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at first on a very informal basis but later with very full notes being taken by the committee staff.

REMEMBER TO TESTIFY OftEN
I therefore welcome the opportunity of being able to testify regularly and as frequently as the chairman and the members of the committee consider desirable about the purposes, policies, and programs of the President and the Administration.

There has been some question about whether dual positions of assistant to the President, and of course, those of a manpower to move policy-making from foreign policy in which it was done. I that me to say that whether there were a cause and manner as is consistent with very informal basis but later important, the opportunity of being considered, on the other we are conducting In the late nineteen forties and in the nineteen fifties, foreign policy was essentially to the break-in of Demo- cratic Congress in 1944, and at that time I said that or an orgy of recrimination set in, it might have an effect on foreign policy. There is no question that if the divisions in a country were cut across. I've done for the conduct of foreign policy will be affected. And then, people have to decide whether it is—whether the issues on which they are being divided are worth it.

On this I'm not now taking a position. I'm just stating the facts analytically.

TO INCREASE INFORMATION
So I know the President's Intention in coming to the Senate is to get more and more information available to the Congress. And the President, whom I have seen only a few minutes ago, has said to me that he has a special interest in seeing the range of issues with respect to the range of issues that I have mentioned, the practical consequence of which will be that more information will be available to the Congressional committees than before.

Now a word about the relationship of the department and of our foreign policy to the public. As you know, we are trying to achieve the last peace which we seek and if we are going to leave behind a foreign policy tradition that will be carried on nonpartisan basis, then we have an obligation to explain our philosophies, purposes and policies to the public.

After my confirmation I intend to invite leaders of various opinion-forming ele­ ments in this country to the State Depart­ ment to advise us on how they can most effectively discharge this responsibility.

We will do our best to conduct foreign policy in as open a manner as is consistent with the goals which we all share, which is to bring about a lasting peace.

REMEMBER TO TESTIFY OftEN

The question is whether there were fighter-bomber raids closer to Phnom Penh than 10 to 15 miles. I'll take this question but I'm sure that the Senate will also want to ask about the border that continued in which the sequence of military operations continued across the border, and in the pursuit of them occasionally—but very rarely—some tactical air operations took place.

They could have been deeper than 10 miles, but I doubt that they were very much deeper.

IMPACT OF WATERTAG
Now your other question on the impact of Watertag on foreign policy. The foreign countries have to assess what sort of a coun-

try they're dealing with, how steady it can be in the carrying out of its commitments and the degree of authority possessed by its leaders. The assumption has been, there is a long-term effect on foreign policy.

Our intention will be, as I stated prior to this appointment, to emphasize both aspects of American policy that I agree—to carry out a foreign policy that has the widest possible support on a bipartisan basis. And since I'm confident that that can be done, I'm confident that the effect of Watertag on the conduct of foreign policy can be minimized. I was asked very early in the Watertag affair at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on this April, whether it might have an effect on foreign policy.

At the time, one's knowledge of it was confined essentially to the break-in of Demo­ cratic Congress in 1944, and at that time I said that if an orgy of recrimination set in, it might have an effect on foreign policy.

There is no question that if the divisions in a country were cut across. I've done for the conduct of foreign policy will be affected. And then, people have to decide whether it is—whether the issues on which they are being divided are worth it.

On this I'm not now taking a position. I'm just stating the facts analytically.

CONSENSUS EVOLING
Now it is true that the consensus on which future American foreign policy in the late nineteen forties and through the fifties and sixties in eroding in part because the conditions in the world have changed so enormously. In the late nineteen forties and in the nineteen fifties, foreign policy was essentially designed to prevent what was munism from entirely over-running the world. Today, we are here not as a world power which is one side and the same time we are engaged in— with the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, and on the other hand, we are trying to strengthen our traditional friendship with Europe and Japan.

On the one hand, we are 

adequate defense budgets, and on the other we are con­ sidering our assistance to other nations in the area of strategic arms. This requires a complexity of thought and a sophistication on the part of the American public that was not called for in the forties, or even the fifties.

We've had the legacy of a war that bitterly divided Americans. And that has to be healed. And therefore one of the prime objec­tives of the State Department is to build the consensus in which the American people and the American Congress can understand and support the necessity of carrying on adequate defense programs and disarmament negotiations.

THE MIDDLE EAST
The President has repeatedly stated that the Middle East is an important area, and perhaps the most dangerous area, and I will pursue, under the President's direction, those policies which are considered necessary, and in the past that has sometimes meant a less restrained profile.

I'm asked to conduct the foreign policy of the United States and I will conduct the foreign policy of the United States, regardless of striking exercise of discretion. In a world in which there is no other country in the world in which a man of my background could be even considered for an office such as the one to which I have been called and that imposes on me a very grave responsibility which I will pursue in the national interest.

GRAIN SALES
With respect to the grain sales, I think it is safe to say that major areas of American foreign policy, or let me rather put it, of the American position in the world in which our approach and realities are fundamentally changing may be the grain sales and the entire first term of this Administration, it was considered axiomatic that the United States could never sell too much grain. The entire farm policy and the entire foreign policy as it was expressed—as it re­ lated to our grain exports—was that our housewives will stand in line in Paris for a week waiting for the cruet to be filled if the line is ever asked to testify with respect to this in any event, and no Cabinet committee staff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for morning business has expired.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, POSTAL SERVICE, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, AND CERTAIN INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1974

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 357, H.R. 9590, which will be stated.

To a legislative clerk read as follows: A bill (H.R. 9590) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for debate on the bill is limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader, or their designees, with time for debate on any amendment in the first degree limited to 1 hour and debate on any amendment to an amend­
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On whose time?

Mr. MONTOYA. On my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MONTOYA. 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. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, H.R. 9590, the Treasury, Postal Service, and general Government appropriations bill for fiscal year 1974, now before the Senate, recommends total appropriations in the amount of $4,823,166,000 which amount is $1,014,300,000 under the appropriations for fiscal year 1973; $78,179,000 under the budget estimates for fiscal year 1974; $557,000 under the bill as passed the House of Representatives in the amount of $4,844,723,000.

In addition to the above sum of $4.8 billion recommended by the committee, the bill involves an additional $44,339,-889,000 of permanent authorizations which do not require annual appropriation action by the Congress, and these are listed in the tabulation commencing on page 40 of the committee report before the Senate. The committee has absolutely no control over permanent authorizations which represent commitments made and which must be met. Members will note that the largest item under permanent authorizations is $27.5 billion, the estimated interest on the public debt for 1974. This is an increase of $3.3 billion over the fiscal year 1973 level.

The permanent authorizations also include funds that enable the Internal Revenue Service to make refunds on overpayments of personal income taxes, the Bureau of Customs to reimburse Puerto Rico for customs duties collected for the Islands, payments to the civil service retirement and disability fund, and so forth.

Senate Report No. 378 is before each Member, and beginning on page 42 is a tabulation which gives a complete comparison of the House-passed bill with the fiscal year 1974 recommendations of the President. The committee recognizes its responsibility for the passage of an annual budget that is neither inflationary nor deflationary, and for the form in which the committee has responded to this responsibility is a mark of its dedication to the welfare of the Nation.

Mr. MONTOYA. For the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, previously administered by the Internal Revenue Service, funds are recommended in the amount of $73,000,000, the budget estimate, for fiscal year 1974. This amount is an increase of $6.5 million over the House allowance.

The functions that this bureau performs are of great importance and the committee believes that the full amount requested should be allowed. Further reductions in the Bureau liquor program could severely reduce effective law enforcement in this area and the committee believes that now is not the time to reduce this particular agency.
For the Bureau of Customs, recently renamed the U.S. Customs Service, the committee recommends an appropriation of $221,200,000, an increase of $7,500,000, or 3.4 percent—and 181 additional positions over 1973. Additional vehicles, aircraft, and improved detection and other technological breakthroughs are needed to control more effectively the illegal importation of narcotics and other dangerous drugs; were allowed by the committee.

For the U.S. Postal Service under title IV of the Postal Service Reorganization Act of 1970, the committee concurred with the House and recommends an appropriation of $1,373,000,000 for payment to the Postal Service Fund, a decrease of $86,000 under the estimate.

As stated in prior reports, it is the sense of the committee that Congress made a mistake in determining the scope of the Postal Service and Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund for increases in the Postal Service Retirement and Disability Fund for increases in the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970, and that nothing in this appropriation is intended to disturb that determination.

Like the House, the committee, as in the past, declines to earmark any of the funds appropriated for any specific purpose, as the Congress is no longer in the ratemaking business; however, the bill provides for the transfer of $142,333,500—or half of the request—from the Postal Fund to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund for increases in the Postal Retirement and Disability Fund for increases in the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970, and that nothing in this appropriation is intended to disturb that determination.

The Postal Service insists that the Congress should appropriate for the contribution to OMB means that the Postal Service should pay it. The fact is that a payment must be made soon and the committee feels, as does the House, that the amount recommended is sufficient for the present or until such time as the matter is resolved by the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the Congress.

Under title III—Executive Office of the President—a total appropriation of $249,833,000 is recommended. This is $480,213,000 under the prior year's appropriation of $828,032,000. The decrease from the budget estimate is the fact that the total of $592,5 million was appropriated for Disaster Relief in 1973 and only $100 million was requested in the 1974 budget. Note—Budget amendment of August 7, 1973, proposes an additional $100 million.

For Disaster Relief, the committee recommended $100 million. The $100 million budget request represented an estimate of needed based on the incidence of major disasters at the time the 1974 budget was submitted. Since that time however, 36 major disasters in twenty-six States have been declared and subsequent to the committee's action on the bill a budget amendment was transmitted to the Congress by the President requesting an additional $300,000,000. I will make more sure the amendments in connection with the aforementioned budget amendment.

Included under this title is the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, for which the committee recommends a total of $5,000,000, an increase of $2,144,000 over fiscal year 1973, or 65.6 million over the House, but $10 million under the estimate. This Office supervises and directs drug abuse programs formerly scattered among many Federal agencies and, hopefully, will effectuate a coordinated, unified attack on drug addiction and its degrading effects. The increase allowed over 1973 provides for increased funding of $220,000 and for treatment expansion and new contracts with single State agencies and establishing central intake facilities at several large cities.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

The committee recommends an appropriation of $19,100,000 for the Office of Management and Budget, a decrease of $500,000 under the prior year's appropriation, and a decrease of $500,000 in the amount requested.

Certain management and policy functions together with personnel were transferred from the Office of Management and Budget to the General Services Administration pursuant to Executive Order 11717 of May 9, 1973. The total annual cost of the transfer is estimated at approximately $1,000,000. OMB did not make corresponding adjustments in its budget request and personnel ceiling. The committee has therefore included in its consideration in making its recommendation and feels that the funds recommended are sufficient to continue the employment of personnel at last year's level.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

For agencies under title IV—General Government—a total appropriation of $1,454,131,000 is recommended. This is $564,394,000 under the prior year's appropriation. This large reduction results from the change in funding for Federal construction projects from direct appropriations to lease purchase contracts and from increases in pay and retirement benefits authorized for Federal employees on or after May 1, 1971.

The Postal Service insists that the Congress should appropriate for the contribution to OMB means that the Postal Service should pay it. The fact is that a payment must be made soon and the committee feels, as does the House, that the amount recommended is sufficient for the present or until such time as the matter is resolved by the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the Congress.

Under title III—Executive Office of the President—a total appropriation of $249,833,000 is recommended. This is $480,213,000 under the prior year's appropriation of $828,032,000. The decrease from the budget estimate is the fact that the total of $592,5 million was appropriated for Disaster Relief in 1973 and only $100 million was requested in the 1974 budget. Note—Budget amendment of August 7, 1973, proposes an additional $100 million.

For Disaster Relief, the committee recommended $100 million. The $100 million budget request represented an estimate of needed based on the incidence of major disasters at the time the 1974 budget was submitted. Since that time however, 36 major disasters in twenty-six States have been declared and subsequent to the committee's action on the bill a budget amendment was transmitted to the Congress by the President requesting an additional $300,000,000. I will make more sure the amendments in connection with the aforementioned budget amendment.

