal 1974, reflecting a federal funds deficit of \$15 billion, offset by a trust fund surplus of \$15 billion.

VI. WORD OF CAUTION

It is clear from the figures I have cited that the budget is subject to constant, sometimes sharp, change, even without consider-

ing the actions of Congress. As a result of economic conditions interest payments on the debt alone went up as much as the net congressional increase to spending. And the \$14 billion swing in revenues dwarfs the \$1.3 billion net change in total spending estimates during the year.

What should concern us all is the possible budget impact of the economic slowdown many are predicting. Fiscal year 1974 is by no means over, and a balanced Unified Budget is not yet a fact.

ACTIONS ON BUDGET ESTIMATES OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY CONSIDERED IN APPROPRIATION BILLS, 93D CONG., 1ST SESS.—REVISED TO DEC. 20, 1973

[Does not include any back-door type budget or spending authority in legislative bills; or any permanent (Federal or trust) authority, under earlier or permanent law, without further or annual action by the Congress]

Bill and fiscal year	House actions				Senate actions			Final action	
	Budget requests considered	Reported by committee	Approved by House	Compared with budget requests	Budget requests considered	Approved by Senate	Compared with budget requests	Reported by conference	Compared with budget requests
<b>A. Bills for fiscal 1974:</b>									
1. Legislative (H.R. 6691)	\$566,945,389	\$550,044,940	\$550,044,940	-\$16,900,449	\$677,150,959	\$640,558,952	-\$36,592,007	\$605,189,933	-\$71,961,026
2. Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection (H.R. 8619)	9,519,550,600	9,385,750,600	9,385,737,600	-133,813,000	9,519,550,600	10,176,926,500	+657,375,900	9,927,667,000	+408,116,400
3. District of Columbia (Federal funds) (H.R. 8658)	432,998,000	427,717,000	427,717,000	-5,281,000	432,998,000	417,717,000	-15,281,000	417,717,000	-15,281,000
4. Transportation (H.R. 8766)	2,892,732,006	2,752,631,006	2,753,231,006	-139,501,000	3,010,732,006	2,959,351,006	-51,381,000	2,898,446,006	-112,286,000
5. HUD-Space-Science-Veterans (H.R. 8825)	18,617,453,000	19,070,954,000	19,070,954,000	+453,501,000	18,617,453,000	19,118,373,063	+500,920,063	19,056,500,000	+439,047,000
6. Labor-HEW (H.R. 8877)	31,544,954,000	32,816,467,000	32,816,467,000	+1,271,513,000	31,549,953,000	33,396,379,000	+1,846,426,000	32,926,796,000	+1,376,843,000
7. Interior (H.R. 8917)	2,274,431,300	2,269,554,200	2,269,554,200	-4,877,100	2,370,367,300	2,488,773,700	+118,406,400	2,443,137,200	+72,769,900
8. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary (H.R. 8916)	4,235,080,000	4,150,143,000	4,152,946,000	-82,134,000	4,522,901,000	4,459,478,250	-63,422,750	4,466,012,000	-56,889,000
9. Public Works-AEC (H.R. 8947)	4,757,469,000	4,671,695,000	4,676,395,000	-81,074,000	4,757,469,000	4,772,982,000	+15,513,000	4,749,403,000	-8,066,000
10. Treasury-Postal Service-General Government (H.R. 9590)	5,073,345,000	4,843,698,000	4,844,723,000	-228,622,000	5,373,345,000	5,123,352,000	-249,993,000	5,233,189,000	-140,156,000
11. Defense (H.R. 11575)	77,250,723,000	77,106,309,000	74,101,309,000	-3,149,414,900	77,250,732,000	73,264,627,000	-3,986,105,000	73,714,330,000	-3,535,793,000
12. Foreign Assistance (H.R. 11771)	6,866,567,000	5,833,912,000	5,833,912,000	-1,032,655,000	6,992,917,000	5,593,440,000	-1,399,477,000	5,780,434,000	-1,212,483,000
13. Military Construction (H.R. 11459)	2,944,900,000	2,609,090,000	2,609,090,000	-335,810,000	2,944,900,000	2,670,972,000	-273,928,000	2,658,361,000	-286,539,000
14. Special Resolution, Gold Devaluation (H.J.R. 748)	2,250,000,000	2,203,000,000	2,203,000,000	-47,000,000	2,250,000,000	2,203,000,000	-47,000,000	2,203,000,000	-47,000,000
15. Supplemental (H.R. 11576)	1,428,790,218	1,432,685,713	1,433,035,718	+4,245,500	1,534,183,886	1,888,425,386	+354,241,500	1,703,125,381	+169,941,500
<b>Total, bills for fiscal 1974, to date</b>	<b>170,655,938,513</b>	<b>167,123,651,464</b>	<b>167,128,116,464</b>	<b>-3,527,822,049</b>	<b>171,804,643,751</b>	<b>169,174,355,857</b>	<b>-2,630,287,894</b>	<b>168,784,107,525</b>	<b>-3,020,236,226</b>
<b>B. Bills for fiscal 1973:</b>									
1. Urgent Supplemental (H.J. Res. 496)	1,366,800,000	494,800,000	1,368,600,000	+1,800,000	1,366,800,000	1,368,600,000	+1,800,000	1,368,500,000	+1,800,000
2. 2d Supplemental (H.R. 7447, vetoed)	3,162,880,434	2,855,542,209	2,855,542,209	[-307,338,225]	3,607,105,504	3,699,239,279	[+92,133,775]	3,362,845,279	[-244,260,225]
3. 2d Supplemental (H.R. 9055)	3,607,105,504	3,362,845,279	3,362,845,279	-244,260,225	3,607,105,504	3,362,845,279	-244,260,225	3,362,845,279	-244,260,225
<b>Total, bills for fiscal 1973</b>	<b>4,973,985,504</b>	<b>3,857,645,279</b>	<b>4,731,445,279</b>	<b>-242,460,225</b>	<b>4,973,985,504</b>	<b>4,731,445,279</b>	<b>-242,460,225</b>	<b>4,731,445,279</b>	<b>-242,460,225</b>
<b>C. Cumulative totals for the session to date:</b>									
1. House	175,629,844,017	170,981,296,740	171,859,561,743	-3,770,282,274	176,778,549,255	173,905,801,136	-2,872,748,119	173,515,352,804	-3,262,696,451
2. Senate									
3. Enacted									

<sup>1</sup> The Budget for 1974, as submitted Jan. 29, 1973, tentatively estimated total new budget authority for 1974 at \$288,029,000,000 gross (\$256,761,000,000 net of some \$31,268,000,000 inter-fund and intra-governmental transactions and certain so-called proprietary receipts handled as offsets for budget summary purposes only). Of this total, an estimated \$146,477,000,000 does not require current action by Congress; it involves so-called permanent appropriations such as interest and various trust funds, already provided for in other basic laws. The remainder, \$172,820,000,000 is for consideration at this session (mostly in the appropriation bills). About \$8,600,000,000 of the \$172,820,000,000 was shown in the January budget as being for later transmittal for supplemental

requirements under present law, new legislation, and allowances for contingencies and civilian pay raises, and \$49,534,408 of the remainder requires legislative reauthorization through various annual authorization bills or where the authorization expires periodically.

<sup>2</sup> \$373,800,000 was added on the House floor as a committee amendment and was covered by budget estimate.

<sup>3</sup> Not to exceed.

<sup>4</sup> Includes \$90,360,000 in advance 1975 appropriations.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

As I said, in determining our actions on the Defense bill we did take into consideration the fiscal situation and we also took into consideration the military needs of the Nation and the security of the country.

I could talk to you at very great length about what we did in the Defense bill. There were not hundreds but thousands of issues involved when you get down to each and every item that was before us in the consideration of this measure.

Let me say we have reduced the total funding available by about \$3 billion. The new budget obligational authority reduction is \$3,535,793,000, but some of this reduction, \$503,300,000, is offset by the reappropriation or reapplication of

funds heretofore provided. So I will not undertake to go into too great detail at this time. It will all be explained in the table I will insert in the RECORD.

MILITARY PERSONNEL

A total deduction of \$331,504,000 was made in the requests for military personnel. The amount appropriated is \$22,374,996,000. For the most part, the position of the House with regard to specific personnel reductions made by the House was upheld in the conference. The House receded on proposed reductions in the movement of household goods to Alaska and Hawaii and the consolidation of chaplain schools. The Senate receded in areas, such as reductions in graduate training, in the number of career counselors, in consolidation of race relations

schools, and in medical training for active duty officers. While it is difficult to estimate the exact effect of an appropriations reduction on military and strengths, it is estimated that the bill will result in an end strength reduction of about 62,000.

This compares with a mandated authorization reduction of 43,000 personnel and a reduction of about 53,000 in the bill as it passed the House.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE SERVICE FUNDED PROGRAMS

The House provided just over \$1,000,000,000 for support of South Vietnam and Laos in the MASF program. The Senate reduced that amount to roughly \$650 million. The conference agreement provides some \$900 million for this support. The House conferees felt that a reduc-

tion of the magnitude proposed by the Senate when one-half of the fiscal year is over would abruptly curtail our aid to South Vietnam and lead to serious destabilization in Southeast Asia. We believe that the amount agreed to will be reasonably adequate.

**OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**

In the operation and maintenance area, reductions totaling \$624,516,000 were made. A total of \$22,340,807,000 is provided. Most of these reductions were not in conference. In large part, the reduction is related to manpower strength reductions. The Senate receded on House reductions made in space available transportation and air defense units. The House receded on amounts for overseas dependents education, camouflage screens, and in Senate reductions related to energy conservation and the executive development program.

**PROCUREMENT**

The conference agreement provides \$16,225,822,000 for procurement of military hardware. This is \$2,144,278,000 less than the budget amount. A number of reductions were mandated by the authorizing legislation.

In the conference the House agreed to a Senate reduction of \$10.5 million in the A-4M aircraft of the Navy and \$4.9 million for a medium transport aircraft for the Marine Corps. The Senate receded on a \$66 million reduction for the S-3A Viking antisubmarine warfare aircraft. Under the total package contract under which this aircraft is being procured, the reduction proposed by the Senate would have had the effect of seriously increasing the unit cost of the aircraft.

One of the major items in conference in the procurement area was the proposed new sea control ship. The sea control ship would be a relatively small ship, capable of carrying helicopters and vertical take off and landing aircraft and would be used primarily for escort service. The House deleted the funds for the ship and the Senate included the funds. Under the conference agreement, the funds for the sea control ship are agreed to, but none of the funds can be obligated until a further study is made by the Appropriations Committee of the need for this ship and until both Appropriations Committees give their specific approval for the obligation of the funds.

The conference agreement includes \$70 million for the procurement of A-7D aircraft for the Air Force as proposed by the Senate and not included by the House. The House had included \$151.6 million for procurement of F-111F aircraft which was deleted by the Senate. The conference agreed to the inclusion of funds for this aircraft. We feel that it would be a serious mistake to close the production line of our only long-range bomber.

The Senate deleted \$50 million of the amount provided by the House for the F-15 aircraft of the Air Force. The conference restored \$22 million of this amount. A total procurement of 62 F-15 aircraft is provided.

**RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**

The bill as agreed to in conference appropriates \$8,088,405,000 for research, development, test, and evaluation. This is \$411,895,000 less than the budget request.

A major issue in this area was the site defense antiballistic missile program of the Army. The House had deleted funds for continued development of this antiballistic missile system at this time believing that continued development of the present Safeguard ABM system along with a vigorous technology program provided sufficient effort in this area. The Senate provided \$135 million for the site defense program. The Senate took the position that the site defense program is necessary to future success in the strategic arms limitation talks and that a more capable system than Safeguard is needed. The conference agreed on the appropriation of \$110 million.

In the Navy, a major issue was Project Sanguine, a proposed new system for use in communicating with submerged submarines. The program has been under fire from residents of areas in which it was tested or proposed to be deployed. Environmental and health hazards were cited. The committee has heard from many residents in Wisconsin who complained of the effect of Project Sanguine's tests conducted in that State. When it was proposed that Sanguine be deployed in central Texas a number of people of that area became fearful of possible harmful effects of such deployment. With this in mind and in view of

the fact that there are other means both in being and under development for communicating with submarines the House deleted all funds for Sanguine. The Senate restored the funds. In conference, \$8.3 million was provided. This will permit the continuation of test activities in Wisconsin but will not provide for initiating the full scale development of the system. The Navy should carefully study the need for the system and the harmful effects alleged.

The conference agreed to provide \$25 million for continued development of the advanced medium STOL transport aircraft. The conference agreement was a compromise between the Senate recommendation of \$65 million and the House position that all funds should be deleted. It is probable that at this point most of the money provided has already been obligated.

**GENERAL PROVISIONS**

The House included a limitation in the bill which would have limited the number of non-high-school graduates and so-called category IV personnel inducted into the military service. The Senate deleted the House provision but agreed in conference to include the restrictive language. We feel that this is important in maintaining a highly qualified military force.

The House included a limitation by grade on the number of officers in the military services. The Senate deleted the provision and the House reluctantly receded in the conference. The managers are in agreement that the limitation as proposed by the House should be maintained by the Department but felt that the language should be deleted at this time in order to give the Committees on Armed Services an opportunity to enact legislation in this area.

The Senate included a provision which would have denied any funds for the furnishing of petroleum products to Southeast Asia. The House conferees were in agreement with the intent of the Senate amendment but felt that it was unnecessarily restrictive. The language was amended to prohibit the procurement of petroleum fuels produced in the United States and to permit the provision of such fuels for U.S. nationals.

