

UNITED STATES

*U.S. Congress.*



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 8

MARCH 26, 1973 TO APRIL 2, 1973

(PAGES 9377 TO 10642)

the only Air Force fighter plane now in the development stage. Its development is being closely watched by the Senate Armed Services Committee and other committees of the Congress who are charged with responsibility for military matters.

The story by Mr. Kelly creates the impression that the Defense Department is busily attempting to cover up a 21-percent increase in the cost of the F-15 and is hiding the fact that the F-100 engine being developed for the F-15 has had 52 undisclosed major breakdowns in its hardware.

At the conclusion of my remarks, I shall include in the record a fact sheet answering in detail Mr. Kelly's allegation. But for immediate purposes, let me say that no phase of the F-15 development has been hidden from me or my colleagues nor have there been 52 major breakdowns in the hardware of the F-100 engine. In the Pratt and Whitney development of the F-100, several design deficiencies have cropped up, just as they do in the development of any engine for a new aircraft. Each of these deficiencies has been effectively and systematically corrected and no one or group of these deficiencies could accurately be called "a major breakdown."

My concern, Mr. President, is with the overall impression created by this news story. To the casual reader, it seems to say that the Defense Department is squandering the taxpayers' money on a useless aircraft and attempting to hide the true situation from the Congress. This is certainly not the case and the fact sheet I shall present will bear me out. And I would just like to say, Mr. President, that I will continue to counter these unfounded stories aimed at the Department of Defense and the development of new and needed items of hardware for the military every time they crop up, whether the author happens to be Mr. Kelly or someone else.

I ask unanimous consent to have this fact sheet printed in the RECORD.

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

[Fact sheet on Washington Star & News article]

#### F-15 COST IS HIDDEN

(By Orr Kelly)

##### CHARGE

A secret Defense Department Study shows a 21% cost increase on the F-15. This has been kept from Congress.

##### FACT

A parametric study by the Cost Analysis Improvement Group (CAIG) of the Office of the Secretary of Defense was accomplished in 1972, using a broad data base from past aircraft development programs. The results of this analytical effort were approximately 21% higher than the present Selected Acquisition Report (SAR) figures.

##### COMMENT

The SAR program estimate bases are negotiated contracts at target, negotiated options with not-to-exceed ceilings, cost trade-off studies at program go-ahead, unique management controls and a sophisticated performance measurement system that permits validation of the program estimate. The SAR estimate is now over three years old with 85% of the development program funded and still on budget target. Additionally, the

SAR values are substantiated within 2-3% by an Air Force Independent Cost Analysis (AF/ICA), validated by the Aeronautical Systems Division of the Air Force Command. This Air Force ICA has been examined and indorsed by the Air Force Auditor. Since the SAR is the DOD best estimate of costs, internal estimates considered in the process of arriving at the SAR estimates are not normally distributed.

##### CHARGE

The F-100 engine being developed for the F-15 has had 52 hitherto undisclosed major breakdowns in its hardware.

##### FACT

The developmental testing of the Pratt & Whitney F-100 engines has identified several design deficiencies, each of which has been systematically and effectively corrected. These have neither been major in scope nor have they been secreted by the contractor or the Air Force.

##### COMMENT

The identification of design deficiencies and performance inadequacies is a fundamental element in the development of all hardware, but it is particularly key in the area of aircraft engine development. To expect the test and qualification of an engine not to identify such deficiencies would be both impractical and unrealistic. The assertion that those technical problems identified to date in the F-100 engine program are "major breakdowns" is not documented in fact. Additionally, the Air Force has been open with both the press and the Congressional staff in discussions of all significant test results of the F-100 engine program.

##### CHARGE

The CAIG estimate has set off a bitter dispute within the Pentagon.

##### FACT

The existence of both the CAIG and the Air Force ICA has been thoroughly discussed between OSD and the Air Force without conflict.