Included under this title is the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, for which the committee recommends a total of $5,000,000, an increase of $2,144,000 over fiscal year 1973, or 65.6 million over the House, but $10 million under the estimate. This Office supervises and directs drug abuse programs formerly scattered among many Federal agencies and, hopefully, will effectuate a coordinated, unified attack on drug addiction and its degrading effects. The increase allowed over 1973 provides for increased funding of $220,000 and for treatment expansion and new contracts with single State agencies and establishing central intake facilities at several large cities.
and space and for overall direction of buildings, design, construction, and repair and improvement of public buildings.

The sum of $82 million is also recommended. The committee has recommended that the House in favor of the Senate's recommendation as to the House's order, and in addition, it made a proportionate cut of $10.3 million under the 1973 "Construction" account balance.

CONSTRUCTION

For the "Construction" account, the committee recommends the budget estimates, appropriations, and obligations for the past fiscal year. The funds are derived from existing funds in this account for two border stations—one in Alaska and the other at San Diego; and for two Federal building projects—one in Fayetteville, Ark. and the other at Buffalo, N.Y. The House recommended the $82 million be derived from unobligated 1973 "Construction" account balance.

DEFENSE CIVIL PREPAREDNESS AGENCY

The committee recommends $50 million, a reduction of $10.3 million under 1973, and $14.1 million under 1974 appropriation, whereas the Senate recommended that the projects be constructed by direct appropriation, whereas the Senate recommended that the 1973 "Construction" account balance.

REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

The sum of $82 million is also recommended. The committee recommends that the $82 million be derived from unobligated funds from construction, as requested.

Mr. MONDALE. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. President, I have a question with respect to the unanimous-consent request. As I understand it, the action taken by the committee on page 9, following the word "available" the following language was struck by the committee, "after approval by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations..."

I was wondering whether the distinguished Senator from New Mexico would exclude that provision from his unanimous-consent request that the amendments be agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MONDALE. As I understand it, I think I would be free to move to strike. However, I prefer not to have it in the first place, which is why I asked the distinguished floor manager of the bill to act that matter separately.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I believe that under my request the September 5, 1973
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shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this order. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota can make further inquiry concerning his position on this matter.

Mr. MONDALE. That would be satisfactory.

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, before commenting directly on the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government appropriations bill, I would like to thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, for his diligent work and leadership on the full committee. Without his experience and knowledge it is doubtful that the bill would have reached the floor in such fine form. While there are few monumental new programs in this bill, we must remember that without the functions funded in this bill there would be no funds to finance expenditures of the other agencies and branches of the Federal Government, including our own. Spending programs which are not a part of appropriations bills would be meaningless without the funds authorized in this appropriations bill.

Funds for the operations of the White House are found in this bill. Funds for the Executive Office of the President have become controversial this year because of the Watergate hearings, the impoundment question, and the questions of executive privilege. We must not lose sight of the fact that this branch of Government is an equal branch of Government entitled to the funds necessary to provide the services on which the Nation so greatly depends. The funds for such purposes as the Domestic Council, the National Security Council, the emergency fund for the President, the Office of Management and Budget, and the funds for, and the salaries of the President and the Vice President are all included in this bill.

While in this year there are political overtones surrounding these funds, we should not lose sight of the fact that these are the funds of the President's advisors. The advisors to which the President must rely, if he is to assimilate the vast amounts of information which goes into decisionmaking by that branch of Government. Aside from these operations, which have had more than a passing interest these days, there are funds for projects which affect the lives of all Americans, such as drug abuse prevention and national disasters.

By and large we are considering today the funds for the general governmental activities of the Federal Establishment—the levying and collection of taxes, the performance of Federal business, the personnel management and retirement programs of the Civil Service Commission and the general housekeeping and oversight responsibilities assigned to the General Services Administrations. We ask them to finance and implement the policies established by various departments and agencies of the Government. While the chairman of the subcommittee has outlined the various provisions of this bill and I will not...
delay by going over many of these matters a second time, there are a few items that are noteworthy of further elaboration and I will take just a few minutes to cover.

First of all, there is an item which concerns the subcommittee, particularly the senior Senator from Oregon (Mr. HARPERS), and myself, who are both ex-Governors. The subcommittee recommended an almost 20 percent reduction of the funding of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, although now defunct, was to deal with natural disasters. Many of these functions have been completed, and many of them are worthless relics of the cold war and can in all likelihood be reduced much further than the 19 percent. Therefore, the committee has made the first move in recommending a significant reduction now, and we intend to hold oversight hearings in the near future to examine these programs and their continuing need.

The committee has recommended an appropriation of $19.1 million for the salaries and expenses of the Office of Management and Budget. This is a decrease of $500,000 under the budget estimate from the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1971. Made this reduction because of the transfers of personnel to the General Services Administration which has made this reduction in funding possible. There has been some discussion that one of the functions of this Congress should be to make OMB tighten its belt just as it has worked to hold down the cost of programs which we have recommended in the past.

Mr. President, this is not the way to run a responsible Government. It would not be in the best interests of the taxpayers of this country. The General Accounting Office has pointed out that OMB must play a strong leadership role in the improvement of financial management of the executive branch of Government. When we consider that 20 years ago this same agency had over 400 employees and was the sole agency for overseeing a $70 billion budget, the relatively new growth of OMB becomes apparent. Today, the same agency is responsible for a budget nearly four times as large, yet it has only 628 employees. In light of the bulging Federal bureaucracy, the Office of Management and Budget should be commended for holding down the size of their agency. Because there is disenchanted with some of the policies of OMB we should not act unwisely and cut their appropriations further.

Let me conclude my remarks by urging the Senate to adopt the bill which the committee has sent you after weeks of hearings and deliberations.

I again commend the distinguished Chairman of this Committee for the firm, fair, and methodical manner in which he has presided over the development of this legislation.

Mr. MONTJOY. Mr. President, I would like to inquire further of the Senator from Minnesota if he has changed his position on the floor.

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, I withdraw my inquiry.

Mr. MONTJOY. I renew my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc, and the bill as thus amended will be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The amendments agreed to on page 12, strike out "For expenses necessary to enable the Vice President to provide assistance to the President in connection with specially assigned functions, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem equivalent of the rate for grade GS-18, compensation for one position at a rate of $140,000; and Federal office building, Payetteville, Arkansas, $140,000; and Federal office building, Buffalo, New York, $600,000; to remain available until expended" and insert "An amount of $2,572,000 heretofore appropriated under this heading shall be available until expended for construction, pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1969, as amended (40 U.S.C. 601-615), in addition to the amounts appropriated for such projects, $2,572,000, as follows: Border Station, Alaska Highway, Alaska, $732,000; courthouse and Federal office, Fairbanks, Alaska, $140,000; Border Station, San Diego, California, $1,100,000; and Federal office building, Buffalo, New York, $600,000; to remain available until expended" and insert "An amount of $2,572,000 heretofore appropriated under this heading shall be available until expended for construction, pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1969, as amended (40 U.S.C. 601-615), and shall be in addition to the sums heretofore appropriated for such projects, as follows: Border Station, Alaska Highway, Alaska, $732,000; courthouse and Federal office building, Payetteville, Arkansas, $140,000; Border Station, San Diego, California, $1,100,000; and Federal office building, Buffalo, New York, $600,000; to remain available until expended for construction, pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1969, as amended (40 U.S.C. 601-615), and shall be in addition to the sums heretofore appropriated for such projects, as follows: Border Station, Alaska Highway, Alaska, $732,000; courthouse and Federal office building, Payetteville, Arkansas, $140,000; Border Station, San Diego, California, $1,100,000; and Federal office building, Buffalo, New York, $600,000; to remain available until expended".

On page 10, line 22, strike out "For expenses necessary to enable the Vice President to provide assistance to the President in connection with specially assigned functions, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem equivalent of the rate for grade GS-18, compensation for one position at a rate of $140,000; and Federal office building, Payetteville, Arkansas, $140,000; and Federal office building, Buffalo, New York, $600,000; to remain available until expended" and insert "An amount of $2,572,000 heretofore appropriated under this heading shall be available until expended for construction, pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1969, as amended (40 U.S.C. 601-615), and shall be in addition to the sums heretofore appropriated for such projects, as follows: Border Station, Alaska Highway, Alaska, $732,000; courthouse and Federal office building, Payetteville, Arkansas, $140,000; Border Station, San Diego, California, $1,100,000; and Federal office building, Buffalo, New York, $600,000; to remain available until expended".

On page 21, line 16, after the word "service", strike out "$33,230,000" and insert "$33,230,000".

On page 17, line 5, after the word "moving", strike out "$380,582,000" and insert "$480,582,000", of which $100,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation made in the Independent Agencies Appropriation Act, 1973, for "Construction, Public Buildings Projects"; and, in line 9, after the word "available", strike out the comma and "after approval by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, of the President, to be accounted for solely on his certificate".

On page 18, line 14, after the word "vehicles", strike out "$200,000" and insert "$240,000".

On page 17, line 5, after the word "mowing", strike out "$380,582,000" and insert "$480,582,000", of which $100,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation made in the Independent Agencies Appropriation Act, 1973, for "Construction, Public Buildings Projects"; and, in line 9, after the word "available", strike out the comma and "after approval by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, of the President, to be accounted for solely on his certificate.".

On page 18, line 14, after the word "vehicles", strike out "$200,000" and insert "$240,000".

On page 17, line 5, after the word "mowing", strike out "$380,582,000" and insert "$480,582,000", of which $100,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation made in the Independent Agencies Appropriation Act, 1973, for "Construction, Public Buildings Projects"; and, in line 9, after the word "available", strike out the comma and "after approval by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, of the President, to be accounted for solely on his certificate.".

On page 18, line 14, after the word "vehicles", strike out "$200,000" and insert "$240,000".

On page 17, line 5, after the word "mowing", strike out "$380,582,000" and insert "$480,582,000", of which $100,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation made in the Independent Agencies Appropriation Act, 1973, for "Construction, Public Buildings Projects"; and, in line 9, after the word "available", strike out the comma and "after approval by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, of the President, to be accounted for solely on his certificate.".

On page 18, line 14, after the word "vehicles", strike out "$200,000" and insert "$240,000".

On page 17, line 5, after the word "mowing", strike out "$380,582,000" and insert "$480,582,000", of which $100,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation made in the Independent Agencies Appropriation Act, 1973, for "Construction, Public Buildings Projects"; and, in line 9, after the word "available", strike out the comma and "after approval by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, of the President, to be accounted for solely on his certificate.".
further, That any person making a false claim shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both: Provided further, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provision of law.”

On page 25, line 14, after the word “activities”, strike out “$3,370,000” and insert “$3,000,000”.

On page 25, line 16, after the word “exceed”, strike out “$40,000,000” and insert “$44,703,000”.

On page 27, after line 21, insert:

"SEC. 610. Funds made available by this Act or any other Act to the Postal Service pursuant to section 3 of the Postal Service Fund (39 U.S.C. 2003), shall be available for employment of guards for all buildings and areas owned or occupied by the United States or the Postal Service and under the charge and control of the General Services Administration or the Postal Service, and such guards shall have, with respect to such property, the powers of special policemen provided by the first section of the Act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281; 40 U.S.C. 318), but shall not be re­stricted to the performance of duties otherwise required by the proviso contained in said section, and, as to property owned or occupied by the Postal Service, the Postmaster General may, in person or by any such person .shall be available for employment of guards for all buildings, and areas owned or occupied by the United States or the Postal Service and under the charge and control of the General Services Administration or the Postal Service, and such guards shall have, with respect to such property, the powers of special policemen provided by the first section of the Act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281; 40 U.S.C. 318)."

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I have a series of amendments affecting the appropriation for the Executive Office of the President. May I say, before I call up any of these amendments, how deeply I respect the excellent work of the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee (Mr. MONDALE) and the fine staff which the chairman has assembled? I support that bill, though I think it involves, in terms of the Executive Office, severe policy questions which have been brought to our attention in exacerbating detail during the Watergate hearings, under the chairmanship of Senator ERVIN.