A table summarizing the actions of the conference follows:

**DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL 1974—SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATIONS**

(In thousands of dollars)

Functional title	Appropriation, fiscal year 1973 (new obligational authority)	Revised budget estimate, fiscal year 1974 (new obligational authority)	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						1973 appropriation	Budget estimate	House	Senate
Title I—Military personnel	23,718,395	22,706,500	22,432,641	22,363,096	22,374,996	-1,343,399	-331,504	-57,645	+11,900
Transfer from other accounts	(21,550)					(-21,550)			
Title II—Retired military personnel	4,441,684	4,705,900	4,681,900	4,681,900	4,681,900	+240,216	-24,000		
Title III—Operation and maintenance	21,461,726	22,965,323	22,504,223	22,240,426	22,340,807	-879,081	-624,516	-163,416	+100,381
Transfer from other accounts	(200,000)					(-200,000)			
Title IV—Procurement	17,799,870	18,370,100	16,513,422	15,872,502	16,225,822	-1,574,048	-2,144,278	-287,600	+353,320
Transfer from other accounts	(1,055,900)		(387,300)	(499,800)	(499,800)	(-556,100)	(+499,800)	(+112,500)	
Title V—Research, development, test, and evaluation	7,959,498	8,500,300	7,966,523	8,103,353	8,088,405	+128,907	-411,895	+121,882	-14,948
Transfer from other accounts	(60,000)			(3,500)	(3,500)	(-56,500)	(+3,500)	(+3,500)	
Title VI—Special foreign currency program	3,400	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600				
Title VII—General provisions (additional transfer authority, sec. 735)	(750,000)	(1,000,000)	(500,000)	(750,000)	(625,000)	(-125,000)	(-375,000)	(+125,000)	(-125,000)
Title VIII—Defense Manpower Commission				750	400	+400	+400	+400	-350
Total, Department of Defense (NOA)	75,384,573	77,250,723	74,101,309	73,264,627	73,714,930	-1,669,643	-3,535,793	-386,379	+450,303
Transfer from other accounts	(1,337,450)		(387,300)	(503,300)	(503,300)	(-834,150)	(+503,300)	(+116,000)	
Total funding available	76,722,023	77,250,723	74,488,609	73,767,927	74,218,230	-2,503,793	-3,032,493	-270,379	+450,303
Transfer authority	(750,000)	(1,000,000)	(500,000)	(750,000)	(625,000)	(-125,000)	(-375,000)	(+125,000)	(-125,000)

DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL 1974—SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

(In thousands of dollars)

Functional title	Appropriation, fiscal year 1973 (new obligatory authority)	Revised budget estimate, fiscal year 1974 (new obligatory authority)	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						1973 appropriation	Budget estimate	House	Senate
Distribution by organizational component:									
Army	20,712,153	20,238,959	19,230,999	18,978,401	19,157,304	-1,554,854	-1,081,655	-73,695	+178,903
Transfer from other accounts	(441,000)		(116,500)	(232,500)	(232,500)	(-208,500)	(-232,500)	(+116,000)	
Navy	24,662,834	25,849,400	24,800,565	24,668,681	24,707,708	+44,874	-1,141,692	-92,857	+39,027
Transfer from other accounts	(330,550)		(156,800)	(156,800)	(156,800)	(-173,750)	(+156,800)		
Air Force	23,694,191	24,345,800	23,312,875	22,872,353	23,106,656	-587,538	-1,239,144	-26,217	+234,303
Transfer from other accounts	(558,200)		(114,000)	(114,000)	(114,000)	(-444,200)	(+114,000)		
Defense agencies/OSD	1,873,703	2,110,664	2,254,972	2,062,542	2,060,962	+187,259	-49,702	-194,010	-1,580
Transfer from other accounts	(7,700)					(-7,700)			
Retired military personnel	4,441,684	4,705,900	4,681,960	4,681,900	4,681,900	+240,216	-24,000		
Defense Manpower Commission				750	400	+400	+400	+400	-350
<b>Total, Department of Defense (NOA)</b>	<b>75,384,573</b>	<b>77,250,723</b>	<b>74,101,309</b>	<b>73,264,627</b>	<b>73,714,930</b>	<b>-1,669,643</b>	<b>-3,535,793</b>	<b>-386,379</b>	<b>+450,303</b>
Transfer from other accounts	(1,337,453)		(387,300)	(503,300)	(503,300)	(-834,150)	(+503,300)	(+116,000)	
<b>Total funding available</b>	<b>76,722,023</b>	<b>77,250,723</b>	<b>74,488,609</b>	<b>73,767,927</b>	<b>74,218,230</b>	<b>-2,503,793</b>	<b>-3,032,493</b>	<b>-270,379</b>	<b>+450,303</b>
Transfer authority	(750,000)	(1,000,000)	(500,000)	(750,000)	(625,000)	(-125,000)	(-375,000)	(+125,000)	(-125,000)

Mr. WYMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. WYMAN. I would like to ask the chairman whether he feels that the \$400,000 in this bill for the Defense Manpower Committee will produce any results in perhaps getting a little different perspective as to how we can save money on the amount for personnel and the amount for hardware in the military to which the gentleman made reference and which we so urgently need.

Mr. MAHON. I am hopeful this commission would prove to be meaningful. I am not too sanguine about it.

But we will hope that some success can come. I am sure that those who serve on the Commission will work diligently toward coming up with some suggestions that will be worthwhile. This is an area where there could be considerable improvement.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield still further, there are other places where there is work that is being done at the present time to see whether reductions in personnel can be achieved in order to lower the 57 percent of this budget going toward personnel.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman, of course, knows that we are dealing with this problem in the committee. We have tried to improve the techniques for recruiting personnel, and we are trying to prevent the practice of recruiting people, keeping them a few weeks or a few months, and then having to discharge them. We are trying to improve the quality of the personnel entering the military service in the first instance. We have made some reductions in personnel in the Department of Defense, as my friend, the gentleman from New Hampshire, knows.

Mr. WYMAN. Is the chairman sanguine about the prospects of being able to perhaps get the defense costs on personnel for the United States down to a figure of about 50 percent.

Mr. MAHON. I would hope we could do something like that. After all, we cannot go on forever at the present balance, as I see it. The gentleman has raised a very valid point, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. WYMAN. I thank the chairman.

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

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, first I want to express my gratitude to the House conferees, and certainly to the chairman for sticking to the position of the House in connection with the Pacific Missile Range, which is in my district, or close to it. And the language contained at page 25 of the report makes it very clear that the House position will be maintained, and the Navy shall continue to operate the Pacific Missile Range with Government military and civilian personnel.

Does the gentleman consider that to be mandatory upon the Navy?

Mr. MAHON. I do consider that to be mandatory. We are unalterably opposed to contracting out this operation. We want to proceed in accordance with the present procedure that the gentleman from California is aware of.

I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that the members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations and the members of the full Committee on Appropriations owe a debt of gratitude to the Members of the House generally who are not members of the full committee and the subcommittees for the contributions which they have made. The members of this committee have worked many, many months, all of them on the Democratic side and all of them on the Republican side of the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL). I believe we have really done the very best we could. The bill is not perfect, but I am of the opinion that the bill comes before the House as the best that could be done under the circumstances.

I hope that the Department of Defense can take this money and continue to keep us No. 1 militarily, maybe by a small margin, but No. 1. We must remain No. 1 in military power and national security.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I do not find the usual table in the report showing the total amount of this bill.

Would the gentleman please state the total cost of this bill as it now stands?

Mr. MAHON. The total is \$73,714,930,000. The amount agreed to is \$3.5 billion less than the budget estimate.

Mr. GROSS. How does it compare with the bill as it left the House?

Mr. MAHON. It is below the bill as it left the House. The House had provided more than \$74.1 billion, so at \$73.7 billion it is lower than it was when it left the House, \$386 million less than it was when it passed the House. It is \$450 million more than the appropriation recommended by the U.S. Senate.

Mr. GROSS. How much lower is it than the bill that passed the House?

Mr. MAHON. \$386,379,000.

Mr. GROSS. There is no funding in this bill for the replacement of the arms and munitions that were taken out of our inventory and given to Israel in the recent Middle East war; is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. No. That comes in the foreign aid bill which should follow this bill.

Mr. GROSS. No. The replacement will not be made there.

Mr. MAHON. Not directly. We will provide funds in the foreign aid bill to reimburse the Department of Defense for the contributions made to Israel. That is the way it is handled.

Mr. GROSS. The Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Clements, told us in the Committee on Foreign Affairs that there would probably be a bill of between \$2 and \$3 billion in addition to the money that was requested by authorization through the Committee on Foreign Affairs for the \$2.2 billion.

Mr. MAHON. For the most part, that would be for hardware for U.S. forces and not directly related to the replacement of weapons given Israel.

Mr. GROSS. The replacement of the arms and planes that were taken out of the U.S. inventory by President Nixon given to Israel will have to be financed nanced next year through another bill; is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. No. The gentleman is not correct on that. In the foreign aid bill we are providing \$2.2 billion for Israel, part of which will be used to reimburse the Department of Defense for the ammunition and airplanes and military support otherwise that was provided for Israel, or that is being provided. There

are some additional costs since the value of the material given Israel is less than the replacement cost of some items.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Texas is demonstrating some new-found optimism, I find, because Israel was already in debt to the United States to the extent of \$1 billion before the October war ever started.

Mr. MAHON. I do not mean that Israel will pay back the \$1 billion which is now owed, and I do not mean that Israel will pay back the \$2.2 billion. Some of it is to be loan money, and some of it will be grant money, and whether any of it would be returned, I do not know. But I would say that up to date Israel has reimbursed the United States in its payments to the extent of about \$250 million.

Mr. GROSS. If we keep pumping economic aid to them they will be able to go through the motions of paying it, but it is our people who are out of pocket. The taxpayers are out of pocket. I predict that the gentleman will be back with a bill next year for more arms as a result of the Middle East war.

Mr. MAHON. I do not foresee that at this time, but it is true that we need modernization of our forces. We need more in quantity of military equipment by way of newer planes, and so forth. We are producing a minimum of new aircraft and new ships and new weapons.

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

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

Mr. McFALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected to show that the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAMMO) except as to amendment No. 77 of the Defense appropriation bill and that I did not.

The RECORD of December 19, 1973, on page H11677 in listing the managers on the part of the House indicates that I excepted as to amendment No. 77. I did not. However, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAMMO) did and I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Now, I should like to tell the gentleman from Iowa that this bill is below last year's budget by \$1,600,000,000. It is less than the House-passed bill, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) has emphasized, by \$386,379,000.

The appropriation we passed in the House was \$1.3 billion below last year's appropriation. The conference action results in a bill which is about \$1.6 billion below last year, and is about \$3.5 billion below the budget estimate for this fiscal year.

I would also like to point out to the gentleman from Iowa that there were many items in this bill that all of us are not completely satisfied with, but that is the nature of any conference report, any kind of compromise. But the con-

ference met for 10 straight hours, with a little time for lunch. I think we have come up with good compromises and fair compromises and a bill that will make for a strong defense for our country. I hope the House will go along with the bill.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I want to express my unhappiness over the fact that the conference agreed to stay by the House provision on section 718. The conferees in accepting the House position, and I recognize this matter was not discussed greatly when it was before the House, I am afraid we will have the Army in a shortfall position of an additional 5,000 to 15,000 men, and it is an unwarranted interference in my judgment in the management capacity of the Defense Department, the idea that we somehow want to limit nonhigh school graduates, because about 25 percent of them are not eligible to make it in the first 18 months service or limit category 4 to a percentage lower than was achieved in the draft. I simply do not understand it.

I hope the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Defense Department in the months ahead will be willing to take a close look and make an analysis of this kind of management decision before undertaking it.

I would simply say to the gentleman from Ohio I am grateful to him for his willingness to yield to me so that issue might be raised, and next year you can be sure it will be raised again if the committee intends to continue this kind of operation.

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. I appreciate having the gentleman's remarks.

The Army has had a great deal of difficulty with its all-volunteer program. We are trying to keep the armed services combat ready as much as we can and that is why we took the action we did.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman state to the House whether there are funds in here for the AMB?

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. There is \$110 million in here for the site defense ABM.

Mr. YATES. Is that for the first installation or the total amount for the program?

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. That is for the first installation.

Mr. YATES. How much will the total program cost?

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. That is the site defense?

Mr. YATES. I wonder how much it will cost in total?

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. That depends on how far we carry the development.

Mr. YATES. For what site will this be the defense?

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. This is a development program. No sites have been selected. The full development cost will

be close to a billion six hundred million dollars.

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

I have been opposed to the ABM and I am sorry the conference saw fit to put money into this program for the ABM again and I would hope they would take another look at it.

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

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to express my own disappointment that the House position failed as opposed to that of the Senate in the determination of the U.S. Armed Services Institute in Madison, Wis., a 30-year institute. I take it that the Senate failed to put forward the arguments of the Defense Department in their desire that this institute be continued and be given an ample opportunity to be literally reconstructed during the next year to follow the needs of the armed services in connection with the education of our military personnel.

In this connection I hope something is salvable, but insofar as the House position prevailed there does not seem to me to be much hope.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I share the concern of my colleague from Wisconsin on this subject, I think it was developed at the hearings that the USAFI did deserve some major surgery. There is a question, however, whether that should extend to decapitation and that was the provision that was in the House bill.

I think the gentleman from Wisconsin put his finger on the situation as it was in the conference, that it was not appropriate for the House conferees to raise the issue in contravention of the House action; that the only way this could have been adequately brought before the conference is if someone of the Senate conferees had spoken up and raised an issue, so that the cards could have been laid on the table. That did not take place, so there was really no practical way in which this matter could adequately be discussed in the conference, so the House position did continue.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to comment that I had very grave questions about whether the best interests were being served by the Defense Department in terms of education.

It will be a poor Christmas present for those employees in Madison, Wis. There are some 200 people that will be involved.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to comment on the discussion by Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, with respect to this subject.

I think there was rather strong feeling in our subcommittee that this figure should have been perhaps higher than the 45 percent that remained in the House bill and is continued in this conference report.

We were concerned that in their efforts to get numbers, in light of their difficulties in recruiting, that people who could not make a satisfactory contribution to the Defense Department or to the Army in particular would be enlisted in the

recruiting program. So because we had before us the history of problems created by people of the capacities shown in their particular categories, we did agree on a figure of 45 percent, which was lower than some of the members of the subcommittee wanted to go. It was put in there to protect the particular level of the caliber of the people being taken into the Army. That is the basis of the 45 percent.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am grateful to my colleague from Wisconsin for his comment.

I would say if we look back to June 1972, the figures, as I recall, supplied by the Defense Department were that 56 percent of the Army career soldiers just a year ago in June were non-high-school graduates when they entered the armed services; so this decision to use, in effect, an artificial criteria, of high school graduation, for the basis of determining whether a man or woman makes a good career soldier, I find very difficult to justify. During the draft era, the proportion of mental IV's who entered each year exceeded the proposed legislative limit of 18 percent in one or more of the services. The proportion of mental IV's who entered the Army, the chief user of the draft, in selected typical years, are shown below:

Fiscal year:	Percent
1954	29.8
1959	20.9
1964	19.0
1966	23.4
1969	27.5
1972	18.8

One of the key factors in this regard is that high school graduation is not used to determine a person's ability to perform a job but is rather a general index as to whether or not an individual will make it through his first 18 months of service. Approximately one-fourth—25 percent—of the non-high-school graduates fail to make it through their first 18 months of service, whereas 9 percent of the high school graduates fail. This difference has encouraged the armed services to seek high school graduates. But any policy restricting non-high-school graduates, is obviously counterproductive for at least 75 percent of them make good soldiers. All entries are qualified by aptitude tests as well, regardless of whether they are high school or non-high-school graduates.

What the Army has now done in this new 179-day provision, so they can get a man or a woman who is not a good soldier out of the Army before they become eligible for benefits means we ought to be able to get anybody in that wants to come in, that wants to volunteer, and then make the judgment as we go along, without making the artificial judgment of high school graduation.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, we are not talking about high school graduation. We are talking about category 4. The record of recruitments in recent months indicates that the Army has been overloading itself and people in these

categories, experience shows, have not been able to make the contribution that we ought to expect from the money we are expending; this is the basis of that action in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Ohio will yield for a couple minutes more, I want to say it is important that this conference report be approved, in spite of the misgivings on individual items that all of us who are House conferees did have.

But it is costing us money every day that we fail to have the 1974 Defense Appropriations Act on the books. That is true because we have directed a number of savings in this bill, in matters which are now going forward, at the old, higher rate in the continuing resolution under which the Department of Defense is operating, and it does cause grave problems of management when the Defense Department, with this amount of money, is required to operate under a continuing resolution.