##### COMMENT

The only dispute that is evident as a result of the CAIG and ICA difference is one of academic merit. The proponents of each method indorse the analytical basis and fundamental assumptions of their model. The differences in the conclusions of the two approaches have led to the recent and on-going efforts to combine the merits of each, and thereby, hopefully to develop an improved model from which to work.

##### CHARGE

Some of the early production models of the F-15 will be equipped with engines that have not passed military qualification.

##### FACT

Engine qualification is currently scheduled to be completed by May 1973, and the first production aircraft is not due for delivery until November 1974.

##### COMMENT

The very conservative F-15 program approach of "fly-before-buy" has provided sufficient program flexibility to insure that such unwarranted risk need not be taken. Even with the delay experienced to date in completing engine qualification, the F-100 engine will be fully qualified at least a year before installation in a production aircraft.

##### CHARGE

Recent decision to proceed with production of the F-15 was a significant departure from the "fly-before-buy" concept.

##### FACT

The F-15 program has always maintained adherence to Mr. Packard's interpretation of the "fly-before-you-buy" concept. Explaining this approach to a Congressional Committee, Mr. Packard said: "In my mind, fly-before-you-buy means having an acceptable level of

confidence that we know what we are doing before we move ahead . . ."

##### COMMENT

Both the experience gained in the F-15 flight test program and the overall engine test program have generated the necessary level of confidence to proceed with the FY 1973 production of 30 F-15s. Production configured engines are currently flying in some RDT&E aircraft. The F-15 has bettered all of the current DCP thresholds except two.

##### CHARGE

There are F-15 associated costs hidden as other efforts to minimize the total F-15 costs.

##### FACT

There are on-going development efforts such as the GAU-7A 25 mm gun and the Tactical Electronic Warning Systems which, if successful, will have application to the F-15 aircraft.

##### COMMENT

The management decision to develop such high risk subsystem as the GAU-7A and TEWS outside of the F-15 program was, in no way, an effort to hide funds expended. Costs associated with these efforts have been reported to Congress and have in every case been clearly identified as having potential application to the F-15, as well as other aircraft.

##### CHARGE

When the engine cost went up \$552 million, \$522.8 million was deleted in needed spares, in an effort to offset the cost increase.

##### FACT

The engine cost increase of \$552 million was a net increase cost projected from the re-priced engine contract after deletion of the Navy F-14B engines. Subsequently, in May 1972, DOD directed a change in reporting cost on the SAR report. This change was applicable to all SAR reports and in no way related to the F-15 engine costs. Previous SAR documents included a last page titled, "Additional System Costs" which included a wide variety of cost categories such as (1) Modifications, (2) Component Improvements, (3) Modification Spares, (4) Replenishment Spares, (5) Common AGE, (6) Common AGE Spares and (7) War Consumables. The revised reporting eliminated all costs categories except (1) Modifications and (2) Component Improvement. The effect of this direction was to reduce the total dollar value of "Additional System Costs" reported by approximately \$520 million.

##### COMMENT

The increase in engine cost was appropriately reflected within the total system acquisition cost of the F-15, and was properly reported in the main body of the SAR. The reduction in reported "Additional Systems Costs" prompted by the DoD Directive does not impact the reported system acquisition cost.

##### CHARGE

F-15 program includes a \$15.5 million spin inhibitor system designed to solve a serious problem.

##### FACT

The F-15 does not have a spin problem and there is no spin inhibitor system either existing or envisioned.

##### COMMENT

The F-15 design has displayed such a resistance to spin that difficulties have been encountered in attempting to spin the 3/8 scale F-15 spin model. The assertion of a spin problem in the F-15 aircraft is unfounded.

## SOCIAL SERVICES—THE HUMAN DIMENSION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in recent weeks a large number of my colleagues and I have joined in vigorously

protesting new regulations proposed by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare regarding Social Services.

We have tried to emphasize the severe and tragic impact these regulations would have on individuals currently benefiting from day care programs, alcohol and drug abuse programs, day activity centers for the retarded and other programs currently made possible through Social Services.