The first amendment I shall call up affects the budget for the so-called Domestic Council. I call up that amendment, which is cosponsored by the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABOUREZK), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JORDAN) at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 8, line 4, strike out “$1,100,000” and insert “$350,000”.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, do I correctly understand we are under controlled time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. Liddy was on the staff as a "staff
assistant" from July through December of 1971, at an annual rate of $25,867. While Krogh was on the staff, he was carried as the deputy director of the executive branch by John Ehrlichman, and took direct charge of the "plumbers" operation, including the burlarizing of the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist.

While Liddy was on the staff, he was a member of the plumbers' team, and actually was burlarizing the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist's office. In addition, since he outlined his entire $1 million espionage plan on January 27, 1972, Liddy—who was on the Domestic Council payroll as late as December 10, 1971, was involved in developing this plan while on the Cabinet staff.

...We in Congress, in my opinion, must bear part of the blame for these developments, because when we look at the history of the creation of the Council and the history of the money we provided for its operation, we can only come to the conclusion that we gave it to the Executive at its request without legislative authority, without requiring any of its officers to be confirmed or made accountable to Congress. We permitted the creation of this very important Executive agency which the President was to create under the principle of the separation of powers as defined by the President, and beyond, the fact finding efforts of Congress, under the doctrine of Executive privilege, once again as defined by this President.

Although the Domestic Council never had permanent statutory authorization from the Congress, we have continued to appropriate virtually every dime which the President has asked for since the Council was organized in mid-1972, without determining how it was being used, who was being paid what, what they were doing, and what kind of product was being achieved for the benefit of the American public. Originally intended to perform strictly coordination functions, for the President the Domestic Council became a combination propaganda agency and decision-making headquarters which left Cabinet agencies behind and which showed no respect for congressional prerogatives in the domestic policy area.

As much as any Member of this body, in the 9 years I have been here, I have been deeply engaged in what I call human problems. I suggest, in that regard, that I have repeatedly met with Cabinet officers and with sub-Cabinet officers in House or Senate to explain and understand with these Cabinet officers, and time after time, I came to the conclusion that Cabinet officers more often than not are merely front and did not possess the capability or the responsibility to determine the true course of action and the policies in those areas which we call domestic policy, but, in fact, those powers were being exercised by a body far beyond the reach and powers of Congress.

Mr. Ehrlichman's successor as Executive Director was Kenneth Cole, Jr.—admitted this in testifying this year before a House appropriations subcommittee.

I think it is possible with a staff of the size that we had perhaps the staff was doing more than perhaps the Cabinet officers were doing, or perhaps the staff was doing more than it ought to be doing.

When the President announced this year's budget request, he noted the Domestic Council in some million dollar in size. In fact, a reduction from 66 to 30 permanent employees was envisioned in the President's budget request for the Council. This, the President stated, was part of an effort to decentralize power back into the Cabinet agencies.

As indicated earlier in connection with the National Security Council, I believe this shift in functions is long overdue. However, I question whether it in fact has been accomplished. Indeed, since Mr. Ehrlichman left and Mr. Cole replaced him there have been continued indications that the Domestic Council is still overlooking its supposed function, and must be cut back still further.

At a January 17 hearing of the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee, the committee released a letter from Mr. Cole to the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. Sparkman). The letter said: "It takes more than a few million dollars of the Nation's subsidized housing programs..."

It contained threats to stop all water and sewer grant commitments until housing programs were folded into a revenue-sharing proposal, prompting the distinguished Senator from Oregon (Mr. Packwood) to state that the letter "almost smacks of blackmail.

Then, on February 27, 1973, the Washington Post reported that

The White House plans to mobilize pro-administration mayors in an effort to counter criticism from the League of Cities and local government officials that federal budget reductions are forcing cutbacks in urban programs.

The Post continued:

Kenneth R. Cole, Jr., executive director of the administration's Domestic Council, said yesterday that he would meet with mayors and city officials to explain what he called "New Federalism" in an effort to "get our story out.

Mr. President, I do not believe that an office within the White House which at this time was maintaining liaison with State and local government officials had any business conducting what amounted to a lobbying effort on behalf of the administration. Once again, I appeared that Mr. Cole and the Domestic Council in general were overstepping the proper boundaries of their assigned functions.

Finally, of this year, Time magazine reported that

The White House Domestic Council is cracking up again under the supervision of Ehrlichman's replacement Kenneth Cole. Last week, Cole was reading revisions of the bill to set up an independent corporation to handle legal services for the poor.

Mr. President, I do not know how many hours I have spent with so-called representatives of the administration in getting the agreement and passed bills which seemed to reflect what we agreed on, only to find them vetoed by the President with rhetoric entirely dissimilar to that which we heard before.

Mr. President, for 3 years I have worked hard in the Senate to create an independent Legal Services Corporation which would truly serve the needs of the Nation. In fact, I think the head of an office who need not be confirmed by the Senate apparently had a major role in shaping legislation which will be of tremendous impact to millions upon millions of the Nation's poor. This is not accountability in government. This is a policy to be usurped by those with no loyalty to anyone but the President, an office elected by no one, responsible to no one, accountable to no one except the President of the United States.

I believe that policy must be stopped.

Mr. President, in view of the lack of statutory authorization for the Domestic Council, in view of the presence of Egil Krogh and Gordon Liddy on the Council payroll for significant periods of time—in view of the usurpation of power in which John Ehrlichman and now Kenneth Cole appear to have engaged—

I believe that we really should not appropriate any money at all for this Council.

Although the Council was created, there were no extensive hearings in either the House or the Senate to review the bill and what it meant; and there was never a bill introduced in Congress to create such a Council. The Council was created by Executive order. We acceded to it. The White House under Nixon over the last 2 or 3 years, and it was appropriated on the ground that they wanted it.

However, I recognize the need for this President and any President to have to hire staff assistants outside the agencies and departments. Therefore, I am proposing a steep cut in the appropriation for the Council from $1.1 million to $500,000. This cut of two-thirds would reduce the staff of the Council from 20 to 10. If there is a need for coordination of proposals among Cabinet agencies, let it be done by a small staff. Hopefully, the size of the staff, if reduced, will assure that they stick to the functions originally outlined in the President's Executive order.

Perhaps more important, I urge that this be the last appropriation for the Domestic Council until and unless the President submits legislation to Congress to establish this Council on a permanent statutory basis.

I might point to the parallel agency that this Council, the Council for International Economic Policy, under Mr. Peter Flanagan. Legislation was submitted to Congress; it was considered; hearings were held; changes were made; debates were held on the proposal, and the legislation was passed. That way, Congress had an opportunity to understand and appreciate each other, and there is an equality of power as it affects the operation of that body.

The Domestic Council was created in an entirely different way, completely lacking accountability to Congress. I think it is lack of accountability that explains Watergate: limitless amounts of money granted with no hearings, no oversight; authority granted with no thorough consideration of where it would lead; special projects funds granted,
with no accountability; no request even stating the general purposes for which it was needed or meant.

With these funds, with these tremendous increases in staff, a President was able to assemble a group of people under him who were known to be the worst political scandal in American public life. Part of that began when we granted these authorities and appropriated these moneys and set up these new staffs, safely hidden in the White House, with no accountability for what protection they asserted, so that they were accountable to no one. Not only did they have the money, but also they were encouraged to believe that they could do anything they wanted with it, and that is exactly what they did. Practically anything they could think of, they thought of and did.

We must return accountability to Government. The President has stated that he wishes to do it. If this is indeed the case, I believe that this cut in appropriations, the Domestic Council will indicate to him that Congress shares this sentiment and will insist on substantive reforms before blindly continuing to appropriate requested amounts to offices within the White House.

MONToya. I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, I am in sympathy with most of what the Senator from Minnesota has said with respect to his amendment. However, I cannot stand here and say that I am in favor of his amendment as proposed.

During the course of the hearings, I was very much aware that some of the funds appropriated to the Domestic Council had been misspent or misused. I made serious inquiry during the course of the hearings as to the use of these funds, and I am happy to note that my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota, cited as justification for his position some of the testimony which I elicited.

I ask those who presented the budget for the White House to give me the complete detail as to who was on the payroll since the inception of the Domestic Council in 1970. Only two of the employees appear to have gotten into trouble, and they were paid out of the funds allocated to the Domestic Council. They appear to be Mr. Egil Krogh, as the distinguished floor manager made, and Mr. G. Gordon Liddy. It boiled down to this: We in the committee considered this particular problem. We considered the testimony adduced during the course of the hearings.

I made serious inquiry during the course of the hearings as to the use of these funds, and I am happy to note that my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota, cited as justification for his position some of the testimony which I elicited. I ask those who presented the budget for the White House to give me the complete detail as to who was on the payroll since the inception of the Domestic Council in 1970. Only two of the employees appear to have gotten into trouble, and they were paid out of the funds allocated to the Domestic Council. They appear to be Mr. Egil Krogh, as the distinguished floor manager made, and Mr. G. Gordon Liddy. It boiled down to this: We in the committee considered this particular problem. We considered the testimony adduced during the course of the hearings. It was presented from the Subcommittee on Appropriations, as well as that of the full committee, that we should not avail ourselves of the power of the purse here, on this occasion, and try to level some kind of retribution on the Office of the President or any of the agencies under him, if we can get away with it in our arguments, and I am not trying to imply that the Senator from Minnesota is being unfair, because I share his concern about the use of these funds.

What I am trying to say is this: Following the analogy, if two or three members of another department of Government, not directly under the President, committed some acts of similar gravity, would that justify us to cut the appropriation for that department by two-thirds? I say no. I say we have to weigh this matter in proper context. I say that the Domestic Council performs a very valuable function for the Government and for the people of America.

I say, also, that when the Domestic Council applies some of the funds—which we provide through appropriations—for nefarious activities on the part of its personnel, that it is subject to correction by all Government and for the people of America.

I hope I can convince the Senator from Minnesota to withdraw this amendment. I do not think that this is the proper way to get at this. I think that is the right avenue to try with respect to these matters. So I am hopeful that, in a spirit of comity, which we should practice here with respect to the executive branch, we will maintain this appropriation intact, as recommended unanimously by the subcommittee and by the full committee.

I assure the Senator from Minnesota, as I did this year, that I will conduct a thorough investigation as to the use of these funds. I will insist that there be no ultra vires activities on the part of these agencies—the kind of ultra vires activity that leads to some kind of nefarious complicity in criminal acts. That is about the best we can do through the Appropriations Committee.

I think that putting the President's budget for the Domestic Council by two-thirds is the wrong way of doing it. I am hopeful that my good friend from Minnesota introduced this amendment in the hope of developing a good dialog, in the hope of transmuting this subcommittee of Congress to the executive department that these activities should not be engaged in and should not be financed from taxpayer funds. In conclusion I ask my good friend from Minnesota to withdraw his amendment.

Mondale. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I concur with the point which the distinguished Senator from Minnesota was making. However, I think that is the right avenue to try with respect to Mr. Krogh. The Senator did directly ask and require the White House to produce the list showing the compensation of all employees in the Domestic Council from the beginning to the end. It was that effort on the part of the Senator thatIDemented in the Catch-22 that permits us to know the facts on which some of my argument is based.

But my arguments go much more deeply than that. The pervasive and high-level involvement of Mr. Ehrlichman, Chairman of the Council; Mr. Krogh, his Deputy Chairman; Mr. Liddy, and others, who helped develop the Watergate hearings suggest the purpose of that office during the election was Involvement in Watergate, and that is the real argument as to how important it is to provide accountability in the terms of what the American people need.

But once again my arguments go to a philosophical point, not a budgetary point. The point is best made in Mr. Reedy's book entitled "The Twilight of Power." He was in charge of public relations for President Johnson, following the end of that administration wrote a book in which he expressed horror at the degree to which a President is able to isolate himself from reality, to hide behind the public relations officers, to defend himself from bad news; to shoot messengers who bring bad news rather than to reward them. It is this battle for reality, as Mr. Reedy put it, that is involved in this budgetary appropriation that I wish to cut. The executive branch has plenty of personnel. I think HEW alone has 110,000 employees. That should be enough people to provide sufficient memorandum to keep the President busy for a day or two.