So, I urge that the House will now adopt this conference report.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions concerning the problems of Project Sanguine Submarine Communications program in amendment 79.

The report says that funds provided are to be available for continuation of effort at the Wisconsin test facility. Is the interpretation of the gentleman from Texas that this does not imply in any way that the primary site is moved back to Wisconsin?

Mr. MAHON. The committee felt that the Sanguine program had not progressed to the point where it should be firmed up as an operational unit, and that the tests and evaluations which had begun and had been in progress in Wisconsin for years could be continued; but not the full-scale development of the system.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, my point is that there is nothing in this language which implies the primary site for further development of Sanguine has been moved back to Wisconsin?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. OBEY. Also, it says that none of the funds were to be applied to any full-scale development. Does that language imply any expansion of the Wisconsin facility at Clam Lake would be in order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would not interpret the report language in that manner. It provides for study, experimentation, and additional study, but I do not think the gentleman from Wisconsin, whom I know is apprehensive about this project, should be too greatly concerned about it at this stage. There are so many other ways of communication that we do not want to go too far with Sanguine at this point. That is the attitude of the committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I agree with the chairman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to

the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) for a question.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the chairman and the conferees on the handling of the reserve part of this bill, which is a large share of the money. Even though the committee has given us a tight budget to work with in the reserves, I believe in my opinion that the reserve can continue to be a vital part of this Nation's defense and continue an outstanding job.

Mr. Speaker, I am a little concerned about the cutback of funds for Virginia Army ROTC units in high schools, and also the Navy Virginia high school ROTC units. In my opinion, these have been very good, workable units. I hope the committee does not act in haste and cut out the units down the line.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I will place in the Record at this point a statement in regard to the Reserves and the Junior ROTC.

As my good friend from Mississippi has indicated, the Reserve components and the National Guard were well provided for in this bill. The original Defense Department request for Guard and Reserve forces was over \$4.4 billion compared with \$4 billion provided in fiscal year 1973. This represents a 10-percent increase in funding despite generally declining manpower strengths.

Actions on the part of the Congress have reduced this \$4.4 billion request less than \$100 million leaving a net increase of over \$300 million. Nearly all of the reduction was related to the difficulties the Reserve components are having in obtaining nonprior—first term—recruits. Most of these individuals were scheduled to undergo from 4 to 8 months of active duty for training. Thus, this category of personnel require proportionately more money than do regular reservists who drill only one weekend a month and are paid accordingly. Accordingly when shortfalls occur large dollar savings are generated.

I would also point out that this conference report agrees to the restoration of some of the specific units which were deleted in the House version. For example, the Navy will be permitted to continue the operation of 30 system analysis divisions and all of the phased force components companies if the Navy desires to do so. You are aware of the fact that the committee questions the need and expenditure for these units.

The conference report also restored 100 technician positions in both the Air Force Reserve and Air Force National Guard. The original bill deleted 200 positions from each. The committee also restored one half of a \$10 million reduction in fuel for the Air National Guard made by the Senate.

I also want to point out that the committee did not reduce or eliminate any junior ROTC units. The committee looked into the matter of the numbers of ROTC units which are not meeting the mandated strength requirement of 100 students. The committee feels that addi-



tional units should not be organized until many of the units which are not meeting required strength levels are either disestablished or brought to the mandated strength.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues also.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT).

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

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, all of the conferees have signed this conference report. Two of the House conferees excepted as to amendment No. 77 proposed by the Senate. One of the Senate conferees excepted as to another section of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to explain our exception to the amendment No. 77.

Amendment No. 77 is the research, development, test, and evaluation, Army section of the bill and the conference report. This program, as has been stated earlier during the debate on this conference report, proposes a total program expenditure before any procurement, according to the House report, of \$1,650,000,000 for a site defense antiballistic missile system, or a site defense ABM system, as it is commonly called.

In the past I have always supported ongoing research and development into an effective ABM system, and I still support that concept. However, I oppose the provision in the conference report to build an extravagant and expensive ABM system which cannot be deployed and probably would not work if it could be deployed.

In the House language of the defense appropriation bill, the House proposed \$111,100,000 for continuation of research and development of the antiballistic missile defense. We proposed and the House passed \$20 million for exploratory ballistic missile defense R. & D. and \$77.7 million for advanced ballistic missile defense R. & D. which latter figure is \$25 million over the budget and above the amount requested by the Department of Defense.

The Defense Appropriations Subcommittee added that \$25 million over and above the budget request, because the subcommittee and the full committee and the House denied the budget request of \$170 million to continue the prototype building of the site defense ABM system. We thought then and two of us think now that this is the more reasonable approach to this item in the bill.

The Senate restored \$135 million and the committee on conference reduced that figure to \$110 million.

Bare in mind that \$110 million is only 1 year's annual increment of the total cost. We have during fiscal year 1973 appropriated and the Department of Defense has expended approximately \$165 million toward this. This \$170 million which the Department of Defense asked for this year was to be the second annual increment into the site defense ABM program which would require over \$850 million for the prototype development and

an additional \$815 million for full engineering.

Mr. Speaker, we held extensive hearings on this in the subcommittee. As a result of those hearings, the subcommittee and the full committee deleted the entire amount requested by the Defense Department for site defense ABM.

The Senate saw fit to restore \$135 million as a part of a \$1.65 billion site defense ABM program. In the event the prototype is developed and full engineering follows, this system, even if it works, will not be deployable, because of the provisions of the SALT I agreements to which we are signatory.

This is a provision in the bill and in the conference report on which reasonable men can disagree. Those who support it think it is a viable program and that it can be deployed and when deployed will work. On the other hand those of us who oppose this program do so, because we cannot deploy it without abrogating the SALT I agreement and because even if we deployed, it will not be effective for its intended purpose.

It is the same old story of hitting a high velocity bullet with another high velocity bullet: You might hit one with one, or even five with five, but when the number of incoming ballistic missiles is increased to 20, 50, 100, or more under the present state of the art the radars and computers cannot differentiate sufficiently to achieve 100-percent effectiveness or anywhere near that. What we need to do is to do further research before proceeding to prototype.

The subcommittee and full committee were unanimous when we marked up this bill and the House passed it. We feel we are going too far, too fast on the unnecessary building of a prototype which, according to the testimony of the project manager of the program, General Leber, this prototype development plus full engineering will cost the \$1.6 billion to which we have referred and which some of us feel should be deleted.

I shall seek recognition to offer a motion to recommit with instructions and such motion will read as follows:

Mr. FLYNT moves to recommit the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11575) to the committee on conference with the following instructions to the managers on the part of the House: To disagree to Senate amendment No. 77.

Mr. Speaker, let me emphasize that this motion to recommit would be totally consistent and compatible with the previous unanimous action of the House, the Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations.

The action previously taken by the House was not considered in haste. It was not an arbitrary reduction but on a decision based on the realities of the state of the art and the foreseeable new developments within the time frame between now and the completion of the nearly \$1 billion prototype.

The committee report on this subject consists of nearly three full pages, and I quote from parts of it:

#### SITE DEFENSE

The Army requested in the January budget \$170,070,000 for advanced development of a new antiballistic missile system

referred to as "Site Defense". The Site Defense system is a new ABM system separate and apart from the presently deployed Safeguard system. Prior to the treaty limiting the deployment of ABM systems, the name of the system was "Site Defense Minuteman". The basic difference in the Site Defense system and Safeguard system is that Site Defense system is a point defense system essentially and the Safeguard system is an area defense system. The Site Defense system would use greater numbers of smaller, less powerful radars and only short range missiles. It would be deployed in close proximity to Minuteman missiles and would provide a point defense of the Minuteman silos.

The treaty limiting the deployment of antiballistic missile systems precludes the deployment of a Site Defense system in the role for which it was designed, the protection of Minuteman missiles, as long as the treaty is in effect. The only location at which the Site Defense system could be deployed under the provisions of the ABM treaty is at the National Command Authority or Washington, D.C. If Site Defense were to be installed at our single ABM site which defends ballistic missiles, Grand Forks Air Force Base, Safeguard missiles would have to be removed. Since we are now in the final stages of installing the Safeguard missiles after the expenditure of \$5 billion, it is not reasonable to propose such a course at this point in time.

The Committee recommends an additional reduction of \$135,000,000 in the Site Defense line item and a partially offsetting \$25,000,000 increase in the amount provided for Advanced Ballistic Missile Defense, a net reduction of \$110,000,000. The purpose of the recommended reduction is the termination of the prototype demonstration of the Site Defense System. The \$25,000,000 transferred to Advanced Ballistic Missile Defense is for advanced development efforts on such components of the Site Defense system as might be considered useful by the Army. If additional funds are required in this area, the funds in advanced development and exploratory development related to ballistic missile defense can be utilized for this purpose if the Army feels that Site Defense technology is of a higher priority than other efforts proposed in these areas.

The Committee does not believe that we should at this time freeze on the design for our next generation antiballistic missile system. If, in 1977, the arms limitation treaty is not renewed, we could take advantage of the state of the art at that time to fully develop a new system. The technology included in the Site Defense system may be far surpassed at that time. If we decide at some point in time that additional antiballistic missile systems are required rapidly, we can further extend the Safeguard system with additional deployments as was previously planned.

The Site Defense program as now envisioned is a program without a home. Under the Arms Limitation Treaty, the system could not be deployed at a Minuteman site where it was designed to be placed. In an effort to find a home for Site Defense, the Army included \$5,000,000 in the budget to study the deployment of such a system at Washington, D.C. Since the Site Defense system involves relatively low level interceptions and nuclear detonations, it is not appropriate for the defense of a city or of an area of population. The funds requested for studies related to Washington, D.C. deployment were specifically deleted in the authorization act.

The estimated cost of the proposed prototype demonstration program for the Site Defense system rose from an estimate of \$794 million late last year to a new estimate

of \$850 million given this year. The Committee believes that if the program were allowed to continue, these costs would continue to rise. In addition, if the prototype demonstration program were successful, it would only lead to a request for a full engineering development effort which would cost at least another \$300 million. Thus, a total of \$1.65 billion is estimated to be required to complete research and development on the Site Defense system.

This indicates that at the present rate of escalating costs, the total development costs would probably rise from \$1.65 to \$2.4 billion between now and the estimated date of completion of the prototype. This figure, regardless of whether it is \$1.65 or \$2.4 billion is solely for prototype development and full engineering development. It does not include any procurement of the end item. The cost of the total procurement cost is estimated to be \$8 billion or more with the maximum figure to be determined by how many additional sites are defended. The report continues:

Another factor which mitigates against the proposed Site Defense system is that the Site Defense system with its necessary radars is a softer target than is the Minuteman missile in its silo. Many of the Site Defense interceptor missiles would have to be used to protect the Site Defense system itself if the system were to be deployed.

Estimates of the total cost of deploying a useful Site Defense system are from between \$8 and \$10 billion. The Committee believes that the time to look at expenditures of this magnitude is relatively early in the development stage. Having done this, the Committee has concluded that an investment of this kind is not warranted.

Mr. Speaker, that is precisely my position today, and all I am asking for. The report concludes:

We have spent some \$5 billion in bringing the Safeguard system to the stage of deployment which it has presently reached. For this expenditure, we are protecting one Minuteman installation only, and estimates are that the system would at best save only a small percentage of the missiles deployed at that installation. At the present state of the art, ABM systems just do not appear to be cost effective.

This was the unanimous recommendation of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, the Committee on Appropriations and was sustained without protest or objection by the House of Representatives. Nothing has changed or intervened since November 26, 1973, the date of the report, to change these facts or my views.

I urge the adoption of an appropriate motion to recommit, in an effort to sustain the House position and at the same time to terminate an ill-advised and extravagantly expensive development of a site defense antiballistic missile system which we cannot deploy under present treaty obligations and which would not be effective for the purpose for which it is intended, even if deployment should become possible by reason of treaty expiration or abrogation of the treaty.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. CHAIMO).

Mr. CHAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I cannot say much in 1 minute about the ABM site defense program which contains \$110

million in this bill but which will commit us to an expenditure of \$1.5 billion. We are talking about building phase II of an antiballistic missile system known as site defense. We are committing ourselves in this bill to an expenditure of \$850 million for a prototype program and it will cost another \$300 million for engineering and another \$8 billion to \$10 billion to deploy.

Our position in this committee and in the House was not to fund the prototype program now but, rather, to continue their money for research and development at least for another year or two until we knew better where we were with regard to the SALT agreements.

Instead of that, as a result of the conference, we are going to give the Department of Defense the go-ahead signal to begin the site defense system, which is a prototype system to be built in Kwajalein and which cannot under the agreement be deployed anywhere in the United States.

I think this is a mistake and a waste of over \$1.5 billion at this time. I urge that the Defense appropriation bill be recommitted to the conference committee with instructions to delete the funds for the antiballistic system known as site defense.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I, too, had misgivings about the funding of the site defense program. It is another payment and \$110 million is a very substantial payment on a program which, if completed, will cost \$1.6 billion. Whether we can continue to justify these large annual increments is debatable. Nevertheless, I voted in conference for the restoration of money for the site defense program.

Had we been able to proceed on our planned program of 12 antiballistic missile sites, there would have been no doubt in my mind for the need of the site defense program. It is a program to make the ABM system more effective. The sad fact is that the SALT talks agreement largely killed off the U.S. ABM program. Instead of 12, we are now limited to 2. One of these is in being at Grand Forks. One, which was well along toward construction at Malmstrom, has been dismantled. We can, under the SALT talks agreement, build another around Washington, the Nation's Capital. There is no indication that we plan to do so. So I am not optimistic about the value of our ABM system. The principal justification for the site defense program is to provide an improved capability in case an expanded ABM system is required at some time in the future.

It is my personal belief that the best defense is a strong offense. There may not be a meaningful defense against intercontinental ballistic missiles. A retaliatory capability is what will count most. I think that the \$110 million carried in this bill for site defense could be spent better for offensive weapons. But there are no plans to spend this money for additional or improved offensive capability.

It is site defense or nothing, at least for the present. The administration and the Pentagon strongly urge approval of the system. They consider it will be an

important asset in future SALT talks and they are optimistic about its value to our ABM capability. Consequently, I support the system. I feel that we should proceed for another year on the program. Then we can take a closer look at its status.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I am voting against this bill because I bitterly object to ever-increasing funding for the Military Establishment while our citizens are being asked to make sacrifices comparable to those of World War II.

The conference committee has reduced the administration's request by only \$3.5 billion, a paltry sum compared to the \$73.7 billion they ask us to appropriate. The cut was mere tokenism.

I also find it appalling that, after the House had voted to terminate the development of Safeguard missile sites, the conferees put back \$110 million for this purpose. This means a minimum of \$1 billion in the very near future for a totally obsolete and counterproductive notion.

Equally disturbing is the fact that \$900 million is specifically appropriated for military aid to South Vietnam and Laos. If the American people are under the impression that the United States is out of Southeast Asia, they should take a long hard look at that item. The money is used to perpetuate President Thieu's dictatorship, to jail and terrorize thousands of political opponents, and thus to prolong the conflict and prevent a negotiated settlement of the war. This is a violation of the Paris agreement, and we have no right to encourage it by continuing our military support.