The reason for the Domestic Council was entirely different. It was to place in the White House a staff which the President picked on his own, with no confirmation requirement of the Senate involved, with a budget and money for which they were not held accountable, which could hide behind principles of separation of powers. It is a State Department, not a branch of the Executive, as defined by the President, to do, to put it mildly, any damn thing they wanted to do.

That is what they did, to escape the Congress, the Cabinet, and the American people. This amendment is designed to help place in the White House the Control of the American people, consistent with the constitutional framework within which we must operate.

We must not permit this effort, which was permitted when OMB was folded into the President's Cabinet, the National Security Council was changed into another State Department to continue to succeed, since their common purpose was to remove fundamental policy questions from public discussion, the American Congress, and the American people.

The key to fundamental policy is the creation of institutions like the Domestic Council, staffed and held free from any
accountability, totally free from any reality, until finally they got Gordon Liddy and Egil Krogh; I think we are now entitled to say that this is enough and that it is time that the Government went back into the hands of the American people. One of the ways to make that certain is to be sure that it gets into hands that will be responsible to the American people, and not the way it was done in Watergate.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes; I am happy to yield.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Am I correct in understanding that the appropriation which the committee recommends for the Domestic Council is $700,000 under the amount appropriated for 1973?

Mr. MONTOYA. The Senator is correct. For fiscal year 1973 the appropriation was $1,800,000. The budget request submitted by the President for 1974 was $1,168,000. The committee's recommendation is $1,100,000, a reduction of $700,000 from fiscal year 1973.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. There has been in Arizona a preference of the President for the request appropriation for that agency. I am wondering whether the Senator from New Mexico has any knowledge as to why the amount has been so greatly reduced or why the recommendation was made.

Mr. MONTOYA. The President made a few reductions at the White House for this last year that were occasioned by the fact that we increased the appropriation for the White House. The Office of Management and Budget then submitted a justification that the White House could not avail itself of departmental personnel to put to its own use. Apparently, the allowances made for the White House for the last fiscal year were too much, because there has been a decision to reduce in personnel at the White House.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. If the substantial reduction by the Senate stands, as recommended by the Appropriations Committee, there will be a reduction in spending of $700,000, compared with the amount appropriated for 1973.

Mr. MONTOYA. That is correct; and the reduction of personnel will be from 75 to 30.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me time?

Mr. MONTOYA. How much time?

Mr. BELLMON. Five minutes.

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELLMON. I specifically support the position of the Senator from Minnesota, has taken that the Secretary and the various agencies themselves have as great a role as possible in the operation of the Government. But, at the same time, I must observe that I believe the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota tries to achieve the purpose in a way that is highly distasteful.

What the Senator from Minnesota seems to be attempting to do is to substitute the judgment of Congress for the judgment of the President as to how the Chief Executive can operate his own office.

I feel that the President has the most difficult and most awesome job in the world and that he is given great latitude in the way he functions. Certainly this President may function differently than past or future Presidents may function. Certainly Congress should not tell the President where to cut and how to make the reductions that he has to make.

I believe that any Senator would greatly resent efforts on the part of the executive branch to tell us how to operate our own staffs or structure our own offices. I believe the President should be entitled to the same latitude that we all brethren have.

I feel that President Nixon has perhaps learned some valuable lessons from what has happened in his own staff and that he may be moving in the direction that the Senator from Minnesota is recommending, and that members of his Cabinet are presently exercising greater power and responsibility than was true in the first term under President Nixon.

I also feel that the amendment by the Senator from Minnesota attempts to punish the President and the members of his Cabinet for the actions of two individuals who are presently being punished in the normal processes of this Government.

So I feel the amendment is not necessary, that the results from Minnesota would make a serious mistake if we went along with his amendment and in this way reduce the effectiveness of the President in the discharge of the duties of his office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I wish to read into the Record a letter which I received today from the Executive Office of the President, specifically from the Office of Management and Budget, dated September 5, 1973:

Honor. Joseph M. Monoya,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I write to convey the President's full support of your Committee's version of the Appropriations Bill for Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government and to urge that you resist any efforts to cut it.

As it contains some of the more sensitive agencies of the Government, there could be strong pressures to reduce the funding levels of some of those agencies in the hope that Congress would be able to reduce the funds and capacities will thereby be enhanced.

While all of us support the concept of a strong legislative branch, it is not likely to be effective if the Executive Office of the President is not able to operate properly. The present personnel levels authorized in your bill for such agencies as the Domestic Council, National Security Council, Special Projects, and the Domestic Council and Budget are at the same or below those authorized and funded last year, and any further reductions would seriously impair the President's ability to perform those activities previously sanctioned by the Congress.

Accompanying this letter is your Appropriations Committee colleagues, to give your full and enthusiastic support to the bill you carefully fashioned in committee.

With highest regards,

Roy L. Ash, Director.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes.
Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in no sense is this amendment designed to weaken the executive, as was suggested earlier in the debate. I want a strong President. We must have one. But I want a President who is legal, whose operations are public, and who is accountable to the American people. That is the objective of this amendment designed to accomplish.

I talk about comity between the executive and the legislative branch, but what we have is comedy—comedy—on the part of the executive toward the legislative. In the war powers field, in impoundment, in executive decisions, and in a variety of other things, in my judgment, there has not only been comity; there has been an utter contempt for the Congress and for the laws. One of the reasons why the Executive has been able to pursue this lawless course—and I say that advisedly, because over 20 courts have now held that the President has been acting illegally in impounding congressionally appropriated funds—is that we have been pursuing our relations with the President in a way that has given him the money he has wanted, the agency and the program he has wanted. The White House, protected by the principles of executive privilege and separation of powers, as he defines them. He was totally isolated from the accepted congressional processes, hearings, confirmation, and budgetary approval.

A classic example was the Domestic Council, which was created without a law, for which money was budgeted and provided without any accountability, as an office able to strip the Cabinet departments of their policymaking functions. This made fools out of the Cabinet officers, and meant that Executive agencies such as the HEW and the Department of Labor had little or no control over the departments they were supposed to have charge of. It simply put that power all in the hands of the White House without it being in the charge of any one.

That is a long way from accountability. That was the reason for offering the amendment. I was for eliminating the council before I knew anything about Watergate. I am trying to prevent the White House from abusing the constitutional powers it has.

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I would like to remind the Senator from Minnesota that the reorganization plan which was submitted to the Congress by the President could have been rejected by the Congress had it chosen to do so. There was nothing unconstitutional about its creation.

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator is correct. And may I say, that the point the Senator makes is a very valid point. I think that we should have rejected it and liked it at the first print in the creation of a Domestic Council. Executive order, just as we remained tragically silent when the OMB was taken into the White House and put beyond our control. Now, we have no ability to get facts from them.

I think it is a tragedy and that we have to do something about it.

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, the Senator agree that if we are going to abolish the Domestic Council, the better way to do it would be in a formal way, through resolution, and find out if Congress really wants to do away with the powers of the President, because the effect of the Senator's amendment would not abolish the Domestic Council as an effective arm of the President's office.

Mr. MONDALE. There is money left by the amendment for the President. There is $350,000, for a staff to advise him on domestic matters. He also has the Secretary of the HEW with 110,000 employees, able to get an idea or two out of them. He has the Department of Labor and he has the Council of Economic Advisers. It really never stops. He probably has a couple of million people if he wants to call on them.

I do not think that this would hurt the President at all. It just makes the process more open and more public and more consistent with what the framers of the Constitution intended.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute on the bill?

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, whether or not we approve of it, we are not trying to abolish it. There is a staff provided of 10 people. Why do they not take the Vice President and make him Chairman of the Domestic Council? He gets a good salary. I remember that when I served as Vice President, I served in that capacity with no additional personnel.

I do not think it in any way violates comity between the President and the Congress. We have a more close relationship with the Cabinet officers and the President. We need to get rid of those fellows in between who are responsible to no one.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Roger Cotlove, of the private floor during vote.

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

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. MONTOYA. 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. MONTOYA. 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. BELLMON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the rollcall vote.

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

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.
Mr. MONDALE’s amendment was rejected.

Mr. MONDOYA, Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. YOUNG, Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment cosponsored by the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGovern), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Muskie), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), and ask that it be stricken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARKIN). The amendment will be struck out.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 12, strike out all on line 1 through line 17.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the House of Representatives deleted $1.5 million requested by the White House for the so-called “special projects fund,” on the ground that the White House utterly and completely refused to say either what they did with the money or what the money was for, without the additional money if given to them.

I propose that the Senate take the same position.

The Senate Appropriations Committee reduced the request by half a million dollars, which still would leave under control of the White House, without any specific request or definition of what they intend to do with it, $1 million to do with as they deemed fit, even though the House Appropriations Committee repeatedly asked the White House to define the specific use of the money that had been spent in the past, and even though it had asked them to specify what they would do with the money if appropriated. The White House took the position that they would not comply with any of the requests for information. This could well be the humiliating posture of giving them money nevertheless, despite this record of executive contempt.

In regard to the alleged burglary, this matter is currently under investigation by the Senate Select Committee, and we prefer not to get into these matters concerning the ongoing Watergate investigation.

To put it mildly, this is another example of executive contempt. They simply do not believe that Congress is entitled to answers or that we will insist on answers, and they would put us in the humiliating posture of giving them money nevertheless, despite this record of executive contempt and despite the record of Watergate, which raises grave suspicions concerning the use of this special slush fund for the payment of a whole range of illegal, outrageous acts, in defiance of the legal processes of American political life.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, will the Senate yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Do I understand that, in testimony, the administration would not account for that money?

Mr. MONDALE. Absolutely refused to
answer any questions. In the one area where they promised to answer them, they followed up with this brush-off to which I have referred. In other words, they said, “We are entitled to the money.”

I am so bad, the House felt they were being dealt with contemptuously, that they finally refused to give them any money; and I am proposing to take the same position.

Mr. ABOUREZK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONDALE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota, for many reasons.

The special projects fund has existed for many years, under different Presidents. The fund was created, I believe, in 1956; and with the exception of 1 or 2 years, Congress has allocated to the White House funding for special projects in a consistent amount of $1.5 million.

This year, we thought we should cut this down to $1 million, and that is the recommendation of the Senate subcommittee as well as that of the full Committee on Appropriations. We did this because we felt that the funding was necessary in carrying out some special projects which do not fall within the orbit of an existing agency. Special projects funds have been used to great advantage and with great benefit for the American people in years past.

I have tried to make inquiry through the hearings as to whether any illegal activity was engaged in in the use of funds in this particular category. I was unable to find that such activity existed.

The special projects fund is worthwhile, and consistently throughout the years a balance has reverted to the Treasury because the President has not used the full amount in any given year. In fact, the reversion of unobligated balances to the Treasury from the appropriated funds, over the entire span of 17 years, has averaged $320,000 a year.

The fund was created, as I stated earlier, in 1956, to be used by the President for staff assistance in special problems which arise from time to time but which cannot be considered the responsibility of an existing agency. Those who advise the President on consumer affairs are paid out of the special projects fund. The present energy setup that was created under the White House is paid out of the special projects fund. Many other worthwhile projects which do not fall within the orbit of authorization in other departments or other agencies have been commissioned because this fund existed.

I feel that we have done what is right in recommending $1 million.

Also, we were cognizant of the reluctance of the President to divulge to the House Appropriations Committee as well as to us full details as to how these funds were allocated. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota in this respect. Anticipating the lack of response by the White House the Appropriations Committee did something about it. This is what we have provided in the bill, so that the White House will be more responsive in reporting to Congress as to the use it makes of the funds in this particular area.

On page 12 of the bill, starting at line 13 we have inserted a provision which reads as follows:

Provided further, That the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives shall be furnished quarterly with a detailed accounting of expenditures made from these funds.

That provision will take care of the fears expressed by my good friend from Minnesota and it will enable us to fully inform Congress as to the use of these funds. But as far as I know and as far as the hearings disclose, this money has been used properly in the past. I am not prepared to say there has not been any misuse, but in the absence of any evidence I am willing to say that the monies have been properly expended by the White House.

I do not believe that we should do within the sphere of our activity as members of the Committee on Appropriations is to exact compliance with our request for quarterly reports and to examine those quarterly reports and then report back to Congress.

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

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

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment taken by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. Every President for many years past has had these special funds. They have not been investigated by us as to how they were spent. The President of the United States should be compelled to operate within the rules of his office.

One President, who is now deceased, did overspend his budget by over $1 million on one foreign trip. Even his special funds did not take care of his expenditures. They were drawn from two different appropriation accounts, the special projects fund. If that President were alive today Senators would like to tell the Senate where they came from. I know but not many other Senators do.

Mr. President, these funds are necessary for a President and I do not think the President should be called upon to account for every penny of it.

Certainly, if those funds went for Watergate purposes they should be held accountable for them. This amendment would be punitive action by cutting out funds the only things they have. It would break precedent with the past and establish a very bad precedent.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Should not Congress, which appropriates the money—these are tax funds—be notified as to what happened to the money?

Mr. MONTOYA. Absolutely, and we have been asking the White House to justify all expenditures.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. But they have not done so.

Mr. MONTOYA. They have with respect to the special projects, but only in a general way. With respect to the emergency fund they did not produce any evidence upon the use of the emergency fund.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Should not Congress, which appropriates the money—these are tax funds—be notified as to what happened to the money?

Mr. MONTOYA. With respect to the emergency fund the justifications indicated that during 1972, funds were made available from this appropriation to finance the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention until it received its own appropriation. That was done in 1972, which was in March 1973.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Just as a broad general question, has the committee been furnished adequate and full information as to what has happened to these tax funds?

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes; we have some information. I asked for details as to how...
much is paid to personnel from this fund and we have that in the hearing record.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. But I understood that the House was refused that information.

Mr. MONTOYA. Maybe the House was but we have the names of individuals and positions.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. The Senate has that information?

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes. Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. But I understood the Senator to say the reason the committee reduced it from $1.5 million to $1 million was that the administration refused to give the facts.

Mr. MONTOYA. I did not say that.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Then, I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. MONTOYA. I did say that in view of the fact that the history of this appropriation reflects an average annual reversion to the Treasury of approximately $550,000, we thought prudent to reduce the budget request of $1.5 million to $1 million.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I thought the Senator also said he was concerned about the point made by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONTOYA. And I did so state that I was concerned about the point made by the Senator from Minnesota and because I was so concerned and the committee was so concerned we put a proviso related to this particular item in the bill which requires that quarterly reports be made to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate so that from those reports we could deduce how the money was going to be spent.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I am not clear as to whether the Senator has or has not received a full accounting of this special project fund.

Mr. MONTOYA. May I say to my good friend from Virginia that we have not received a full accounting from the Senate?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Have not.

Mr. MONTOYA. As I have stated before we have received the names and position, titles of employees funded by the special projects fund. That information appears on page 1778 of the Senate hearings.

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

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield.

Mr. BELLMON. I would like to point out that on pages 1778 and 1779 of the hearings, copies of the rosters of employees of the Senate, there appears a list of employees funded by special project funds and also the justification for these projects.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I wish to say that my comments on these funds are not directed at the individuals but at public policy. I took this same view in the Virginia Senate for 18 years when some of my closest friends were serving as governornot to give them unspecified funds. I have great reluctance to support unspecified funds, funds supplied by the taxpayers.

In this case, if we go back to the last time before the Senate last month, the request was denied to the Treasury, so I shall vote against providing this extra amount of money for unspecified special projects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes.

Mr. MONTALE. Mr. President, I wish to make just a few points before we vote.

The first is that I must disagree with the distinguished floor manager on the question of whether any significant accounting has been made by the White House on the use of these funds. The record shows only a list of current employees; it says nothing about past practices. The House committee tried to find out who was who. But from the director, what role, if any, this fund played in Watergate, I must conclude the White House had no intention of answering those questions and they did not answer them. Therefore, I am very suspicious that the reporting requirement we require once we give the money will be no more successful in getting information than we were when they wanted the money.

We have seen from time to time in the past the contemptuous way they slide around governmental reporting procedures when that is their intention.

I think it is true that these funds have been made available in the past without accounting, and I guess I voted for them; but it is also true that a little thing has happened along the way called Watergate.

We have seen the American public to see the tremendously dangerous tendency that exists when we grant, without specification, without control, without information, substantial funds to the White House which are used by them behind the protection of executive privilege and the separation of powers to do as they please.

What we are creating is a government that increasingly is drawing within the confines of the White House the central policymaking powers and decisions so that Cabinet officers have less and less to do with decisions and Congress, by that fact, is less and less able to find out what has happened.

There is one good answer to that, and that is to insist that, as a condition of receiving those funds, the use of those funds shall be made public to the extent that is practical.

In this case, national security was not involved, and a national scandal was involved. We wanted to know whether these money were used to help fund the worst political scandal in American history. This administration said, "It is none of your business, but we want the money anyway." The Senate said, "OK. Here it is."

We will be treated with contempt as long as we permit ourselves to be used in such a way. We have the duty to know how this money is being used. This is one of the classic examples. The contempt for Congress was so great that the House of Representatives said, "We refuse to give you this money until you tell us what you intend to do with it." I think this is a very simple objective.

I might add, finally, that the President still has $1 million in petty cash over there that is still unaccounted for in the other emergency fund that they still can use any way they want. He has vast funds from other sources to accomplish what he wants to do. This particular fund was one of the simplest ways to pay for Watergate, probably they did not think they would have to answer for it. I now know, but it makes me suspicious when they are asked specific questions and they refuse to answer. While we are trying to find out who is guilty, we have to make institutional provisions to see that it does not happen again.

One of the ways to begin is the way in which we appropriate the money. That is why I hope my amendment will be agreed to, and that we will comply with the position of the House.

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

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. MONTOYA. I am glad to yield.

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

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute on the bill.

As I stated before, I wanted to find out what particular employees had been paid out of this fund. I was furnished a list of the employees. As I have previously stated, the list appears on page 1778 of the Senate hearings. The names of the employees listed have not been mentioned in the course of our Watergate hearings in any way, shape, or form. So I deduced from that that no employees who were engaged in the various Watergate activities were paid from this fund.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes on the bill.

At the last minute, before we were to embark upon the markup of the bill by the subcommittee, we received information in an indirect way. This information was given to the minority members, but not to me, by the people downtown who are responsible to special projects appropriation and the use made of it.

I shall submit the text of this memorandum, but I shall also give a résumé while I am speaking on it.

An example of a special project is contained in the best ways in which we expend the funds from the special projects appropriation for 1973, as follows:
The President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board is funded out of special projects based on the initiating Executive order of March 20, 1969. 

The original Energy Office set up under Charles DiBona. Mr. DiBona's salary as well as that of his secretary were paid from special projects. Of course, this Office has been dissolved with the establishment of the new Office under former Governor Love.

The salary and expenses for the Interagency Classification Review Committee, of which John Eisenhower was chairman, March 19, 1972.

The President's consumer adviser, Virginia Knauer.

The White House summer intern program, which serves not only the White House, but the Domestic Council, the National Security Council, and the rest of the organizations housed in the White House-Executive Office Building complex.

Increased White House "personnel search office" required to restaff the administration after November 7, 1972.

The increased White House "personnel search office" required to restaff the Administration after November 7, 1972.

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield myself 2 additional minutes on the bill.

When the three Cabinet members were designated as counselors, they each maintained an office in the Executive Office Building. Their EOB Staffs were on detail, but salaries were reimbursed to respective agencies out of the special projects appropriation.

Special projects funds also pay the salaries of the White House photographers, and the legal consultants working on the Presidential papers question.

The Advisory Committee on Federal Pay.

The Special Action Office on Drug Abuse, under Dr. Jaffe, until he obtained a congressional appropriation for his office in FY73.

Finally, this appropriation is the only source for official reception and representation expenses for 13 organizations within the Executive Office of the President, including the White House Office. 

This appropriation has maintained a budget authority of $1,500,000 except in FY70 when the appropriation was increased by $1,000,000 to cover the costs of switching to an "honest budget" policy. 

In part years the President has found it necessary to establish a number of special projects to deal with specific problems. Some of these projects are of a temporary character, but others may continue for an indefinite period. The President's consumers have not made satisfactory arrangements for financing projects of this nature because they often cut across departmental responsibilities.

The establishment of a separate appropriation in the Executive Office of the President furnishes a sound method of providing financial support for these projects and at the same time permits identification of funds in a normal budgetary procedure. This separate appropriation also consolidates these projects in one place and affords further budgetary control.

LIMITATIONS

To be expended at the President's discretion without regard to such provisions of law as may concern the Executive Office of the President or to the Executive Office Building. Funds may be expended for the compensation and employment of members of the White House Office (see FY73). To be expended within the Executive Office of the President for other federal employees. 

Not to exceed $10,000 shall be available for allocation within the Executive Office of the President for official reception and representation expenses.

EXAMPLES

The following are some examples of the types of personnel or projects that were funded out of the Special Projects appropriation during FY73.

The President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board is funded out of Special Projects based on the initiating Executive order of March 20, 1969.

The original Energy Office set up under Charles DiBona. Mr. DiBona's salary as well as that of his secretary were paid from Special Projects. Of course, this Office has been dissolved with the establishment of the new Office under Governor Love.

The salary and expenses for the Interagency Classification Review Committee chaired by John Eisenhower (March 8, 1972).

The President's Consumer Adviser, Virginia Knauer.

The White House Summer Intern Program which serves not only the White House but the Domestic Council, the National Security Council, and the rest of the organizations housed in the Executive Office Building complex.

The increased White House "personnel search office" required to restaff the Administration after November 7, 1972.

When the three Cabinet Members were designated as Counselors, they each maintained an office in the Executive Office Building. Their EOB Staffs were on detail, but salaries were reimbursed to respective agencies out of the Special Projects appropriation.

Special Projects funds also pay the salaries of the White House photographers, and the legal consultants working on the Presidential papers question.

The Advisory Committee on Federal Pay.

The Special Action Office on Drug Abuse (Dr. Jaffe) until he obtained his Congressional appropriation in FY73.

Finally, this appropriation is the only source for official reception and representation expenses for 13 organizations within the Executive Office of the President, including the White House office.

The Office of the President needs to have special funds for the type of projects which are described above. The cost of these activities is difficult to forecast. They may not be of an emergency nature but are essential areas of interest for the President. At the same time they are not as susceptible to regular agencies of the government because they are in the established departments. A separate appropriation is the best method of financing such activities. It gives an opportunity to consolidate these costs so that better budgetary control can be maintained.

Mr. MONTOY A. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute on the bill?

Mr. MONDALE. I shall make two points. First, the list which the Senator has given does not contain the names of past employees. It does not tell us what the future will be. The House asked for a list of employees during the Watergate period. The White House refused to disclose them.

Second, from the list the Senator has read today, I gather that some of the money is used to hire lawyers to determine what further income taxes on some papers that he gave to the U.S. Archives, which would be a nice service if most U.S. taxpayers could afford it.

I hope that my amendment is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota (putting the question).

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MONDALE. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUBBARD), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HURSH), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), and the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senators from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER and Mr. BROCK), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONDO), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) is absent because of illness in his family.

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

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 52, as follows:
Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this amendment is a simple one which would conform to the Senate Appropriations Committee’s language with that now contained in the House bill so that public money spent on the private property of the President for security-related purposes would have to be cleared with the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

Mr. President, it has been falsely charged that the President does not want to spend public money on housing. That is false. He is willing to spend a good deal of public money on housing, provided it is located in San Clemente or in Key Biscayne.

What the amendment is designed to do is to make certain that the money is spent for public purposes and not for purposes of private enrichment.

In particular, expenditures by the General Services Administration— whose appropriation we are taking up today— have been most interesting. Starting in May, with a GSA estimate of $39,000, we have seen a constant and striking escalation of estimates—an inflation which puts even the soaring rate of inflation in our economy to shame.

The May estimate of $39,000—which the GSA now states was only intended to cover a limited number of interior improvements on the island of a total cost of $186,000. Then in early August came another jump, this time to $3,691,000. All of these expenditures, according to the GSA, are directly related to Presidential security. Whether this is indeed the end—only time will tell.

Some of these expenditures are familiar—and have caused a good deal of outrage among the American public.

How is installation of a $2,000 flagpole designed to enhance Presidential security? Or the expenditure of $3,000 on lawn sprinklers for the President’s lawn and grounds?