There are many other objectionable features to this bill, but my chief concern is that we are being asked, for no logical reason, to continue handing the Pentagon everything it wants, while denying our citizens heat, light, gasoline, education, even food. This shows very little change in our sense of priorities.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have consulted with the conferees and written Members of the other body. I am discouraged and disappointed with the conference report for several reasons, but principally the \$20,190,000 reduction in "graduate training."

This cut is devastating in both the current academic year and in the long-term competence of our defense forces.

Because of the lateness of the passage of this bill, the fiscal year is almost half completed. The academic year began in September. A 20-percent cut in academic load will necessarily require that many students, teachers, and professors be withdrawn from schools immediately and even larger withdrawals made at the semester break.

This imposes bad personnel management upon the academic institutions. This reduction, the necessary withdrawal of students, the turbulence in personnel assignments, the degradation in learning, and the lowering of the academic level of the services will cause a vacuum of talent that will cause sequential acceleration of the education gap that is developing fast in our defense forces.

The committees of Congress should

know by now that superior modern weaponry will not be enough to win future wars or to keep the peace or to defend freedom. We are in, and will continue to be in, a battle of concepts, wars to win minds and contests to convince, which will be more important, and difficult, than the conventional wars of brute force and attrition. We will not win or even compete well unless our defense personnel have superior educations and training. We are losing the education battle fast.

A grave debacle for the services is certain to result from the severe cut in appropriations for "graduate training."

One evident reason why the services cannot presently compete with their civilian and governmental counterparts is their educational deficiency. This educational deficiency begins at the recruit level and maintains throughout the officer corps. The deficiency curve rises until the disparity becomes most critical at the junior officer level.

Neglect at the graduate level will most adversely affect the leadership and managerial capability of the services.

In spite of this worrisome comparative deficiency in educational levels, the defense appropriation bill cuts graduate training by more than \$20 million. This is less than a drop in the ocean in a \$74 billion budget, but it will be a cut that devastates the military services.

This cut in budget and training load will cause more family turbulence, more dissatisfaction among career-oriented personnel, and more disillusionment among our most outstanding upward-bound young officers than any other budget cut.

Families already en route to graduate schools must be reassigned, all graduate courses must be reprogrammed by January 1, 1974, and many careers must be abruptly revised. These personal disappointments, inconveniences, and added costs are insignificant, of course, when compared to the comprehensive loss and the prospective degradation of the educational level of the defense forces.

We must pay more attention to education, particularly graduate education, which is the most cost-effective expenditure in the whole defense budget.

Admittedly, the Congress cut the budget and must assume its share of the blame for the consequences of its mistake, but the services failed to justify the urgent need of graduate training for their key officers.

No university, business, industry, or other nation would pay so little attention or apply so little of its resources to graduate education and training without succumbing to its competitors, let alone its enemies.

It may be easy to cut and simple to explain to constituents the mathematical equation of dollars divided by persons and fall away at a large dollar-per-officer expenditures, but we should understand better the value of education, especially a graduate education, in the complicated and sophisticated function of successfully managing the personnel, weapons, and facilities of our defense forces and pursuing the tenuous nation-

al policy of peace with freedom in these perilous times.

Although I regret casting a vote that might appear opposed to a strong national security and peace with freedom, I intend to vote against the conference report as a protest against excellence and against the degradation of the educational level of defense forces personnel.

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

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. TALCOTT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TALCOTT moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 11575 to the Committee on Conference.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GIAIMO. 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 88, nays 280, not voting 64, as follows:

[Roll No. 711]

YEAS—88

Abzug	Giaimo	Pritchard
Adams	Ginn	Quie
Anderson, Calif.	Green, Oreg.	Rangel
Ashley	Green, Pa.	Rees
Badillo	Gude	Reuss
Bergland	Hamilton	Robison, N.Y.
Bingham	Hawkins	Rodino
Blatnik	Hechler, W. Va.	Rooney, Pa.
Brademas	Helstoski	Rosenthal
Breckinridge	Hicks	Roy
Brinkley	Holtzman	Roybal
Brown, Calif.	Hungate	St Germain
Chisholm	Johnson, Colo.	Sarbanes
Clay	Karth	Schroeder
Cohen	Kastenmeier	Seiberling
Culver	Kyros	Stanton
Davis, Ga.	Lehman	James V.
Dellenback	Long, Ia.	Stark
Dellums	McCloskey	Steiger, Wis.
Donohue	McCormack	Stokes
Drinan	Mathis, Ga.	Stuckey
Eckhardt	Mazzoli	Studds
Edwards, Calif.	Meeds	Talcott
Evans, Colo.	Mezvinsky	Thompson, N.J.
Flynt	Mink	Thieman
Foley	Mitchell, Md.	Waldie
Ford	Moorhead, Pa.	Whalen
William D. Fraser	Mosher	Yates
Frenzel	Nedzi	Young, Ga.
	Obey	
	Owens	

NAYS—280

Abdnor	Armstrong	Bauman
Addabbo	Ashbrook	Beard
Andrews, N.C.	Bafalls	Bell
Annunzio	Baker	Bennett
Archer	Barrett	Bevill

Blaggi	Haley	Peysor
Blester	Hammer-	Pickle
Blackburn	schmidt	Pike
Boggs	Hanley	Poage
Boland	Hanrahan	Powell, Ohio
Bowen	Hansen, Idaho	Preyer
Brasco	Harsha	Price, Ill.
Bray	Hastings	Price, Tex.
Breaux	Hays	Quillen
Broomfield	Heckler, Mass.	Rallsback
Brotzman	Henderson	Randall
Brown, Mich.	Ellis	Regula
Brown, Ohio	Hinsshaw	Rhodes
Broyhill, N.C.	Hogan	Rinaldo
Broyhill, Va.	Holifield	Roberts
Buchanan	Holt	Robinson, Va.
Burgener	Horton	Roe
Burke, Fla.	Hosmer	Rogers
Burke, Mass.	Howard	Roncallo, N.Y.
Burleson, Tex.	Huber	Rose
Burison, Mo.	Hudnut	Rostenkowski
Butler	Hunt	Roush
Byron	Hutchinson	Rousselot
Camp	Ichord	Runnels
Carney, Ohio	Johnson, Calif.	Ruppe
Carter	Johnson, Pa.	Ruth
Casey, Tex.	Jones, Ala.	Sandman
Cederberg	Jones, N.C.	Sarasin
Chamberlain	Jones, Okla.	Satterfield
Chappell	Jones, Tenn.	Sebelius
Clark	Jordan	Shoup
Clawson, Del.	Kazen	Shuster
Cleveland	Kemp	Sikes
Cochran	Ketchum	Skubitz
Collier	King	Slack
Collins, Tex.	Kluczynski	Smith, Iowa
Conable	Koch	Smith, N.Y.
Conlan	Landgrebe	Snyder
Conte	Latta	Spence
Corman	Lent	Staggers
Cotter	Litton	Stanton
Coughlin	Long, Md.	J. William
Crane	Lujan	Steed
Cronin	McClary	Steele
Daniel, Dan	McCollister	Steelman
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	McDade	Stratton
Daniels, Dominick V.	McEwen	Sullivan
Danielson	McFall	Symington
Davis, S.C.	McKay	Symms
Davis, Wis.	McKinney	Taylor, N.C.
de la Garza	McSpadden	Teague, Calif.
Denholm	Macdonald	Teague, Tex.
Dennis	Madden	Thomson, Wis.
Derwinski	Madigan	Thone
Devine	Mahon	Thornton
Dickinson	Mallary	Towell, Nev.
Diggs	Mann	Treen
Dingell	Maraziti	Udall
Dorn	Martin, N.C.	Ullman
Downing	Mathias, Calif.	Vander Jagt
Duncan	Matsunaga	Vanik
du Pont	Mayne	Waggonner
Edwards, Ala.	Melcher	Wampler
Ellberg	Milford	Ware
Erlenborn	Miller	White
Esch	Minish	Whitehurst
Eshleman	Minshall, Ohio	Whitten
Fascell	Mitchell, N.Y.	Widnall
Findley	Mizell	Wiggins
Fish	Moakley	Williams
Fisher	Mollohan	Wilson, Bob
Flood	Montgomery	Wilson,
Flowers	Moorhead,	Charles H.,
Forsythe	Calif.	Calif.
Fountain	Morgan	Wilson,
Frey	Murphy, Ill.	Charles, Tex.
Froehlich	Murphy, N.Y.	Winn
Fuqua	Myers	Wolff
Gaydos	Natcher	Wright
Gettys	Nelsen	Wyatt
Gibbons	Nix	Wylder
Gilman	O'Brien	Wylle
Goldwater	O'Hara	Wyman
Gonzalez	O'Neill	Yatron
Goodling	Parris	Young, Alaska
Grasso	Passman	Young, Fla.
Gross	Patman	Young, Ill.
Grover	Patten	Young, S.C.
Gunter	Pepper	Young, Tex.
	Perkins	Zablocki
	Pettis	Zion

NOT VOTING—64

Alexander	Carey, N.Y.	Frelinghuysen
Anderson, Ill.	Clancy	Fulton
Andrews, N. Dak.	Clausen,	Gray
Arends	Don H.	Griffiths
Aspin	Collins, Ill.	Gubser
Bolling	Conyers	Guyer
Brooks	Delaney	Hanna
Burke, Calif.	Dent	Hansen, Wash.
Burton	Dulski	Harrington
	Evins, Tenn.	Harvey

Hébert Mills, Ark.  
Heinz Moss  
Jarman Nichols  
Keating Podell  
Kuykendall Rarick  
Landrum Reid  
Leggett Riegle  
Lott Roncallo, Wyo.  
Mailliard Rooney, N.Y.  
Martin, Nebr. Ryan  
Metcalf Scherle  
Michel Schneebell

ShIPLEY  
Shriver Sisk  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Stephens  
Stubblefield  
Taylor, Mo.  
Van Deerlin  
Veysey  
Vigorito  
Walsh  
Zwach

Daniel, Dan  
Daniel, Robert  
W. Jr.  
Daniels  
Dominick V.  
Danielson  
Davis, Ga.  
Davis, S.C.  
Davis, Wis.  
de la Garza  
Dellenback  
Denholm  
Dennis  
Derwinski  
Devine  
Dickinson  
Diggs  
Dingell  
Donohue  
Dorn  
Downing  
Duncan  
du Pont  
Eckhardt  
Edwards, Ala.  
Eilberg  
Erdensborn  
Esch  
Eshleman  
Evans, Colo.  
Fascell  
Fendley  
Fish  
Fisher  
Flood  
Flowers  
Flynt  
Foley  
Ford,  
William D.  
Fountain  
Frenzel  
Frey  
Froehlich  
Fuqua  
Gaydos  
Cietys  
Chaimo  
Gibbons  
Gillman  
Ginn  
Coldwater  
Gonzalez  
Gooding  
Grasso  
Green, Oreg.  
Grover  
Gude  
Gunter  
Guyer  
Haley  
Hamilton  
Hammer-  
schmidt  
Hanley  
Hannahan  
Hansen, Idaho  
Harsha  
Hastings  
Hays  
Heckler, Mass.  
Heinz  
Henderson  
Hicks  
Hillis  
Hinshaw  
Hogan  
Hollifield  
Holt  
Horton  
Hosmer  
Howard  
Huber  
Hudnut  
Hungate  
Hunt  
Hutchinson  
Ishord  
Johnson, Calif.  
Johnson, Colo.  
Johnson, Pa.  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, N.C.

Jones, Okla.  
Jones, Tenn.  
Jordan  
Karth  
Kazen  
Kemp  
Ketchum  
King  
Kluczynski  
Koch  
Kuykendall  
Kyros  
Landgrebe  
Latta  
Lehman  
Lent  
Litton  
Long, La.  
Long, Md.  
Lott  
Lujan  
McClory  
McCloskey  
McCollister  
McCormack  
McDade  
McEwen  
McFall  
McKay  
McKinney  
McSpadden  
Macdonald  
Madden  
Madigan  
Mahon  
Mallary  
Mann  
Maraziti  
Martin, N.C.  
Mathias, Calif.  
Mathis, Ga.  
Matsunaga  
Mayne  
Mazouli  
Meeds  
Melcher  
Mezvisky  
Milford  
Miller  
Minish  
Mink  
Minshall, Ohio  
Mitchell, N.Y.  
Mizell  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead,  
Calif.  
Moorhead, Pa.  
Morgan  
Murphy, Ill.  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Myers  
Natcher  
Nedzi  
Nelsen  
Nix  
O'Brien  
O'Hara  
O'Neill  
Owens  
Parris  
Passman  
Patman  
Patten  
Pepper  
Perkins  
Pettis  
Peyser  
Pickle  
Pike  
Poage  
Powell, Ohio  
Preyer  
Price, Ill.  
Price, Tex.  
Pritchard  
Quie  
Quillen  
Randall  
Regula  
Rinaldo

Roberts  
Robinson, Va.  
Robinson, N.Y.  
Rodino  
Roe  
Rogers  
Roncallo, Wyo.  
Roncallo, N.Y.  
Rooney, Pa.  
Rose  
Rosenthal  
Rostenkowski  
Roush  
Rousselot  
Roy  
Runnels  
Ruppe  
Ruth  
St Germain  
Sandman  
Sarasin  
Sarbanes  
Satterfield  
Schroeder  
Sebelius  
Shoup  
Shuster  
Sikes  
Slack  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, N.Y.  
Snyder  
Spence  
Stanton,  
J. William  
Stanton,  
James V.  
Steed  
Steele  
Steelman  
Steiger, Wis.  
Stratton  
Stuckey  
Studds  
Sullivan  
Symington  
Symms  
Taylor, N.C.  
Teague, Calif.  
Teague, Tex.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Thone  
Thornton  
Tiernan  
Towell, Nev.  
Treen  
Udall  
Ullman  
Vander Jagt  
Vanik  
Waggonner  
Wampler  
Ware  
Whalen  
White  
Whitehurst  
Whitten  
Widnall  
Wiggins  
Williams  
Wilson, Bob  
Wilson,  
Charles H.,  
Calif.  
Wilson,  
Charles, Tex.  
Winn  
Wolf  
Wright  
Wyatt  
Wylder  
Wylie  
Wyman  
Yates  
Yatron  
Young, Alaska  
Young, Fla.  
Young, Ill.  
Young, S.C.  
Zablocki  
Zion

NOT VOTING—64

Alexander  
Anderson, Ill.  
Andrews,  
N. Dak.  
Arends  
Aspin  
Bolling  
Brooks  
Burke, Calif.  
Burton  
Carey, N.Y.  
Clancy  
Clausen,  
Don H.  
Collins, Ill.  
Conyers  
Delaney  
Dent  
Dulski  
Ewins, Tenn.  
Frelinghuysen  
Fulton

Gray  
Griffiths  
Gubser  
Hanna  
Hansen, Wash.  
Harrington  
Harvey  
Hébert  
Jarman  
Keating  
Landrum  
Leggett  
Mailliard  
Martin, Nebr.  
Metcalf  
Michel  
Mills, Ark.  
Moss  
Nichols  
Podell  
Rallsback  
Rarick

Reid  
Rhodes  
Riegle  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Ryan  
Scherle  
Schneebell  
Shipley  
Shriver  
Sisk  
Skubitz  
Staggers  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Stephens  
Stubblefield  
Taylor, Mo.  
Van Deerlin  
Veysey  
Vigorito  
Walsh  
Young, Tex.  
Zwach

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:  
Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Hébert against.  
Mrs. Collins of Illinois for, with Mr. Carey of New York against.  
Mr. Riegle for, with Mr. Rooney of New York against.  
Mr. Harrington for, with Mr. Dent against.  
Mr. Metcalfe for, with Mr. Arends against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rarick with Mr. Aspin.  
Mr. Shipley with Mrs. Burke of California.  
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.  
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.  
Mr. Podell with Mr. Heinz.  
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Keating.  
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Don H. Clausen.  
Mr. Burton with Mr. Michel.  
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Guyer.  
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Roncallo of New York.  
Mr. Ewins of Tennessee with Mr. Lott.  
Mr. Gray with Mr. Clancy.  
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Kuykendall.  
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Zwach.  
Mr. Moss with Mr. Frelinghuysen.  
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Scherle.  
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.  
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Taylor of Missouri.  
Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Mailliard.  
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Schneebell.  
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Gubser.  
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Walsh.  
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.  
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.  
Mr. Reid with Mr. Shriver.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 336, noes 32, not voting 64, as follows:

[Roll No. 712]

AYES—336

Abdnor  
Adams  
Addabbo  
Andrews, N.C.  
Annunzio  
Archer  
Armstrong  
Ashbrook  
Ashley  
Bafalis  
Baker  
Barrett  
Bauman  
Bead  
Bell  
Bennett  
Bergland  
Bevill  
Biaggi  
Blester  
Blackburn  
Blatnik  
Boggs  
Boland  
Bowen  
Brademas  
Brasco  
Braz  
Breaux  
Breckinridge  
Brinkley  
Broomfield  
Brozman  
Brown, Calif.  
Brown, Mich.  
Brown, Ohio  
Broyhill, N.C.  
Broyhill, Va.  
Buchanan  
Burgener  
Burke, Fla.  
Burke, Mass.  
Burleson, Tex.  
Burlison, Mo.  
Butler  
Byron  
Camp  
Carney, Ohio  
Carter  
Casey, Tex.  
Cederberg  
Chamberlain  
Chappell  
Clark  
Clawson, Del.  
Cleveland  
Cochran  
Cohen  
Collier  
Collins, Tex.  
Conable  
Coulan  
Conte  
Corman  
Cotter  
Coughlin  
Crane  
Cronin  
Culver

NOES—32

Abzug  
Anderson,  
Calif.  
Badillo  
Bingham  
Chisholm  
Clay  
Dellums  
Drinan  
Edwards, Calif.  
Forsythe  
Fraser  
Green, Pa.  
Gross  
Hawkins  
Hechler, W. Va.  
Helstoski  
Holtzman  
Kastenmeier  
Mitchell, Md.  
Mosher  
Obey

Rangel  
Rees  
Reuss  
Roybal  
Seiberling  
Stark  
Stokes  
Talcott  
Thompson, N.J.  
Waldie  
Young, Ga.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:  
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Metcalfe against.  
Mr. Podell for, with Mr. Conyers against.  
Mr. Dent for, with Mrs. Collins of Illinois against.  
Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Riegle against.  
Mr. Rhodes for, with Mr. Harrington against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Gray.  
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Young of Texas.  
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Jarman.  
Mr. Moss with Mr. Walsh.  
Mr. Carey of New York with Mrs. Burke of California.  
Mr. Burton with Mr. Taylor of Missouri.  
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.  
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Frelinghuysen.  
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.  
Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Skubitz.  
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.  
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Scherle.  
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Delaney.  
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Rallsback.  
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Clancy.  
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Michel.  
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Shriver.  
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Don H. Clausen.  
Mr. Reid with Mr. Schneebell.  
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Keating.  
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Harvey.  
Mr. Ewins of Tennessee with Mr. Gubser.  
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Mailliard.  
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.  
Mr. Aspin with Mr. Zwach.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

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

The Clerk read as follows:  
Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 15, insert ", of which not to exceed \$9,900,000 shall be transferred to appropriate accounts under this head for the fiscal years 1969, 1971, and 1972 but only in such amounts as are necessary for payments to the Internal Revenue Service for unpaid withholding taxes, and the accounts in such fiscal years shall be adjusted accordingly."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

December 20, 1973

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 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. 9: Page 6, line 2, strike out "\$1,808,832,000" and insert "\$1,807,832,000."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$1,802,832,000."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 6, line 8, strike out "\$6,133,747,000" and insert "\$6,153,747,000."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$6,214,697,000."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: Page 6, line 18, insert "": *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army may transfer up to 5 per centum of the amount of any subdivision of this appropriation to any other subdivision of this appropriation, but no subdivision may thereby be increased by more than 10 per centum and the Secretary of the Army shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed, insert "": *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army may transfer up to 3 per centum of the amount of any subdivision of this appropriation to any other subdivision of this appropriation, but no subdivision may thereby be increased by more than 5 per centum and the Secretary of the Army shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 7, line 14, strike out "\$6,023,200,000" and insert "\$6,013,683,000."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$6,004,950,000."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: Page 8, line 4, strike out the word "more" and insert "less".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 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. 27: Page 8, line 6, insert "and not less than \$359,919,000 shall be available for the performance of such work in private shipyards."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 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. 28: Page 8, line 12, insert "": *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy may transfer up to 5 per centum of the amount of any subdivisions of this appropriation to any other subdivision of this appropriation, but no subdivision may thereby be increased by more than 10 per centum and the Secretary of the Navy shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed, insert "": *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy may transfer up to 3 per centum of the amount of any subdivision of this appropriation to any other subdivision of this appropriation, but no subdivision may thereby be increased by more than 5 per centum and the Secretary of the Navy shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 34: On page 9, after line 7, insert "": *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy may transfer up to 5 per centum of the amount of any subdivision of this appropriation to any other subdivision of this appropriation, but no subdivision may thereby be increased by more than 10 per centum and the Secretary of the Navy shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed, insert "": *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy may transfer up to 3 per centum of the amount of any subdivision of this appropriation to any other subdivision of this appropriation, but no subdivision may thereby be increased by more than 5 per centum and the Secretary of the Navy shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 35: On page 9, line 18, strike out "\$1,124,154,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$117,192,000."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$1,108,442,000."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 36: On page 9, line 20, strike out "\$1,014,091,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,014,082,000."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 36 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$1,006,332,000."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 39: On page 9, line 23, strike out "\$2,318,938,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,311,568,000."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39 and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$2,304,868,000."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 44: On page 10, line 7, insert "": to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Air Force, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, and his determination shall be final

H 11822

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 20, 1973

and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government:".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed, insert ", to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Air Force, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes:".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 45: Page 10, line 14, insert ": Provided further, That the Secretary of the Air Force may transfer up to 5 per centum of the amount of any subdivision of this appropriation to any other subdivision of this appropriation, but no subdivision may thereby be increased by more than 10 per centum and the Secretary of the Air Force shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed, insert ": Provided further, That the Secretary of the Air Force may transfer up to 3 per centum of the amount of any subdivision of this appropriation to any other subdivision of this appropriation, but no subdivision may thereby be increased by more than 5 per centum and the Secretary of the Air Force shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 49: Page 11, line 12, strike "\$450,859,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$448,159,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$446,859,000".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 50: Page 11, line 13, strike "\$1,650,408,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,456,198,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$1,454,898,000".

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 11, line 15, insert ", to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payment may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government:".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed, insert ", to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payment may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 52: Page 11, line 23, insert ": Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer up to a 5 per centum of the amount of any subdivision of this appropriation to any other subdivision of this appropriation, but no subdivision may thereby be increased by more than 10 per centum and the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed, insert ": Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer up to 3 per centum of the amount of any subdivision of this appropriation to any other subdivision of this appropriation, but no subdivision may thereby be increased by more than 5 per centum and the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 55: Page 13, line 19, strike "\$223,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$222,800,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$221,900,000".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 14, line 12: Strike "\$524,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$523,839,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$524,400,000".

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 16, line 9, insert:

CONTINGENCIES, DEFENSE

For emergencies and extraordinary expenses arising in the Department of Defense, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense and such expenses may be accounted for solely on his certificate that the expenditures were necessary for confidential military purposes; \$5,000,000: Provided, That a report of disbursements under this item of appropriation shall be made quarterly to Congress.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed, insert:

CONTINGENCIES, DEFENSE

For emergencies and extraordinary expenses arising in the Department of Defense, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense and such expenses may be accounted for solely on his certificate that the expenditures were necessary for confidential military purposes; \$5,000,000.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 62: On page 19, line 14, strike out "\$46,100,000 which shall be derived by transfer from 'Procurement of Ammunition, Army 1973/1975'" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$146,000,000, of which \$100,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Army Stock Fund, and \$46,100,000 which shall be derived by transfer from 'Procurement of Ammunition, Army, 1973/1975'".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62 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. 71: On page 24, line 30, strike out "\$2,693,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,470,900,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

December 20, 1973

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11823

In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$2,-720,400,000".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 75: On page 26, line 14, strike out "\$1,605,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,589,300,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$1,542,700,000".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 78: On page 27, line 18, insert "and in addition, \$3,500,000 to be derived by transfer from 'Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army, 1973/1974'".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78 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. 79: On page 28, line 2, strike out "\$2,616,065,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,647,945,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$2,-651,805,000".

The motion was agreed to.

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

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to amend the unanimous-consent request which I made earlier and ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report.

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

There was no objection.

## CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 11771, FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1974

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous-consent request that

was granted yesterday, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11771) making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 19, 1973.)

Mr. PASSMAN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement of the managers be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, in my considered judgment, this is the best balanced foreign aid bill it has been my privilege to bring back to this House since I became chairman 19 years ago.

I am sure that Members would like to know that the conference report is \$53,478,000 below the House bill that we passed with a very substantial margin a few days ago.

The conference report is \$1,212,483,000 below the budget request. This is a large reduction.

There are one or two things I would like to bring to the attention of the Members and that is, in the conference we had a determined group of conferees on either side trying to streamline this bill—not to wreck it, but to streamline it; and make the administrators just as responsible as could be.

I stated in the committee, and of necessity I must restate for the record at this time, that we have actually reduced the administrative expense of AID far too low. They just cannot operate the AID program and administer the program with the administrative expenses we have allowed.

Therefore, I contend that any other accounts can be used to supplement the administrative expenses and other operating costs if justified to the Committee on Appropriations of the House and the Senate.

This is in keeping with the intent of the House and the Senate conferees. I mentioned the Appropriation Committees, because the authorizing committees had previously authorized a higher figure for administrative expenses than that agreed upon by the House and the Senate conferees handling the appropriation.

Furthermore, the authorizing legislation permitted transfers, as mentioned above. In the conference of December 19, I stated categorically that we were denying the administration sufficient funds for the administrative expenses for the AID program.

Today I discussed this matter again with Senator INOUYE, and it is my understanding he concurs with my views, that if the AID Agency can establish that

the amount appropriated is insufficient and can justify additional funds for the administrative expense by transfer, that he would have no quarrel with this procedure.

Now, there is one other significant change that we made in conference, and that is, with respect to the aid for Israel. Members may recall that the House bill called for \$2.2 billion in emergency military assistance for Israel, with \$1 billion being on a grant basis. After, I am assured, long deliberations in the other body, the Senate provided that \$1.5 billion should be on a grant basis and the other \$700 million on credit terms that can be worked out according to the legislation on the books.

I certainly supported this amendment in conference, because when I look at the amount of military assistance we have given world-wide and I look at the very fact that we have never given Israel any grant military assistance as such, I think this is fair compromise. We have made sales to Israel and the record indicates they have never been delinquent on the repayment of any of their obligations covering these credits; so the conference committee went along with this proposal.

I thought we were right, because this nation is, indeed, an ally of the United States.

As I said when I reported the bill, and I repeat here, if Israel should go down the drain, that in my considered judgment it is just a matter of time until all the Arab nations, including 150 million people, would come under the domination of the Russians. With that would go a great portion of the Mediterranean, the Suez Canal, and 70 percent of the known oil reserves of the world.

So in reality, in providing ample military assistance for Israel, I think we are putting an umbrella over the entire Arab world and in due time, I believe it would be accepted on that basis.

At this time I will yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the gentleman to say a few moments ago that in his view there is an adequate funding for the administration of the AID programs? Because of that aid, the administrator would be able to take moneys from other areas of appropriations to use in the administration of the program?

Mr. PASSMAN. The authorizing legislation had transfer authority, but in conference we locked it up to where they could not draw on other funds if they should become short. Knowing something about what it costs to administer the program, I felt we had cut it too low, that we had locked them out and they would not be able to administer the program on the amount of funds we had provided in conference.

I further stated, and I think that is the way the record reads, at a subsequent date if and when they feel that they must have additional funds, then they must be justified by the Appropriations Committees of the Congress. If they can justify additional funds, the committee may draw those funds from other sources.

Mr. SHUSTER. But, they have already justified those to the Committees of the Congress, and this House would not have an opportunity to vote on the matter, is that correct?

Mr. PASSMAN. Not on that part of it. It is very minor, compared with the overall bill, and I think the members of the conference agree with me that we have cut it to the extent that they just cannot administer the program. I am not a foreign aid enthusiast, but I am a realist, and we cannot expect them to administer the program unless they get sufficient administrative funds.

I think the case is well made, and I am sure that when they come before the Congress, they will have to have very good justifications because Senator INOYE is just as determined as I am that we should streamline the program.

If I may return briefly to the question of Israel, I would not want to mislead the Members. We also provided \$50 million in the bill for Israel under supporting assistance; \$36,500,000 for the Soviet Jewish refugees, and \$300 million for military credit sales. So, all in all, Mr. Speaker, may I repeat that I think this is a well balanced bill. The conferees worked very hard to balance the bill out, to bring a conference report back which the Members could support.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee to page 11 of the report, amendment 44. It has language that is unusual, not without precedent but nevertheless unusual. It makes the availability of funds for Israel contingent upon the enactment of authorizing legislation.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct, and the legislation is on the Senate floor at this time, and it is my understanding, and we were assured yesterday by the conferees from the Senate, that this legislation would be enacted into law.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the reason I draw the gentleman's attention to this language is in the hope that a clarification can be made in the event that the authorizing legislation has a figure in it lower than the amount authorized to be appropriated by this conference report.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I respond to the gentleman? If the House and the Senate voted \$2,200,000,000, it is locked in at that figure. The only question is as to whether or not we have an authorization bill. If we do not get an authorization bill, of course, none of the funds can be spent.

Mr. FINDLEY. But suppose the authorization bill in its final form as signed by the President has a figure, let us say, of \$1 billion as opposed to \$2.2 billion. Which will be the limit on appropriations?

I raise that question because in the normal rationale of our legislative processes, the authorization figure is a limitation on the Congress, not on the executive branch.