Or $80,000 on golf carts for the Secret Service at Key Biscayne? Or $2,000 on a correcting beach erosion or over $600 on purchase of an icemaker for the Secret Service? Why should the public pay for seemingly normal maintenance functions such as $9,000 for a new roof on the President’s private residence, $4,000 to remove dead plantings at San Clemente? And why should taxpayers spend over $16,000 to provide security-related improvements on the island of a wealthy personal friend of the President?

Yet, disturbing as these and many
other individual expenditures may be, an important principle in involved—an issue which goes beyond taxpayers' money being spent on furniture for a President's den or golf carts for the Secret Service.

No one wishes in any way to skim on legitimate expenditures necessary for the protection of the President. And the GSA correctly states that their expenditures on San Clemente, Key Biscayne, and other Presidential pleasure retreats were necessitated by the requests which they received from the Secret Service to make such expenditures.

The cost of a President is a most precious thing, and no Member of this body—nor any American citizen—would want that protection to be inadequate.

Various accounts have been given by those who have seen the improvements. And there is little doubt that many of these expenditures are necessary to provide adequate Presidential security.

But the huge sums involved—almost $4 million spent by GSA alone—raise the question of how necessary all these improvements really were for the protection of the President.

Why should we in Congress continue to allow large amounts of taxpayers' dollars to be spent without any congressional control over these expenditures? And why should the appropriate congressional committees not have a broader oversight role in insuring that when money is spent it is for the protection of the Presidential security—that it really is devoted to safety and not personal luxury?

The House, when it adopted the bill before us today, saw fit to adopt just such a provision, to require that the Appropriations Committees must be consulted before any large expenditures are made on private property.

This amendment, it seems to me, is a minimal, reasonable kind of restriction that assures that extravagant expenditures out of public funds not truly related to Presidential security—that it really is devoted to safety and not personal luxury.

The House, when it adopted the bill before us today, saw fit to adopt just such a provision, to require that the Appropriations Committees must be consulted before any large expenditures are made on private property.

This amendment, it seems to me, is a minimal, reasonable kind of restriction that assures that extravagant expenditures out of public funds not truly related to Presidential security—that it really is devoted to safety and not personal luxury.

The House, when it adopted the bill before us today, saw fit to adopt just such a provision, to require that the Appropriations Committees must be consulted before any large expenditures are made on private property.

This amendment, it seems to me, is a minimal, reasonable kind of restriction that assures that extravagant expenditures out of public funds not truly related to Presidential security—that it really is devoted to safety and not personal luxury.

The House, when it adopted the bill before us today, saw fit to adopt just such a provision, to require that the Appropriations Committees must be consulted before any large expenditures are made on private property.

This amendment, it seems to me, is a minimal, reasonable kind of restriction that assures that extravagant expenditures out of public funds not truly related to Presidential security—that it really is devoted to safety and not personal luxury.

The House, when it adopted the bill before us today, saw fit to adopt just such a provision, to require that the Appropriations Committees must be consulted before any large expenditures are made on private property.

This amendment, it seems to me, is a minimal, reasonable kind of restriction that assures that extravagant expenditures out of public funds not truly related to Presidential security—that it really is devoted to safety and not personal luxury.

The House, when it adopted the bill before us today, saw fit to adopt just such a provision, to require that the Appropriations Committees must be consulted before any large expenditures are made on private property.

This amendment, it seems to me, is a minimal, reasonable kind of restriction that assures that extravagant expenditures out of public funds not truly related to Presidential security—that it really is devoted to safety and not personal luxury.

The House, when it adopted the bill before us today, saw fit to adopt just such a provision, to require that the Appropriations Committees must be consulted before any large expenditures are made on private property.

This amendment, it seems to me, is a minimal, reasonable kind of restriction that assures that extravagant expenditures out of public funds not truly related to Presidential security—that it really is devoted to safety and not personal luxury.

The House, when it adopted the bill before us today, saw fit to adopt just such a provision, to require that the Appropriations Committees must be consulted before any large expenditures are made on private property.

This amendment, it seems to me, is a minimal, reasonable kind of restriction that assures that extravagant expenditures out of public funds not truly related to Presidential security—that it really is devoted to safety and not personal luxury.

The House, when it adopted the bill before us today, saw fit to adopt just such a provision, to require that the Appropriations Committees must be consulted before any large expenditures are made on private property.

This amendment, it seems to me, is a minimal, reasonable kind of restriction that assures that extravagant expenditures out of public funds not truly related to Presidential security—that it really is devoted to safety and not personal luxury.

The House, when it adopted the bill before us today, saw fit to adopt just such a provision, to require that the Appropriations Committees must be consulted before any large expenditures are made on private property.

This amendment, it seems to me, is a minimal, reasonable kind of restriction that assures that extravagant expenditures out of public funds not truly related to Presidential security—that it really is devoted to safety and not personal luxury.

The House, when it adopted the bill before us today, saw fit to adopt just such a provision, to require that the Appropriations Committees must be consulted before any large expenditures are made on private property.

This amendment, it seems to me, is a minimal, reasonable kind of restriction that assures that extravagant expenditures out of public funds not truly related to Presidential security—that it really is devoted to safety and not personal luxury.

The House, when it adopted the bill before us today, saw fit to adopt just such a provision, to require that the Appropriations Committees must be consulted before any large expenditures are made on private property.

This amendment, it seems to me, is a minimal, reasonable kind of restriction that assures that extravagant expenditures out of public funds not truly related to Presidential security—that it really is devoted to safety and not personal luxury.

The House, when it adopted the bill before us today, saw fit to adopt just such a provision, to require that the Appropriations Committees must be consulted before any large expenditures are made on private property.

This amendment, it seems to me, is a minimal, reasonable kind of restriction that assures that extravagant expenditures out of public funds not truly related to Presidential security—that it really is devoted to safety and not personal luxury.

The House, when it adopted the bill before us today, saw fit to adopt just such a provision, to require that the Appropriations Committees must be consulted before any large expenditures are made on private property.

This amendment, it seems to me, is a minimal, reasonable kind of restriction that assures that extravagant expenditures out of public funds not truly related to Presidential security—that it really is devoted to safety and not personal luxury.

The House, when it adopted the bill before us today, saw fit to adopt just such a provision, to require that the Appropriations Committees must be consulted before any large expenditures are made on private property.

This amendment, it seems to me, is a minimal, reasonable kind of restriction that assures that extravagant expenditures out of public funds not truly related to Presidential security—that it really is devoted to safety and not personal luxury.

The House, when it adopted the bill before us today, saw fit to adopt just such a provision, to require that the Appropriations Committees must be consulted before any large expenditures are made on private property.

This amendment, it seems to me, is a minimal, reasonable kind of restriction that assures that extravagant expenditures out of public funds not truly related to Presidential security—that it really is devoted to safety and not personal luxury.

The House, when it adopted the bill before us today, saw fit to adopt just such a provision, to require that the Appropriations Committees must be consulted before any large expenditures are made on private property.

This amendment, it seems to me, is a minimal, reasonable kind of restriction that assures that extravagant expenditures out of public funds not truly related to Presidential security—that it really is devoted to safety and not personal luxury.
Mr. President, there are adequate office facilities for the President and for Camp David for Presidential use. Should we in Congress not attempt to impose some control on the number of Presidential residences which are turned into White Houses away from home—for which the American taxpayer must pick up the tab?

No one wishes to deny the occupant of the most tension-filled office in the world the right to relax. But there is a difference between Presidential residences designed for and paid for by the President, for his personal use—and massive additional White House office complexes paid for by the American taxpayers.

I hope there will be congressional inquiry into these broader problems. In the meanwhile, we should begin to gain some control over money spent by the General Services Administration on facilities which are turned on and off as the President wishes. I believe it is possible to impose control over money spent by the President on facilities by requiring approval by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees over these expenditures.

This is a start, perhaps only a small step, toward insuring greater White House accountability in the way in which our tax dollars are spent.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment. I want to explain why the committee saw fit to remove the restriction placed by the House on the bill with respect to the expenditure of funds for these purposes.

The committee was advised that such a restriction as embodied in the words "after approval by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations" was unconstitutional, and had been ruled so by the Attorney General. The Congress had respected the opinion completely in other legislation which had come before the Congress. I recall that this matter came before us on the Public Works Committee and after we received the opinion of the Attorney General with respect to the unconstitutionality of such a requirement, the Public Works Committee agreed to respect the opinion of the Attorney General. I believe it is sound, because the requirement that the Senator wishes to impose through his amendment is opposed first by the GSA. It is a requirement which imposes on a committee of Congress to perform executive duties which exclusively belong to the executive department of the Government.

I cannot envision the Framers of our Constitution authorizing a committee of Congress to perform executive duties whereby it would take executive functions away from the President, and this would be an executive function—to approve or disapprove any expenditures within this item and that they be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate for such approval or rejection.

The congressional committees should not superimpose their will or administer funds appropriated by the President. It would be highly impractical and virtually impossible for the Appropriations Committees to meet every time an expenditure is proposed under this particular item. It would be too difficult. We do not have the staff to determine whether this piece of equipment or that piece of equipment or this electronic device or that is proper in the protection of the President.

That is why I believe the Attorney General properly ruled that such a restriction would be unconstitutional and would be an assumption of Executive power on the part of Congress. I will read part of the opinion, but I do not want to prolong the debate. This is what Attorney General Kleindienst ruled on April 24, 1972.

Listing my views solely to the legal question, it is my opinion that the committee approval provisions of section 5 (f) and (h) are unconstitutional. Of course, there would be no legal objection to the imposition of a provision requiring that contracts be submitted to the committees and that they not be carried out for a reasonable period thereby giving Congress the opportunity to disapprove the contract by legislative enactment.

In view of the Attorney General's opinion, and in view of the recommendations by the General Services Administration that they certainly could not work with this type of provision, especially in view of its unconstitutionality, I would oppose the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that there has been an abuse. I think it is patently clear that the use of taxpayers' money, as he has mentioned. The congressional committees will look into it, no doubt. One committee in the House is already looking into these expenditures. If taxpayers' money was used improperly, I presume that there will be lawsuits by the Government to recover part of the money expended in behalf of private parties, as the Senator from Minnesota has indicated. But I do not believe that we should put in an appropriation bill a restriction that is unconstitutional.

During the hearings next year, I will attempt to exact from GSA complete details as to how these expenditures were made, why they were made, and whether there was any legal justification for the expenditures. I think Congress is entitled to know the answers to these questions. I hope to get complete detail. But in view of the apparent unconstitutionality of the provision, I would have to oppose this amendment.

I am sorry to have to oppose my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota, whose words have been most informative, most instructive, and elucidating. I agree with him almost wholeheartedly in what he has said, but I do not agree with him on the approach he has taken to our problems about which he speaks.

Mr. MONDALE. I must say that the Senator has been carrying the day.

Mr. President, personally, I do not find the constitutional argument persuasive. It is one of the difficulties of this administration that they have had a great number of Attorney Generals. Mr. Kleindienst being the one who issued this opinion.

I do not see any constitutional problem here. I think there is precedent for it. In the Public Buildings Act of 1972 we have precisely the same requirement.

In any event, what I propose to do is to modify my amendment to provide for notification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, rather than approval, so that while they would not have to go through the approval process which the Attorney General said is unconstitutional—although I disagree with his finding—we would then certify to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, which would then be aware of what they have in mind. I do not see how that conceivably could be said to be anything other than providing for the continuing interest of Congress in being advised of Executive actions.

I would hope that, as modified, the distinguished manager of the bill might accept this amendment.

Mr. MONTOYA. In view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has walked over the fence into the pasture of unconstitutionality, I would accept it.

Mr. MONDALE. This is a wonderful day for me.

Mr. MONTOYA. Subject to the language being approved, specifically.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator modify his amendment?

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I modify my amendment to read as follows:

On page 17, line 9, after the word "available," insert a comma and the following: "after notice to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations."

So that it is notice and not approval that is required. I so modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. MONTOYA. I still see the roots of unconstitutionality here.

Mr. MONDALE. I was afraid the Senator would.