So, if the limitation placed in the authorization bill is lower than that in this conference report—

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we waive the provision in the bill and the House bill was handled by rule on this floor, then of course we would have to abide by whatever is in the authorizing legislation, because we agreed in conference that we would have to abide by the authorization bill. If they cut the authorization bill to \$200 to Israel, then \$200 is exactly what they will get. They will never do that, though; they will never go that low.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, my second question—and I am glad to have that clarification—there is also a provision in it which purports to establish a limit on grants considerably higher in the House version.

Mr. PASSMAN. No, it does not say that. It says, "not more than" so much will be available for grants. I think that is the way it reads.

Mr. FINDLEY. There is a limitation on grants of \$1.5 billion, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2 billion, as proposed by the House.

Now, here again, let us speculate and assume that the authorizing language holds to the lower figure.

Mr. PASSMAN. Then we would have to abide by the lower figure.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his clarification.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa for a question.

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

I believe the gentleman said something about \$700 million being subject to terms and conditions. What kind of terms and what kind of conditions are we talking about?

Mr. PASSMAN. Under the regular military credit sales program, as I understand it, 10 years is the maximum length of the credits at the ongoing rate of interest. Let me just refer to the report and see if there has been any modifications in that.

The House committee in reporting this bill out, on a motion made by my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), agreed that we extend the terms to Israel to 25 years, and let me say to the gentleman that I supported it, because around the world we will find that many nations, conducting their business, even for commodities, are going up to 25 years. I think it was a good motion, and I hope it can soon be put into effect.

The report language says that in view of the predicted economic difficulties of the State of Israel, the committee recommends a maximum credit repayment period of 25 years for that nation.

I hope that can be implemented fully so that it may be carried out.

Mr. GROSS. Does that provide a grace period, 10 years with no interest?

Mr. PASSMAN. No. There is no concession marked out as such in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. But it is a 25-year loan; is that right?

Mr. PASSMAN. It can go up to 25 years.

Mr. GROSS. It can go up to 25 years. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman, is it not true that Israel owes the United States \$1 billion as of now?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not know just what the total indebtedness is.

I can state to the gentleman that over a period of years we made military loans to Israel for military equipment. The terms have been lower in some instance, but they have never been delinquent on one dollar.

I checked the figures recently, and I found they paid \$218 million to the United States on their indebtedness up to last year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I misspoke myself. I said, "As of now." They owed us \$1 billion before the war broke out in the Middle East; is that not correct?

Mr. PASSMAN. My guess is that it is even greater than \$1 billion.

Mr. GROSS. It is greater than that amount now, that is for sure.

Mr. PASSMAN. They have been able to pay their indebtedness up-to-date.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has a right to be critical of this, but I will tell the gentleman that we have a true ally in Israel, and if we ever let Israel go down the drain, we will find that 150 million Arabs and all of the Arabian nations will come under the domination of the Soviets and Soviet Russia will gain all of those oil reserves, as well as the Suez Canal.

Mr. GROSS. That is, of course, an assumption made by the gentleman. He is entitled to his opinion concerning what will happen, and I am entitled to my opinion concerning what will happen.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is only an assumption on the gentleman's part, and it is based on observation.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not have a scintilla of evidence to back up what he says.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman from Iowa and I do have a lot of fun arguing about these things.

Perhaps I should simply wish the gentleman a Merry Christmas and terminate the discussion.

Mr. GROSS. I did not think the gentleman would want to continue it very long.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, if that is the way he wishes to leave it.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland for a question.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman from Louisiana feels as I do, am I correct, that it is very important that 70 percent of the world's oil supply should not fall under the control of Russia or even under the influence of Russia; is that not so?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, let me say that I have led the fight for the funds for Israel. Of course it is important to keep the oil supplies free from Russian domination.

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



original Senate amendment, under the special responsibilities of the Secretary.

#### WELFARE RECIPIENTS

Mr. President, I was pleased that we were able to reach agreement with the House on language in the joint explanatory statement with regard to special consideration for welfare recipients in filling EEA jobs. I had authored a provision on the Senate floor to the S. 1560, which provided for due consideration for welfare recipients in filling EEA jobs, but I believe the joint statement language adequately addresses my concern. It states:

The Senate amendment requires that due consideration be given to the employment of welfare recipients. The House amendment has no comparable provision. The Senate recedes, but in the understanding that welfare recipients are eligible for consideration for employment, and may be eligible for special consideration under paragraph 7 of section 205.

#### INFORMATION FOR BILINGUAL PERSONS

While a bilingual information provision I authored in S. 1560 as adopted by the Senate mandating the provision of information in appropriate areas regarding public service job availability for individuals of limited English-speaking ability in their primary language was not specifically retained in the conference report.

I believe several other provisions of the conference report express the intention of the Congress in that regard, particularly sections 105(a)(1)(D), 105(a)(2), 105(a)(3)(A), 107(a)(1)(A)(vi), 104, 305(b)(B), and, with particular direct impact for title II public service jobs programs, section 209(2) of the bill.

#### TITLE I—COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER SERVICES PRIME SPONSORS

Mr. President, both the House and Senate bills recognized the overwhelming argument for decentralization of manpower programs. Throughout the last several years that I have worked on this legislation, I have heard innumerable witnesses urge that local communities be free to design and operate their own manpower programs within a decentralized manpower system. There are presently over 10,000 separate contracts which are administered by the Department of Labor under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. Local officials were adamant that this new legislation not make them subordinate to a system operated, basically, by the 50 Governors. I believe the conference report has fully and successfully reconciled all these concerns.

In the Senate version of S. 1559, I authored a provision—identical to one I authored in 1970 and which was retained in the vetoed bill sent to the President that year—which provided, that, when two units of general purpose government both qualified with regard to population as prime sponsors, such as a city within a county in which both the city and the county qualified by population, the Secretary was directed to designate to serve as prime sponsor for the common area, the unit which could more effectively carry out the respon-

sibilities of a prime sponsor under the act. I saw this as a mechanism to limit unnecessary and duplicative program administrators—thereby enabling more Federal dollars to go into jobs and job training—and a way of maximizing the use of experienced program sponsors.

Unfortunately, this time the House conferees were unwilling to accept any such provision, nor would they accept a modification I offered to provide that in limited exceptional circumstances, where the larger unit of government containing a smaller unit—both with an eligible population—manifested a “clearly superior” capability for carrying out the purposes of the act, the Secretary could designate the large unit as the prime sponsor.

I believe that this modification would have resulted in more effective program administration. However, I am hopeful that the Secretary will fully utilize his authority under section 103(b)—the provision which reserves not more than 5 percent of the appropriated funds to the Secretary to encourage voluntary combinations of units of government as described in section 102(3)—to urge such combinations. And I urge Governors to make recommendations for such combinations to the Secretary in appropriate situations as they are entitled to do under the conference provision.

It should be stressed, Mr. President, that this provision is applicable not only to contiguous cities or counties, but to cities and counties in situations such as I just described. I would, thus, very strongly urge the Secretary to urge combinations in such situations before designating as prime sponsor the smaller unit submitting or approvable comprehensive manpower plan, because I sincerely believe that such combinations can result, in many instances, in more effective, economical, and efficient programs.

An example of the type of situation where I think the Secretary could effectively foster such a combination is in Alameda County, Calif.

In Alameda County, there are several communities which will qualify as prime sponsors under the 100,000 population requirements of the conference report—Berkeley, Oakland, and Hayward, for example. The county, in this instance, has had a long history of program responsibility in the manpower area, and up until very recently, administered the manpower programs for all the cities in the county. It would be foolish, I think, to now turn around and designate four prime sponsors where there previously had been only one—necessitating expenditures for four separate program administrations and so forth.

I would hope, Mr. President, that in areas such as this, the Secretary would use his 103(b) incentive money to encourage cities and counties to form a combination prime sponsorship—thereby eliminating unnecessary duplication and waste.

#### LINKS TO REAL JOBS

Mr. President, the biggest single failing of adult manpower training programs in the past has been the failure, with the obvious exception of Emergency Employment Act programs—to provide strong

linkages to real jobs. For too often manpower trainees have been funneled from one “training” program to another.

Because I was so concerned about this, I offered two amendments to the Senate bill—adopted in committee and included in the Senate version of S. 1559 that went to conference, first, providing priority in funding for training programs in which strong job commitments had been obtained by the prime sponsors, and, second, requiring the prime sponsor to follow up on such commitments by conditioning future funding on the ability of the sponsor to demonstrate that it had done everything possible to place the successful trainee in such employment or itself to employ the trainee.

After much discussion, Mr. President, I believe we were able to work out a minimally acceptable compromise requiring that training and OJT programs, wherever possible, lead to meaningful jobs at decent wages. I hope the Secretary will implement this provision in a most aggressive fashion. The joint explanatory statement clearly reflects the very strong concern of the conferees in this regard. It states:

The Senate amendment requires the establishment of program goals, a description of employment and training needs and that priority be given to programs where public and private employers make employment commitments to prospective participants. The House amendment also requires that prime sponsors receiving funds under title II, as well as this title, integrate their title II programs with activities financed under title I. The conference compromise adopts the provisions of the House amendment, as well as the provisions of the Senate amendment on establishing goals and a provision requiring, wherever possible, that training lead to employment providing economic self-sufficiency.

#### LABOR MARKET INFORMATION AND COMPUTER JOB BANK

Mr. President, I was very pleased that the conference report retained the provisions in the Senate bill with respect to the development of more adequate labor market information. This provision derives from a provision I originally authored in S. 3311 in the 92d Congress, which I have reintroduced again this year as S. 793, the proposed “Public Service Employment Act of 1973.” In order to assure implementation of this important provision, I had added in committee a provision mandating a set-aside of funds to begin the difficult and detailed task outlined in the Senate provision. This set-aside was retained in section 312 of the conference report.

Also contained in section 312 of the conference bill, is a provision directing the Secretary to establish a computerized job bank and matching system—utilizing the job listing requirements of section 2012(a) of title 38 of the United States Code, which I described earlier in my remarks—and the title 38 linkup part which I had authored in the Senate bill.

#### BILINGUAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS

Mr. President, I would like to express my appreciation for the able assistance of Congressman BADILLO in helping me effect a good compromise between the two bills with regard to the required components of manpower and employment programs for limited English-speaking

people under the new act. The Congressman had authored a provision in the House bill similar in intent to a provision I had authored in the Senate bill, specifying the components of such bilingual-type programs.

The joint explanatory statement discusses this provision as follows:

The Senate amendment requires the Secretary to establish procedures to insure that programs for persons of limited English speaking ability provide such training and supportive services as will increase employment and training opportunities for them. These procedures shall also provide that programs for such people emphasize occupations that do not require proficiency in English, emphasize technical English vocabulary necessary for specific occupations, train bilingual instructors and otherwise establish, maintain and operate programs to increase employment and advancement opportunities for persons of limited English speaking ability. The House amendment provides that in carrying out his special responsibilities the Secretary shall establish procedures to insure that programs for such persons will increase their employment and training opportunities. The Senate receded in light of the agreement in section 301(b).

Basically, what the conference provision represents in 301(b) are the crucial components of the Senate provision—including, provision of job training services at alternative times, so that presently employed individual would have an opportunity to learn new skills; programs designed to increase the promotional opportunities of limited English-speaking people; programs teaching skills which do not require a high proficiency in English; programs teaching specific English technical vocabulary necessary to the performance of certain occupations; and the conduct in the primary language of participants of programs themselves, and the provision of information about jobs and job training programs, including conduct of outreach programs to enroll those needing such programs, using the participants' primary language.

Mr. President, I think we have a good provision here, and I would hope that the Secretary will carry out his responsibilities under it very vigorously, and promote new and innovative bilingual manpower and employment programs both as national emphasis programs, and to be carried out by title I prime sponsors and title II eligible applicants.

COMMUNITY-BASED GROUPS AND LOCAL  
MANPOWER COUNCILS

Mr. President, in our haste to decentralize the manpower program bureaucracy, I felt it was imperative that we ensure a continuing role for programs and groups which have already demonstrated their effectiveness, and insure that the poverty community had a real voice in program decisionmaking.

I was, consequently, very gratified that we retained in the conference bill provision to require that the Secretary terminate financial assistance to prime sponsors, after full opportunity for a hearing, "failing to serve equitably the significant segments of the population" or "failing to give due consideration to funding programs of demonstrated effectiveness."

We were also able to agree on a definition of "community-based organiza-

tions" which includes an exemplification of several programs which I believe are "of demonstrated effectiveness"—including jobs for progress—SER—a program which I believe should be retained in the many communities it has so effectively served, and opportunities industrialization centers and community action actions, also of long experience in carrying out manpower and training programs.

Finally, in this same connection, after long debate the House conferees accepted a compromise between versions which I and Congressman STRICKER offered to continue the Senate bill requirement of mandatory local manpower advisory councils appropriately representative of local poverty, community-based, labor and business groups, and other appropriate groups and interests. The Senate bill included provisions I authored specifically including representatives of veterans on the local councils, as well as on the State councils to be established under section 107(a)(1), and on the National Manpower Policy Commission, established under section 105(a)(1), of the conference report. The exclusion of this specification was in no way intended to discourage such veterans representation on these councils, which would obviously be appropriate given the great stress placed on the employment and training needs of veterans throughout the conference report, which I discussed earlier.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, we have a bill. We have a good bill. It is one which has been carefully scrutinized. I urge my colleagues to support the conference report—so that we may get on with this so desperately needed manpower program reform.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the chairman and ranking minority members of the Manpower Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on which I serve for the excellent job they have done on this very important legislation. I have had the privilege of working with them from the inception of the bill in subcommittee through conference and know firsthand of the tremendous effort and leadership they have shown in producing a bill which will go a long way toward helping the unemployed and underemployed in our Nation.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I previously wrote the distinguished senior Senator from New York, asking for his support and assistance in resolving the language of the Comprehensive Manpower Act of 1973 in conference so that a local general government such as Wilmington, with a population of less than 100,000, may qualify as a prime sponsor for comprehensive manpower programs. Senator JAVITS has been most gracious and helpful in this regard. I thank him for his efforts.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am particularly concerned with section 3 of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 as reported by the conference committee. This section deals with the transition from existing manpower programs under the Manpower

Development and Training Act and the Economic Opportunity Act to those under the proposed Comprehensive Employment and Training Act.

I interpret section 3 of the bill as reported by the conference to mean that there will be no lessening of manpower training efforts as we phase from the old program authority into the new comprehensive program. I take section 3 to mean that under the authority existing prior to June 30, 1973, programs may continue to be funded up to midnight June 30, 1974, and that they may thereafter run their full and formal course. I also assume that with the language of section 3, my colleagues on the conference committee mean to protect the Federal investment made in programs under the old manpower authority by assuring that there will be adequate staff in appropriate agencies—the State departments of education, for example—to assure that ongoing programs will be adequately monitored and that there will be sufficient program staff to insure the efficient phase-down in programs under the old authority into that of the new.

Fortunately through the past 10 years of program operations under the MDTA, Indiana has developed a fine manpower capability. This resource will, I am sure, be invaluable as we phase into and then get the new comprehensive program going. At the present time the State Board of Vocational and Technical Education is responsible for institutional manpower training. The board is overseeing some \$3.2 million in manpower training programs including millions of dollars in valuable training equipment.