Mr. MONTOYA. Perhaps the Senator will agree to this language: that this appropriation shall be available and that when there are expenditures under this appropriation, the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations shall be so notified.

Mr. MONDALE. Does the Senator contemplate after expenditures or before?

Mr. MONTOYA. If it is before, we face the test of constitutionality, as I have indicated.
Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?
Mr. MONDALE. I yield.
Mr. BROOKE. Does not the Senator from Minnesota's modification of his amendment fall within the purview of the Kleindienst opinion so far as contracts are concerned? Does it not fit under that language? The Senator read some portion of the Kleindienst opinion, which in my view would accommodate the Mondale modification. Is that not possible?
Mr. MONTOYA. The Kleindienst opinion is directed at the requirements for approval before any expenditure is made. That is the exact wording of the Kleindienst opinion.
Mr. BROOKE. What about the portion the Senator read pertaining to the contracts?
Mr. MONTOYA. The Kleindienst opinion does not find that objectionable.
Mr. BROOKE. What is the time of the contract?
Mr. MONTOYA. Thirty days.
Mr. BROOKE. Before or after?
Mr. MONTOYA. When the contracts are awarded notice thereof must be given to the Committee on Public Works of both houses of Congress and after expiration it must be valid, but the idea of the 30 days is to give the committees time to propose legislation in opposition to the contracts prior to final formalization.
Mr. BROOKE. Could not the same thing be done under the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota?
Mr. MONTOYA. Absolutely, but he is not doing that.
Mr. BROOKE. Would the Senator accept that?
Mr. MONDALE. Would the Senator repeat his question?
Mr. BROOKE. In order to comply with the Kleindienst opinion I am suggesting the notification be given 30 days thereby allowing the work to commence.
Mr. MONDALE. That would be fine. I am trying to get it open to the public process.
Mr. BROOKE. We do not want a lot of lawsuits. We want to prevent any future actions that might be embarrassing to the President on any improper expenditure of public funds. We do not want the horse out of the barn before we do something about it. That is what I understand the Senator's modification to be.
Mr. MONDALE. The Senator is correct.
Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
Mr. MONTOYA. I yield.
Mr. BELLMON. I would like to suggest to the Senate to move cautiously in this area. Let us assume the Secret Service proposes an expenditure on private property, that the request comes to the Senate, and then in 30 days goes into effect; and during that time the President will do or try to do what they want to do. I think we place Congress in an untenable position. I think we would be better off to let the Secret Service use its judgment and then review what they have done after they have made the improvement.
Mr. MONTOYA. Would the Senator from Minnesota agree to a requirement that the Government Services Administration render a report periodically, say every 3 months after the expenditure is made with respect to the items on page 17? I think that would fulfill the purpose of what you desire.
Mr. MONTOYA. Perhaps we can have a quorum call to see if we can work it out.
Mr. MONTOYA. It is similar to the provision we have in the special projects appropriation account.
Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes remaining.
Mr. MONTOYA. In other words, the proviso to which I refer and which I think would be proper here and accomplish the purpose the Senator has in mind would be as follows:
Provided further, That the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall be furnished quarterly with a detailed accounting of expenditures made from these funds.
Mr. MONDALE. Would that report be public under that provision?
Mr. MONTOYA. Absolutely.
Mr. MONDALE. I will accept the substitution. Mr. President, I modify my amendment accordingly.
Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I see the amendment ordered to be printed.
Mr. MONDALE. Yes. On page 17, line 19, after the word "purposes" insert the following:
Provided further, That the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall be furnished quarterly with a detailed accounting of expenditures made from these funds.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator send the modification to the desk?
Mr. MONTOYA. Yes. Is that agreeable?
Mr. MONDALE. Yes. I modify my amendment accordingly. I yield back my time.
Mr. President, did we ask for the yeas and nays?
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been requested.
Mr. MONTOYA. In view of the change in the amendment I would be willing to accept the amendment if my colleague would accept it.
Mr. BELLMON. I accept the amendment.
Mr. MONTOYA. I yield back the remainder of my time.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota as modified. The amendment as modified was agreed to by the yeas to 71, the nays to 27.
Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.
The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.
Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.
Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I expect to withdraw the amendment in 5 minutes.
Mr. BROOKE. My reason in opposing these amendments is that I think the warnings of such persons as George Reedy and others who have studied the institution of the White House can no longer be ignored. We have created an institution which permits its occupant to escape from reality to hide behind the grandeur of the President's house, to lose himself in elaborate constitutional and legal protections, behind its fantastic budgetary powers and other powers. We have created an institution in which its occupant can start a war, can bomb, can spend, can wiretap, can break into doctors' offices, can have an Attorney General who will use his powers in ways to undermine the laws; and we have seen in many, many ways the danger warnings about this Presidential Institution that we have created.
Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I want a strong President. I want a President who is sufficiently strong in his powers to deal in the vast range of domestic and foreign affairs, but I think if what we need above all is a strong President whose office is open, public, constitutional, and responsible to the American people. I am afraid that this is what we are increasingly losing as we grant the President power, as we appropriate money without a quorum call, which is an absolute money we have created. We have created an institution which permits its occupant to escape from reality to hide behind the grandeur of the President's house, to lose himself in elaborate constitutional and legal protections, behind its fantastic budgetary powers and other powers. We have created an institution in which its occupant can start a war, can bomb, can spend, can wiretap, can break into doctors' offices, can have an Attorney General who will use his powers in ways to undermine the laws; and we have seen in many, many ways the danger warnings about this Presidential Institution that we have created.
Recently, John Gardner said that the President has created a curious and unprecedented one-way communication with the American people; he can reach us but we cannot reach him; we can see him, but he cannot hear us; he is always with us but there is no dialogue.
Whether it was the day we let him take the Bureau of the Budget and bring it into the White House, whether it was the day there was created the Domestic Council which took many powers of HEW and Labor and brought them into the White House, or the day we permitted him to expand the National Security Council from a modest advisory body to what, in effect, was a separate and independent Department of State, in many different ways Congress unwittingly or unwittingly contributed an Institution which permitting the President to undermine, ignore, and disregard laws we adopted, money we appropriated, and the very terms of legislation he himself has often signed into law.
It may not happen again but I think it might, and if we do not learn from Watergate other than just punishing the wrongdoers, I think it is possible to reform the institution so it cannot happen again, I believe we will have several Watergates in the future, perhaps more and worse than we have seen today.

We have had too close a call with American democracy this time. And at the heart of the success of Watergate strategy was a White House, with so much power, with so much money, without limits, that they could carry on this fantastic array of activities without anyone even knowing about it; and it was really only an accident that permitted us to stub our toes on it in the first place.

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

Mr. MONDALE. If I may have one more minute, therefore I hope, as we deal with these budgets and as we create a new dialog with the President, whoever he may be, with this experience in mind, that we reshape that office and that we deal with it in a way that it will become open, legal, constitutional, and above all, be back in control of the American people.

I thank the distinguished floor manager for his courtesy and generosity. I withdraw the amendment and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withdraw his amendment?

Mr. MONDALE. I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, on behalf of myself and Senators McCLELLAN, RANDOLPH, and BELLON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 7, line 18, strike out "$100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$400,000,000".

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, by way of brief explanation, this amendment is with respect to disaster relief. The President in his initial budget request asked Congress to appropriate $100 million, and in the intervening months we had 36 different disaster situations throughout the country, including the Mississippi floods. Just recently, since we marked up the bill, the President submitted a revised budget request to reflect an increase of $300 million over the initial request of $100 million, so that the total would be $400 million.

This is a mere tinkering with any amendment. It is felt, not only by me but by other members of the committee, that this money is needed.

Last year, I believe, when we had Hurricane Agnes, we appropriated at different intervals during the year approximately $800 million. The damage caused by the recent floods along the Mississippi Delta have been very severe. There is a great demand for these funds at the present time.

It is in view of the urgency of the situation, I want to say that I have consulted with my colleague on the minority side and we have agreed to this amendment.

SENATOR RANDOLPH SPONSORS DISASTER RELIEF AMENDMENT

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

Mr. MONTOYA, I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is the Senator yielding time to me on his amendment?

Mr. MONTOYA. I will yield time on the amendment, if the Senator wishes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would appreciate it. I shall be very brief.

Mr. President, I commend the author of the amendment and appreciate the fact that I am privileged to cosponsor it. I think in this amendment we attempt to meet the administration's request. It is a request which I think is justified, because the money will go to communities and to persons who suffer from these disasters.

We have made great strides in recent years in providing the Federal Government with a mechanism to respond quickly and effectively when disasters strike. The Disaster Relief Act of 1970 was developed by the Committee on Public Works on which the Senator from New Mexico serves. This statute was the result of several years' work and for the first time established procedures for placing disaster relief activities into operation without delay.

In the past 3 years there has been, I believe, considerable success in implementing this act. Forecasting the incidence of disaster in any single year is, of course, impossible. Therefore, when we provide urgently needed disaster relief, we must pay the bill.

Last year the number of disasters was far above average and additional appropriations were required. During 1973 we have, unfortunately, experienced a number of devastating and costly disasters. It is likely we will have the recovery from these disasters and the return to normal that these additional funds are being sought today.

Mr. President, this is an appropriate time for me to bring the Senate up to date on the activities of the committee with regard to legislation in this field. Early in the 93d Congress our Subcommittee on Disaster Relief was reestablished under the able chairmanship of Senator Hatfield of Oregon. Our Subcommittee immediately began to review the operation of the 1970 act and to determine if amendments were necessary.

Hearings were held in locations that have recently experienced disasters—Biloxi, Miss.; Rapid City, S. Dak.; Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; and Elmira, N.Y.

Senator BURACK will conduct 3 days of hearings in Washington next week to discuss specific legislative proposals relating to the Disaster Relief Act. I am confident that this subcommittee will weigh testimony carefully and review the proposals in acting to improve what I believe to be already effective law.

So I join the Senator from New Mexico, chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this bill, in urging adoption of the amendment, which has already been agreed to by himself and the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his contribution. I know that he has been an ardent supporter of disaster relief throughout the years—at least during the years I have served on the Public Works Committee. I commend him for it and thank him for offering his support at this time.

Mr. President, in order to supplement State and local government efforts to alleviate the suffering damage resulting from major natural disasters, the President is empowered, under the provisions of the Disaster Relief Act of 1970, as amended, Public Law 91-606, and Public Law 92-385, to determine whether a disaster is of sufficient magnitude to warrant Federal aid. The President has delegated the responsibility for coordinating all such Federal assistance to the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Disaster relief is provided, in accordance with statutory authority, with the money appropriated to the President's Disaster Relief Fund, administered by the Federal Disaster Assistance Administration in HUD.

During the period January 1-August 24, 1973, the President has declared 39 major disasters in 23 States. Of this total, 32 were declared in the months of June and July. In addition, pre-disaster assistance has been made available to California to prevent the threat of fire in 2,800 acres of dead and damaged eucalyptus trees; and fire suppression grant assistance has been authorized for Montana and Oregon.

Perhaps the most dramatic disaster activity of the past spring has been the flooding and shoreline erosion which occurred along the Great Lakes and the flooding in the Missouri and Mississippi River Valleys. In the first case, high winds and rain, combined with the highest water levels in the Great Lakes in recorded history, caused substantial damage along the shorelines of New York, Ohio, and Michigan. In the second case, high winds and rain combined with the highest water levels resulted in extensive flood damage along the Missouri River and floods of record level along the Mississippi River.

This has resulted in disaster declarations for the States of Michigan, Minnesota, Illinois, Louisiana, Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Iowa. A complete list of disasters declared by the President
in fiscal year 1973 and in fiscal year 1974 to date has been included as part of this justification.

The passage by Congress of the second supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1973 brought total appropriations to the President's Disaster Relief Fund in that year to $592.5 million. The $100 million appropriated in this supplemental, which was submitted in January, represented the best estimates at that time of the funding requirements for disaster relief. While these funds have played a key role in meeting the most immediate relief requirements for disasters declared since January, the major impact of this unprecedented number of declarations, in terms of funding requirements, will be experienced during the first and second quarters of fiscal year 1974. The current estimates of fund requirements for disasters which have been declared to date, when matched against funds which are currently available or anticipated, indicate the need for $300 million in addition to the $100 million which has previously been requested. The derivation of this requirement is exhibited in a table which accompanies this justification, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record.