My purpose in seeking clarification of section 3 is simply this: In Indiana and throughout the Nation we have a sizable investment of federally funded resources which were generated under MDTA and EOA. These resources are currently being used to provide manpower training services. I seek reassurance that it is the intent of the conferees that these resources will be fully used, with no fallback from fiscal year 1974 training plans, up to July 1, 1974. I further seek reassurance from the conferees that there will be no decrease in the manpower training effort during the time required for phrasing into the new program under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1974.

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

The report was agreed to. *File*

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on H.R. 11575, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated by title.

The legislative clearly 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. 11575) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year end-

ing June 30, 1974, 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 a majority of 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 December 19, 1973, at pp. H11676-H11677.)

**Mr. McCLELLAN.** Mr. President, on Tuesday, December 18, the conferees on the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1974, after 7 hours of deliberation, reached agreement on the differences between the two Houses.

The total amount agreed to was \$73,714,930,000. This is \$3,535,793,000 under the budget. If transfers are excluded, the net reduction is \$3,032,493,000 under the budget.

This is the goal we sought earlier this year when the Defense Subcommittee set a tentative target figure for defense at \$3 billion under the budget. I believe that we have achieved this ceiling without harm to either the ongoing operations of the military services or detriment to future preparedness.

The conference agreement figure is \$386,379,000 under the House bill and \$450,303,000 over the Senate bill. It is \$1,669,643,000 under the appropriation for fiscal year 1973.

The conference was completely free with every difference carefully considered and some issues vigorously contested. Since there are hundreds of individual items involved, I believe the conferees on the part of the House and of the Senate acted with proper expedition and good judgment.

The following are some of the major items which were agreed to in conference:

**MILITARY ASSISTANCE SERVICE FUNDED SUPPORT TO LAOS AND SOUTH VIETNAM**

The House bill included \$1,008,500,000 while the Senate bill provided \$650,000,000. The conferees agreed on a figure of \$900,000,000 for military support to the two countries. Under the provisions of the continuing resolution there have been obligations of \$470 million through December 14. If the Senate figure of \$650 million were provided, the assistance would have terminated prior to the end of February 1974, assuming obligation of funds at the same rate as has occurred since the beginning of the fiscal year.

The conference agreement of \$900 million will result in some reduction of assistance to Laos and Vietnam during the remainder of the fiscal year yet permit the program to continue.

**AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY**

The conferees agreed to the Senate reduction of \$10.5 million in the A-4M Skyhawk aircraft program which buys 20 aircraft instead of the 24 funded in the House bill. The conference agreed to a Senate reduction of \$11 million in the A-6E Intruder aircraft program, which reduces the fiscal year 1974 buy from 15 to 13 aircraft. The conference agreed to the Senate reduction of \$22 million in the A-7E Corsair II aircraft program, reducing the number of aircraft to be procured from 42 to 30. The conferees also agreed to provide the full amount of the budget request, \$401,400,000, to procure 45 S-3A Viking aircraft. This is an increase of \$66 million over the Senate allowance, which provided funds to purchase 36 aircraft.

**WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY**

The Senate had restored the House reduction of \$14.1 million for advance procurement of the Harpoon missile. The conference agreed to restore the funds to the "Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy" appropriation. The conferees agreed to the House denial of \$12.4 million for the AGM-83A Bulldog missile. The House provided \$26.6 million for the fleet satellite communications system, while the Senate included \$44.1 million for the program. The conference agreed on \$36.6 million for this communications system.

**SEA CONTROL SHIP**

The conference agreed to provide \$29.3 million in advance procurement funding for the sea control ship as proposed by the Senate. The House had provided no funds. The conferees further agreed that no funds are to be obligated for the program pending completion of a designated study and until specific written approval has been granted by each Appropriations Committee.

**AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE**

The conference agreed to provide \$70.1 million for the procurement of 24 A-7D Corsair II aircraft as proposed by the Senate and \$151.6 million for 12 F-111F aircraft as proposed by the House. The House provided \$764 million for 68 F-15 aircraft while the Senate included \$714 million for 60 aircraft. The conference agreed to provide \$736 million to procure 62 F-15 aircraft. The conference agreed to provide \$7.6 million for the E-3A air-

borne warning and control system aircraft program. The House had provided no funds while the Senate had included \$11.7 million. The conference agreed to provide \$32.3 million for a fourth E-4A advanced airborne national command post aircraft as proposed by the Senate. The House had included no funds. The conferees agreed that no further 747 aircraft are to be included in budget requests for the program until the command-control-communications electronics package has been completely developed and thoroughly tested.

**RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**

The conferees agreed to delete the \$26.2 million requested for the submarine launched ballistic missile phased array radar program.

The conference also agreed to provide \$110 million for the site defense program. The House had provided no funds, while the Senate figure was \$135 million.

The conference restored \$22.6 million, which the Senate had deleted, for the SAM-D missile program, thus providing the full amount of the budget request of \$193.8 million.

The House provided no funds for Project Sanguine, whereas the Senate bill included the full budget request of \$16.6 million. The conference agreement provides \$8.3 million with a statutory provision that one of the funds shall be used for full-scale development.

The House bill did not include funds for the advanced medium short take off and landing transport aircraft. The Senate provided the full budget request of \$65.2 million. The conference agreement provides \$25 million.

The Senate deleted \$10 million from the A-10 close air support aircraft program. The conference agreement restored the \$10 million and provides the full authorization of \$107.4 million.

The Senate bill included a general provision limiting the supply of petroleum products to Southeast Asia. The conference amended the language to read:

None of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to furnish petroleum fuels produced in the Continental United States to Southeast Asia for use by non-United States nationals.

I ask unanimous consent that a tabulation summarizing the action of the House, Senate, and conference be printed in the RECORD.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION, 1974, BILL (H.R. 11575)**

Appropriations (by functional title)	Revised fiscal year 1974 budget request	House allowance		Senate allowance	Conference agreement	Conference compared with—		
		House allowance	Senate allowance			Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
<b>TITLE I—MILITARY PERSONNEL</b>								
Military personnel, Army.....	7,211,400,000	7,131,437,000	7,098,050,000	7,109,950,000	7,109,950,000	-101,450,000	-21,487,000	+11,900,000
Military personnel, Navy.....	5,355,600,000	5,281,995,000	5,271,350,000	5,271,350,000	5,271,350,000	-84,250,000	-10,645,000	
Military personnel, Marine Corps.....	1,555,800,000	1,549,452,000	1,547,000,000	1,547,000,000	1,547,000,000	-8,800,000	-2,452,000	
Military personnel, Air Force.....	6,932,500,000	6,886,411,000	6,863,350,000	6,863,350,000	6,863,350,000	-69,150,000	-23,061,000	
Reserve personnel, Army.....	463,700,000	452,408,000	452,408,000	452,408,000	452,408,000	-11,292,100		
Reserve personnel, Navy.....	212,100,000	209,403,000	209,403,000	209,403,000	209,403,000	-2,697,000		
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps.....	67,500,000	61,173,000	61,173,000	61,173,000	61,173,000	-6,327,000		
Reserve personnel, Air Force.....	139,300,000	126,962,000	126,962,000	126,962,000	126,962,000	-12,338,000		
National Guard personnel, Army.....	587,100,000	555,900,000	555,900,000	555,900,000	555,900,000	-31,200,000		
National Guard personnel, Air Force.....	181,500,000	177,500,000	177,500,000	177,500,000	177,500,000	-4,000,000		
Total, title I—Military personnel.....	22,706,500,000	22,432,641,000	22,363,096,000	22,374,996,000	22,374,996,000	-331,504,000	-57,645,000	+11,900,000

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, APPROPRIATION 1974, BILL (H.R. 11575)—Continued

Appropriations (by functional title)	Revised fiscal year 1974 budget request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference agreement	Conference compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
<b>TITLE II—RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL</b>							
Retired pay, defense.....	4,705,900,000	4,681,900,000	4,681,900,000	4,681,900,000	-24,000,000		
<b>TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE</b>							
Operation and maintenance, Army.....	6,401,700,000	6,133,747,000	6,153,747,000	6,214,697,000	-187,000,000	+80,950,000	+60,950,000
Operation and maintenance, Navy.....	6,156,700,000	6,023,200,000	6,013,683,000	6,004,950,000	-151,750,000	-18,250,000	-8,733,000
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps.....	417,000,000	411,645,000	410,645,000	410,645,000	-6,355,000	-1,000,000	
Operation and maintenance, Air Force.....	6,717,100,000	6,532,100,000	6,458,241,000	6,504,294,000	-212,800,000	-27,800,000	+46,053,000
Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies.....	1,478,400,000	1,650,400,000	1,456,198,000	1,454,898,000	-23,500,000	-195,510,000	-1,300,000
Operation and maintenance, Army Reserve.....	260,400,000	255,000,000	253,900,000	253,900,000	-6,500,000	-1,300,000	
Operation and maintenance, Navy Reserve.....	175,400,000	172,000,000	170,750,000	170,750,000	-4,650,000	-1,250,000	
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve.....	11,400,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	-400,000		
Operation and maintenance, Air Force Reserve.....	227,600,000	223,000,000	222,800,000	221,900,000	-5,700,000	-1,100,000	-500,000
Operation and maintenance, Air Force Reserve.....	540,000,000	524,000,000	523,839,000	524,400,000	-15,600,000	+400,000	+561,000
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard.....	524,500,000	518,000,000	510,500,000	514,250,000	-10,250,000	-3,750,000	+1,750,000
National Board for the promotion of Rifle Practice.....	159,000	159,000	159,000	159,000			
Claims, Defense.....	49,100,000	49,100,000	49,100,000	49,100,000			
Contingencies, Defense.....	5,000,000		5,000,000	5,000,000		+5,000,000	
Court of Military Appeals.....	864,000	864,000	864,000	864,000			
<b>Total, title III—Operation and maintenance.....</b>	<b>22,965,323,000</b>	<b>22,504,223,000</b>	<b>22,240,426,000</b>	<b>22,340,807,000</b>	<b>-624,516,000</b>	<b>-163,416,000</b>	<b>+100,381,000</b>
<b>TITLE IV—PROCUREMENT</b>							
Aircraft procurement, Army.....	181,000,000	139,400,000	138,400,000	138,400,000	-42,600,000	-1,000,000	
Transfer from other accounts.....		(21,400,000)	(21,400,000)	(21,400,000)	(+21,400,000)		
Missile procurement, Army.....	569,500,000	514,600,000	525,100,000	525,100,000	-44,400,000	+10,500,000	
Transfer from other accounts.....		(22,000,000)	(22,000,000)	(22,000,000)	(+22,000,000)		
Procurement of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, Army.....	238,000,000	224,300,000	224,300,000	224,300,000	-13,700,000		
Procurement of ammunition, Army.....	1,138,900,000	931,300,000	676,100,000	784,300,000	-354,600,000	-147,900,000	+108,200,000
Transfer from other accounts.....		(46,100,000)	(146,100,000)	(146,100,000)	(+146,100,000)	(+100,000,000)	
Other procurement, Army.....	551,900,000	502,290,000	460,590,000	461,690,000	-50,210,000	-40,600,000	+1,100,000
Transfer from other accounts.....		(27,000,000)	(39,500,000)	(39,500,000)	(+39,500,000)	(+12,500,000)	
Aircraft procurement, Navy.....	2,927,500,000	2,785,200,000	2,646,700,000	2,722,700,000	-204,800,000	-62,500,000	+76,000,000
Transfer from other accounts.....		(106,800,000)	(106,800,000)	(106,800,000)	(+106,800,000)		
Weapons procurement, Navy.....	933,400,000	790,700,000	834,700,000	809,700,000	-132,700,000	-10,000,000	-34,000,000
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy.....	3,754,100,000	3,453,800,000	3,468,100,000	3,468,100,000	-286,000,000	+14,300,000	
Other procurement, Navy.....	1,393,800,000	1,261,000,000	1,202,300,000	1,204,200,000	-189,600,000	-56,800,000	+1,900,000
Transfer from other accounts.....		(45,000,000)	(45,000,000)	(45,000,000)	(+45,000,000)		
Procurement, Marine Corps.....	180,000,000	173,932,000	173,932,000	173,932,000	-6,068,000		
Transfer from other accounts.....		(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(+5,000,000)		
Aircraft procurement, Air Force.....	2,906,800,000	2,693,800,000	2,470,900,000	2,720,400,000	-186,400,000	+26,600,000	+249,500,000
Transfer from other accounts.....		(54,000,000)	(54,000,000)	(54,000,000)	(+54,000,000)		
Missile procurement, Air Force.....	1,519,600,000	1,371,500,000	1,395,800,000	1,393,300,000	-126,300,000	+21,800,000	-2,500,000
Transfer from other accounts.....		(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(+30,000,000)		
Other procurement, Air Force.....	2,004,900,000	1,605,600,000	1,589,300,000	1,542,700,000	-462,200,000	-62,900,000	-46,600,000
Transfer from other accounts.....		(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(+30,000,000)		
Procurement, Defense agencies.....	70,700,000	66,000,000	66,280,000	66,000,000	-4,700,000		-280,000
Transfer from other accounts.....							
<b>Total, title IV—Procurement.....</b>	<b>18,370,100,000</b>	<b>16,513,422,000</b>	<b>15,872,502,000</b>	<b>16,225,822,000</b>	<b>-2,144,273,000</b>	<b>-287,600,000</b>	<b>+353,320,000</b>
Transfer from other accounts.....		(387,300,000)	(499,800,000)	(499,800,000)	(+499,800,000)	(+112,500,000)	
<b>TITLE V—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION</b>							
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army.....	2,095,200,000	1,866,458,000	1,915,908,000	1,912,100,000	-183,100,000	+45,642,000	-3,808,000
Transfer from other accounts.....			(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(+3,500,000)	(+3,500,000)	
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy.....	2,709,100,000	2,616,065,000	2,647,945,000	2,651,805,000	-57,295,000	+35,740,000	+3,860,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force.....	3,192,000,000	2,998,000,000	3,057,000,000	3,042,000,000	-150,000,000	+44,000,000	-15,000,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense agencies.....	479,940,000	461,400,000	457,900,000	457,900,000	-21,500,000	-3,500,000	
Director of Test and Evaluation, Defense.....	24,600,000	24,600,000	24,600,000	24,600,000			
<b>Total, title V—Research, development, test, and evaluation.....</b>	<b>8,500,300,000</b>	<b>7,966,523,000</b>	<b>8,103,353,000</b>	<b>8,088,405,000</b>	<b>-411,895,000</b>	<b>+121,882,000</b>	<b>-14,948,000</b>
Transfer from other accounts.....			(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(+3,500,000)	(+3,500,000)	
<b>TITLE VI—SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM</b>							
Additional transfer authority, sec. 735.....	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000			
<b>TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS</b>							
<b>TITLE VIII—RELATED AGENCY</b>							
Defense Manpower Commission.....			750,000	400,000	+400,000	+400,000	-350,000
New obligatory authority.....	77,250,725,000	74,101,309,000	73,264,627,000	73,714,930,000	-3,535,793,000	-386,379,000	+450,303,000
Transfers from other accounts.....		(387,300,000)	(503,300,000)	(503,300,000)	(+503,300,000)	(+116,000,000)	
<b>Total, funding available.....</b>	<b>77,250,725,000</b>	<b>74,488,609,000</b>	<b>73,767,927,000</b>	<b>74,218,230,000</b>	<b>-3,032,493,000</b>	<b>-270,379,000</b>	<b>+450,303,000</b>
Transfer authority.....	(1,000,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(750,000,000)	(625,000,000)	(-375,000,000)	(+125,000,000)	(-125,000,000)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, this represents the best possible compromise between the defense appropriation bill passed by the Senate and that of the House. There was some hard bargaining and many compromises, but I believe that even when a cut as deep as \$3.5 billion below the budget is made for the Defense Department, it can live with it, and that the research, development and production of the very necessary new, modern weapons can go forward. I support the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN).