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

**Disasters Declared, Fiscal Years 1973-1974**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type of disaster</th>
<th>Date of declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Severe storms</td>
<td>July 3, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Severe storms</td>
<td>July 3, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Severe storms</td>
<td>July 19, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Severe storms</td>
<td>Aug. 1, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Severe storms</td>
<td>Aug. 1, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Severe storms</td>
<td>Aug. 18, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Heavy rains and flooding</td>
<td>Aug. 23, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Severe storms and flooding</td>
<td>Aug. 25, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Severe storms</td>
<td>Sept. 4, 1972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated Requirements—Disaster Relief Fiscal Year 1974**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total estimated requirements</th>
<th>Less: Obligations</th>
<th>Fiscal year 1974 requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>245 1,185 1,274 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>101,176 1,258 1,402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>235 4,730 4,697 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>276 7,630 7,600 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>721 8,925 8,918 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>274 9,300 9,319 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>235 5,050 5,077 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>283 6,980 6,572 124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>295 11,150 11,117 58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>296 18,970 17,883 977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>288 2,420 2,396 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>299 15,680 12,652 89,383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>301 1,290 1,277 93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>307 4,750 4,189 56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>307 4,750 4,261 2,314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>307 4,390 4,369 2,314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>307 14,300 13,212 1,088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>311 5,400 5,273 168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>312 5,340 4,888 426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>313 5,590 5,359 321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>316 7,000 6,596 138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>318 679 656 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>319 9,720 8,796 424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>321 2,337 2,273 64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>323 4,625 2,639 1,986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>324 2,418 2,000 188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>325 7,800 7,681 119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>326 895 822 71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>327 350 346 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>329 2,748 2,087 661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>330 1,460 1,360 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>331 400 326 74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>332 2,420 2,131 233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>333 1,350 1,262 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>334 400 200 600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>335 80,000 75,821 3,878</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>336 3,300 3,233 67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>337 102,500 93,474 18,776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>338 20,770 19,219 1,571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>339 456,500 235,634 221,166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>340 7,670 7,435 235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>341 1,497 1,427 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>342 1,535 1,435 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>343 5,211 5,037 174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>344 1,257 1,278 149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>345 1,400 1,301 99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>346 1,400 1,317 99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>347 7,680 7,435 245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>348 1,257 1,278 149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>349 1,641 1,592 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>350 4,765 3,913 1,874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>351 1,257 1,278 149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>352 521 514 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>353 600 562 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>354 2,350 2,097 1,353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>355 150 147 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnote at end of table.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back their time on the amendment?

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment having been yielded back the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico (putting the question).

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 11, line 13, delete the figure "$30,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$40,000,000".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to increase the appropriation for the special fund for the Office for Drug Abuse from the figure which the committee has provided $30 million to the budget estimate of $40 million. The House gave only $21.5 million.

Obviously, of course, the compromise will be between those two figures. I would hope we would be able to stand by the $30 million figure.

I have discussed this amendment with the manager of the bill, and he feels that the Special Action Office gave very good accounting of what they would use the $30 million for. He does not feel, however, that they have adequately accounted for the whole budget request of $40 million.

He, of course, will speak to that himself.

I offered the amendment only for the purpose of inducing my colleague—although I am sure it is entirely agreeable with him—to discuss the matter with us so that the Senate might be acquainted with what is at stake and we might have an opportunity to do something about it in the future should that seem to be warranted by the facts. Furthermore, I will show why it is likely that justification will be forthcoming and these funds can be provided in a supplemental appropriation dealing with section 223 funds.

The amendment would expressly provide money for three purposes, outreach, funding of new methods of treatment for various types of drug abuse and strength-
en planning the capacity of the States to meet their own drug abuse needs.

This is a uniquely great opportunity to deal with and be abreast of the problem, because even the nature of drug abuse tends to change while we are looking at it. For example, there have been reports on a reduction in the illicit use of heroin, drug abuse and material increase in the use of a drug called methadone, which is also addictive and which has not been the subject of much research.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record a letter which Senator Hughes and I wrote to the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Montoya) respecting the effort to provide the full budget estimate for this particular item.

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

U.S. SENATE

Hon. Joseph M. Montoya,
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee,
Subcommittee on Treasury, U.S. Postal Service and General Government, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Chairman:

In connection with your consideration of proposed fiscal year 1974 budget estimates for the Department of Treasury, this large family of federal agencies, we would like to call your attention to what we consider to be a serious deficiency in the House bill. As you know, that bill approoves $5 million for the purposes of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention; $20 million for Section 224, pharmacological research; and $21.5 million for Section 223. We are unable to express our concern over the amount allocated for the Special Fund. The fact that SAODAP did not expend its full Section 223 appropriation for fiscal year 1973 for the reasons cited in your letter of November 14, 1973, does not justify the belief that those funds were contained in supplemental appropriations and did not become available until late in the fiscal year. The purpose of this amendment was to increase the number and diversity of drug treatment and prevention programs throughout the country with the expectation that improvements in law enforcement measures, these programs have begun to have an important impact on the drug abuse problem. Major indicators of heroin abuse have begun to show a downturn, but we must not now reduce the federal potential to consolidate and multiply the gains which have already been made.

While vastly expanding treatment capacity, SAODAP has tightened management control systems and sought new measures of program effectiveness. It is instituting better methods of management which will provide a more effective evaluation of all programs.

Through use of the Special Fund, SAODAP has sought to establish central intake facilities. For example, in Texas, the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, in cooperation with the San Antonio Intake Center, has been able to reduce the need for detoxification services and to allow the Central Intake System, an addict in need of treatment can report to a single central office and be referred to the kind of treatment program that is right for him. When the addict early in his treatment reports to the program intake and intake facility, where the program has room for him. This system eliminates the problem of addicts approaching various programs for help and being turned away by one program because the addict is unsuited to their needs. Such facilities have already been established in Houston, Texas and Hartford, Connecticut. Expansion of this kind of program in new areas is now an important priority for SAODAP.

These funds have also been used to better utilize the criminal justice system as an outreach mechanism. The TASO (Treatment Alternative System Outpatient) is designed to identify, screen and refer for treatment drug dependent persons who are arrested. Through a process of interview and urinalysis, persons are referred to the appropriate facility; they are tracked throughout treatment to insure satisfactory performance, and they are counseled in order to productively return them to the community.

During fiscal year 1974 the Special Fund will be used for three primary purposes: outreach, funding of new methods of treatment and research. The latter includes strengthening the capability of the states to meet their own drug abuse needs. SAODAP also intends to do much more in the area of job training for drug abusing youth. The problems of the estimated 130,000 drug addicts in our federal, state and local prisons will also receive much needed attention. We also propose new approaches to treating drug abuse in view of the new polydrug use phenomenon which has been found in many areas throughout the nation. SAODAP will also establish a committee to new initiatives in this field, as well as to the development of antagonists and other chemical substitutes for methadone treatment.

These and other programs will substantially contribute to reducing our national drug problem. Restoration of the full request for SAODAP is essential.

We ask that you appropriate $8.5 million over the House and third further amendment to be proposed, Senate and other sympathetic as may be, and vote the money available. There will be the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Montoya) did this work for the House, and I will continue to do in the future and will be as sympathetic as I possibly can be within fiscal prudence so that we can expand the drug abuse prevention program, and we must express the hope that however, we must do so in an orderly process, and not just throw money away.

Mr. JAVITS. I thoroughly agree with the Senator, but I am going to raise this question, so that he might have it in mind in conference. I might say that I shall withdraw the amendment when I have finished.

I am told that because of the financing of this fund in a supplemental for fiscal year 1973, carryover funds cannot be used. Of course, Congress can always appropriate $5 million for the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention program, but this would be a serious relief. But I believe that with the disposition of the Senator who has just spoken, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Montoya)—and if he will bear this point in mind, which may or may not be followed in the conference—I have every confidence that so far as money is deserved, it will be forthcoming.

I thank the Senator, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask for the third reading.

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

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

The bill was read the third time. The PRESIDING OFFICER. I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield me 3 minutes, please? Mr. MONTOYA. I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to page 40 of the committee report. On that page, which will be in the possession of the Senator from New Mexico, is the interesting fact that the interest on the public debt for the current fiscal year will be $275.6 billion. That figure is not in the bill before the Senate, but it is in the committee report. It is the amount of money that the taxpayers will be called upon to finance the interest on public debt which we are appropriating for public purposes.

I think it is important that attention be focused on how much it is costing the taxpayers to finance that debt. Many persons look at the debt as a figure which has little relation to the average citizen. I say that nothing could be further from the truth.
the fact, or the truth. The fact is that 17 cents of every personal and corporate income tax dollar paid into the Treasury by the taxpayers and wage earners of the country go for one purpose; namely, to pay the interest on the debt.

As the committee report states, the interest of $27.5 billion on the debt is $3.3 billion more than the interest charges for fiscal 1973.

One other figure I shall mention in connection with the public debt. For the fiscal years 1970 through the current fiscal year—during that 5-year period—the national debt increased $116 billion. To put it another way, the accumulated deficits for that 5-year period from fiscal 1970 through the current fiscal year will total $116 billion. That represents 25 percent of the total national debt of the Nation.

During that 5-year period, 25 percent of the total national debt has been incurred. The remaining 75 percent goes back more than 100 years. I think the figure for the interest charges, given in the committee report before us today, shows the very severe and grave financial condition facing the Government of the United States. Until Congress and the President, acting together, are willing to cooperate and to get spending under control and get these huge deficits under control, I feel that we average American citizen, the average wage earner, the average working person, man and woman, is going to pay the price either in the form of inflation or more taxes, or both.

The basic cause of inflation, in my judgment, or the major cause of the inflation we are experiencing, is these continued huge Government deficits. It is not generally realized that in the 5-year period from fiscal year 1970 through fiscal year 1974 the accumulated Federal funds debit totaled $116 billion, which represents 25 percent of the total national debt. This figure in the committee report of $27.5 billion representing the interest charges on the debt for fiscal 1974, dramatizes that there is a real cost to the American people in financing these huge deficits.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a table entitled "Deficits in Federal Funds and Interest on the National Debt, 1955–1974 Inclusive."

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

# Thus the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Outlays</th>
<th>Surplus (-) or Deficit (+)</th>
<th>Debt Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>$585.1</td>
<td>552.9</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>654.4</td>
<td>639.9</td>
<td>-14.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>688.8</td>
<td>671.7</td>
<td>-17.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>656.8</td>
<td>700.7</td>
<td>-43.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>658.8</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>-112.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>777.7</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>-12.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>752.2</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>797.7</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>831.7</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Thus the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Outlays</th>
<th>Surplus (-) or Deficit (+)</th>
<th>Debt Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>$585.1</td>
<td>552.9</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>654.4</td>
<td>639.9</td>
<td>-14.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>688.8</td>
<td>671.7</td>
<td>-17.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>656.8</td>
<td>700.7</td>
<td>-43.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>658.8</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>-112.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>777.7</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>-12.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>752.2</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>797.7</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>831.7</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Thus the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Outlays</th>
<th>Surplus (-) or Deficit (+)</th>
<th>Debt Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>$585.1</td>
<td>552.9</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>654.4</td>
<td>639.9</td>
<td>-14.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>688.8</td>
<td>671.7</td>
<td>-17.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>656.8</td>
<td>700.7</td>
<td>-43.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>658.8</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>-112.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>777.7</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>-12.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>752.2</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>797.7</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>831.7</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Thus the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Outlays</th>
<th>Surplus (-) or Deficit (+)</th>
<th>Debt Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>$585.1</td>
<td>552.9</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>654.4</td>
<td>639.9</td>
<td>-14.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>688.8</td>
<td>671.7</td>
<td>-17.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>656.8</td>
<td>700.7</td>
<td>-43.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>658.8</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>-112.0</td>
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</tr>
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<td>1960</td>
<td>777.7</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>-12.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>752.2</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>797.7</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>831.7</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>$585.1</td>
<td>552.9</td>
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<td>-4.3</td>
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<td>85.6</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>831.7</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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