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank

the distinguished Senators McCLELLAN and Young for receding in the conference to allow the full amount for research and development, in respect to the A-10 plane which is of great importance both in a defense sense and to the manufacturer, Fairchild, in my State, as it relates to employment, to remain in the conference report as the House had it.

Although the amount was relatively small, to the total appropriation, about \$100 million, that roughly 10 percent made a great difference according to the analysis and the submittal of the contract which I submitted to the conferees

with the support of the local Congressman from that particular area.

It is most gratifying that though the amount is small they were willing to entertain consideration of the matter as an element in the negotiations with the House.

Also I wish to thank the committee for an item which was not in conference but very important to the area. I refer to keeping open the St. Alban's Hospital in Queens which involves tens of thousands of veterans being served there, which was in danger of immediate closing. Now we have a chance to save it by getting

the VA to take it over, or in some other proper way.

I wish again to express my appreciation to the committee with respect to Fairchild and the A-10 program. I wish to name Representative RONCALLO from that area who worked with me in the effort to get favorable consideration in the conference.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for his comments.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. 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. STENNIS. Mr. President, I direct the attention of the Senator from Arkansas to page 18 of the printed conference report, near the bottom, the paragraph which reads:

With respect to the fiscal year 1973 procurement of U-X utility aircraft by the Army and CX-X utility aircraft by the Air Force, the conferees agreed that the funds already appropriated be held in abeyance until this program is rejustified to Congress.

My question is, is it the understanding of the Senator from Arkansas, regarding the action by the conferees, that it does strike out the money and calls on the Department of Defense, if it sees fit to come back and prove its request, if it has one, for an authorization first, by the authorization committee?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Well, Mr. President, the money for that was appropriated in 1973. They were prohibited from spending it. This provides that until the program is rejustified, the Congress—I would assume that means the present authorization—I do not know how Congress can demonstrate its justification except by authorization. I know of no other way to do it.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much. That is the answer I thought he would give me, even though we have not had a conference about this.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know of any other way Congress can authorize spending money except by legislation.

Mr. STENNIS. It was suggested to me that a possible interpretation was it could be rejustified by us merely by going before a committee or something of that kind, which I do not think is possible.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I would assume those interested in the program, when the military defense bill authorization is up in the next session of Congress, if they were interested in renewing the program, would go before the Defense Authorization Committees and justify it, that it be included in a further authorization in the bill, so that the authorization would be restored.

Mr. STENNIS. Either restored or rejected.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. If Congress felt it justified, they would restore it.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much and compliment him as well as the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Young) for the extraordinary amount of fine work they have done, day and night, during this whole year. I know they started working on this bill last December. I have observed some of it. I have not been making my contribution to it, but I know what they have done and the amazing amount of work they have done. We are all indebted to them—and so is the country.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that the very thorough and efficient work of the Armed Services Committee was a great aid to those of us on the Appropriations Committee, which made it much easier for us to determine many of these requests on their merits. We also have the benefit of the counsel of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) as we considered the appropriations. We were very fortunate in that. While he did not get to contribute as much and be present in the Appropriations Committee deliberations this year as much as he normally would, he was very valuable to us in the conference just ended, and we appreciate his contributions there.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I also wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for his competence and for his real contribution in helping develop this bill. Although he was not able to be here much of the year, we did consult with him often, and he was very helpful in the conference, especially on the more involved subjects.

Mr. STENNIS. It is a privilege to work with the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Arkansas.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, December 20, 1973, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1435. An act to reorganize the governmental structure of the District of Columbia, to provide a charter for local government in the District of Columbia subject to acceptance by a majority of the registered qualified electors in the District of Columbia, to delegate certain legislative powers to the local government, to implement certain recommendations of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1529. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements with non-Federal agencies for the replacement of the existing American Falls Dam, Minidoka project, Idaho, and for other purposes;

S. 1945. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, so as to authorize certain grapefruit marketing orders which provide for an assessment against handlers for the purpose of financing a marketing promotion program to also provide for a credit against such assessment in the case of handlers who expend directly for marketing promotion; and

S. 2493. An act to authorize the disposal of silicon carbide from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

#### THE REPUBLICAN REPORT

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, it is customary for the Republican leader at the end of each session of Congress to submit to his colleagues a report on what has happened during the year. Today I submit such a report and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my brief remarks.

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

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that this Republican report, entitled "Congress Rediscovered Itself" be printed as a Senate document, and that the staff of the Minority Policy Committee be authorized to make revisions in the tabulated midportion as of the time the Senate adjourns sine die.

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

#### CONGRESS REDISCOVERS ITSELF

##### INTRODUCTION

Mr. President, at the outset of this Report I must admit that my job has been made possible only by virtue of the fine relationship I have enjoyed with the distinguished Majority Leader, the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD). Our friendship is of long standing, and our close working relationship started the very first day I was elected Republican Leader. I owe him much, the Senate owes him much, the Nation owes him much.

I wish also to commend the vigorous and balanced way the Majority Whip, my good friend from West Virginia (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD), has handled the difficult assignment of keeping the Senate moving ahead on the Nation's business.

On my side of the aisle I am, of course, deeply indebted to the untiring efforts of the Assistant Republican Leader, the fine and distinguished Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN). His help has been enormous, his energy boundless and his sagacity great. The rest of the Republican leadership, the energetic and thoughtful Conference Secretary (Mr. BENNETT), and our distinguished Conference Chairman, the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. CORTON), have likewise been of inestimable assistance. At this point I must interject my own feeling of sorrow that Senator BENNETT and Senator CORTON have determined not to seek reelection next year. Their strong voices of reason and their remarks, always sense-making, will be sorely missed in this chamber. Great thanks must also be given to the Chairman of the Republican Policy Committee (Mr. TOWER), for the capable and vigorous way he has directed the affairs of that committee and the contributions he has made to the orderly process of legislation.

It has been an honor to serve my Republican colleagues as their floor leader. Their fine cooperation and their willingness to help on all occasions have made it possible for me to carry on my job.

##### I

The year 1973 brings to an end ten tumultuous years in American history. At least, we can hope it all moderates with 1973. To go on as we have been is more than even our strong country ought to be asked to bear.

The 1860's and the 1940's may have been bloodier—the 1890's may have had more labor-management violence—

But nothing quite matches the wild variety of shocks to which the American people have been subjected during the decade just past: assassinations of our leaders; head-on

confrontations and racial violence in the civil rights struggle; riotous upsurges of student radicalism; ivory towers toppling in the groves of academe; increasing cost in blood and treasure for an undeclared war 10,000 miles away; resort to violent protest against that conflict; attempts to smash the orderly proceedings of major political parties nominating presidential candidates; vast swings in public opinion, from overwhelming Democratic victory in 1964 to the second-closest election in history in 1968 to overwhelming Republican victory in 1972; pell-mell increases in public expenditures for social welfare programs, together with growing disillusionment as to the efficacy of such programs; sudden and far-reaching changes in moral codes for families, for public entertainment, for personal conduct; luxuriant growth in personal spending habits for "youth" as well as adults; great revolutions in American foreign policy with respect to China and Russia; and finally the drop from the 1972 heights of political popularity of the Nixon Administration as a result of revelations and investigations in 1973.

How will history treat this time? Certainly there will be a more vivid record of it than was available for any historians of earlier times.

Perhaps our instant, minute-by-minute media techniques of reporting everything virtually as it happens have helped make this decade seem so wild, undisciplined, even mindless.

Every crime, every act of violence, every tragic accident, every confrontation of any magnitude throughout the United States (in itself more like an entire continent than a mere country), and the entire world, comes smashing into our living rooms each evening, arouses us in the morning, accompanies us in our work all day.

With it comes a demand for instant solution, immediate reparation, or at the very least, total public investigation.

This ceaseless dramatization of human travail becomes the inspiration for page after page of proposed legislation in the Congressional Record.

It leads to the feeling that everything is collapsing all around us. We forget that solid foundations of civility, human kindness and community assistance still exist. We ignore the thickets of laws and ordinances so long grown to protect family and friend from these terrible blasts of human irrationality.

The one place this should not be forgotten—at least one would so think—is Washington, D.C. And yet I sometimes feel the dramatization of humanity's predicaments has become so concentrated in this District of Columbia enclave as to cause Congress to twitch and jerk in never-ending response. We in Congress were elected not just to reflect and represent; we were elected to distinguish between fool's gold and the real thing, to filter the best thoughts, the most honorable wishes, the finest hopes from the great wash of human utterance and outcry of 210 million people.

Instead, the reverse seems to be true. Beyond the Potomac there is not the same preoccupation with politics and government. That is perhaps to be expected. For beyond the Potomac there is also a calmer, more restrained, more objective attitude toward the Washington dramas of personality and power.

## II

We live in an age that is hard cheese on tradition and precedent. Last year the Senate in its majestic cast 532 record votes, thereby breaking a 184 year-old mark.

Unfortunately for this new record, the Senate this year has voted on so many subjects, and at such a furious pace as to run far beyond 1972. In fact, it could well come close to the 600 mark, which to us, may be considered as something like the magic 1,000 Dow-Jones market average. This means that if the

Senate should lapse into somnolence next year—or exert a bit more discipline—and produce a mere 450 votes (which would of itself be a record only a few years ago) it will nevertheless set an all-time record vote total for a two-year Congress, breaking a mark that stood in solitary "splendor" for 90 years.

What then did the Senate vote on, and why so often?

The entanglement of education, health and welfare programs, of foreign policies and military preparedness, of environment, energy, agriculture, and election campaign reform all stimulated the legislative glands. To this must be added a unique relation in our political history: the Majority Party in Congress has faced a President of the opposite Party since 1969.

Perhaps we should start with this political factor. When the 1st Session of the 93d Congress began in January, 1973, Senate Democrats had an explanation for the contradictions of the 1972 election: they announced that the continuation of the Democrats as majority party in House and Senate, alongside the overwhelming victory of Republican President Nixon, proved the American people did not want "one-party" government.

Perhaps they are right; perhaps not; we may never return to those bad old days between 1938 and 1953, and again between 1961 and 1969, when the Nation groaned under "one-party" Democrat government.

In any event, the clash between Executive and the Congressional Majority has been a great constant in the 1st session of the 93d Congress. It began, and it will end, with the gut issue of Executive Budget versus Legislative Appropriations. But in addition to the President's efforts to curtail inflationary spending, this historic conflict has flared over such matters as "executive privilege" versus the investigatory powers of Congress; the power to appoint versus the power to confirm; the "war powers" of President and Congress.

## III

Disagreement between President and Congress over dimension and content of the budget is an annual affair. Indeed, it would be cause for real alarm if Congress supinely accepted the budget as trundled down from the Executive Office.

The debate was sharper and more disagreeable in 1973 because of inflation. What President Nixon proposed this year is closely related to what Senate and House failed to do last year, and the year before: set limits on Federal spending and root out programs which either were duplicatory, or no longer justifiable.

Some of the proposed program terminations or revisions had been advocated earlier by President Nixon, and President Johnson as well. Congress' response has heretofore been to refuse to impose an overall budget limit, and to shy away from hard decisions on terminating programs. In October, 1972, the task of curbing spending to check inflation was, in effect, thrown to the President by House and Senate. His response in January, 1973, was to propose that the FY 1974 Budget level be held at \$268 billion. To make sure this was a ceiling and not a take-off pad, he ordered the withholding of funds and/or phasing out of programs sufficient to cut current spending by about \$9 billion.

The President justified this anti-spending, anti-inflationary program in broad terms. He argued that he had to execute all laws faithfully; that he was bound as much by laws aimed at fighting inflation, requiring the public debt limit not be exceeded, or determining the environmental impact of programs, as he might be by specific program authorizations and appropriations.

And he could point to "impounding" or "reserving" of funds appropriated by Congress by Presidents from Jefferson to Lyndon Johnson.

As far as can be determined, most such actions by previous Presidents were not challenged in court. Some of the more recent refusals to spend, involved considerable moneys for specific defense programs. Perhaps it would only be fair to point out that one would hardly expect the Department of Defense to attempt to litigate the matter as against the Commander in Chief.

This time the situation was different. Not only was Congress' authority challenged, but large numbers of private groups, of city, county and State agencies, were cut off from funds for which Acts of Congress had made them eligible. Thus when the legal battles began, the cast of litigants and the law in question differed in each case. President Nixon was not the defendant; rather it was the particular Federal official obligated to administer the particular law under which funds were distributed. And that particular law—not a broad constitutional theory—was the determinant as to whether funds were properly withheld or not. In almost all such litigation, the courts have held the funds were withheld improperly, that Congress had made clear why and how such funds were to be obligated and allocated, and had left no discretion to President or Federal official charged with administering the law.

It might then be argued that the Executive has lost the "impoundment" or "reservation" of funds battle; that the powers of Congress have been refurbished and clarified.

On the other hand, early this year Congress enacted legislation placing a ceiling on the FY 1974 Budget of \$268 billion—something it refused to do last year. Even more important, because more far-reaching, committees in House and Senate, after lengthy hearings, have reported out separate bills to improve procedures by which Congress first considers the entire budget and only thereafter authorizes and appropriates.

The whole question of reserving appropriated funds or curtailing programs has proven more complicated than either Executive or Congress realized when battle was joined last January. One measure of this is that although numerous so-called anti-impoundment bills were proposed, and differing versions of one bill were passed by Senate and House, final consideration of this question has been postponed until next year. These reforms are long past due.

Finally, we move back to Square-One: the fight against inflation fed by Federal spending. For this has also been the primary justification offered by President Nixon in most of his vetoes of legislation enacted by Congress this year and last. And despite the solid Democratic majorities in Congress, all but the last of his nine vetoes—that of the War Powers Act—were sustained either by House or Senate. Insofar as the taxpayer is concerned, the veto is the last handle available to turn off the money faucet, whether it be a reckless flow or a ceaseless drip.

The sustaining of Presidential vetoes on money matters is a tribute to the cohesiveness of Senate and House Republicans, and their allies in the all-important battle to save the taxpayers' purse.

## THE POWERS OF CONGRESS

Congress, because it is such a living reflection of America with all our strengths and weaknesses, seems to be subject to continuous disparagement. Our home-grown critics overlook what foreign observers consider most remarkable: that it is still a highly viable lawmaking body. There are few legislatures or parliaments in the free world that can still initiate laws, as well as amend or refuse laws suggested by the executive.

A few years ago—particularly during those long dark expensive nights of "one-party" government when Democrats controlled both Congress and the Presidency—Congress was continually lectured by its critics to give the Executive the powers he needed. The