It is one thing to talk in Washington about the statistics involved, but it is quite another to see first-hand the individuals who needs these programs so desperately. I had the opportunity last week to visit a day care center in Minneapolis and talk with working mothers who depend on that center to keep themselves and their children off the welfare rolls. It is a sobering experience to visit one of these centers while HEW's sword of Damocles is threatening the self-reliance of those who use it; I strongly recommend such a visit to anyone who doubts the value of the Social Services program.

It is the human dimension of Social Services that makes this entire matter so urgent and so important, and yet it is that same human dimension that has been lost in the new HEW regulations. This week there appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune an article by Sam Newlund which dramatizes as effectively as any article could precisely what effect these regulations will have on a 4-year-old girl in Minneapolis. I highly commend the article to my colleagues and I especially commend it to Secretary Weinberger, who has it within his authority to reverse the proposed regulations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Minneapolis Tribune article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PROPOSED U.S. RULES KEEP CITY GIRL, 4, FROM DAY-CARE CENTER URGED BY DOCTOR  
(By Sam Newlund)

A proposed set of controversial federal rules has spurred a national uprising among human service advocates.

The proposed regulations also mean quite a bit to Tracy Ybarra, a frisky Minneapolis 4-year-old who lives at 3647 N. 6th St.

The rules aren't in effect yet. They are supposed to begin April 1. That date may be extended, and the regulations may be softened.

But for Tracy, the uncertainty means that she can't attend a day care center which a child psychiatrist said she needs.

Tracy, the dark-eyed, gregarious daughter of Mrs. Shirley Ybarra, was referred to the Northeast Child Development Center, 1929 2nd St. NE., by Dr. Joel Finklestein, a child psychiatrist at the Minneapolis Clinic of Psychiatry and Neurology.

Mingling with other children at the day care center, Finklestein said, could help solve Tracy's behavior problems. He said the problems include temper tantrums and "screaming as in fear with night terrors."

Tracy was struck by a car while crossing a city street last year. The shock, the psychiatrist said, may have worsened her emotional troubles.

The child is barred from the day care center because of a highly controversial set of regulations issued Feb. 16 by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW). They have the effect of severely limiting eligibility and federal support for

a wide range of social services under current federal aid matching programs.

Besides day care, the regulations affect such services as alcohol- and drug-abuse programs, day activity centers for the retarded and homemaker services for the elderly.

For the most part, the rules limit services to welfare recipients. Tracy and her divorced mother are welfare recipients (Aid to Families With Dependent Children). But because Mrs. Ybarra is not working or undergoing job training, their status as welfare clients does not make them eligible.

Under the old rules, Tracy would be eligible as a "special needs" child. This means that an allowable reason for day care is not just to allow a parent to work or train, but to give the child a prescribed educational experience because of physical or emotional problems.

But the new rules, among other things, remove the "special needs" category of eligibility. Tracy, therefore, fits none of the eligibility pigeon-holes of the new rules.

At the center where Tracy would have gone, 32 of the 55 children now enrolled would be denied service by the regulations, according to Morris Manning, day care center director.

On a state level, the Department of Public Welfare estimates that the regulations would remove half of the 4,000 Minnesota youngsters now in federally aided day care centers.

"There is no question," Dr. Finklestein said, "that day care centers are marvelous adjuncts for people who need this kind of care." To have Tracy "out of the home and to bring her in contact with more children," he said, could have been "a corrective emotional experience."

Manning said the center is full now, but that Tracy would have been high on the list except for the new regulations.

The regulations were issued, according to HEW Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger, in an attempt "to bring some order out of what was promising to become a chaotic situation."

It was apparent, he said, that without "strong effort at the federal level, the expenditures by states for social services would soar out of control."

But there still is confusion. The April 1 effective date of the regulations may be extended, according to the best guess of knowledgeable Congressional sources.

Weinberger also has hinted that HEW may back off on at least one rule which does not allow private contributions to be counted as part of the matching money used to attract federal aid for social service programs such as day care.

Meanwhile, in a direct challenge to the Nixon administration's rules, Democratic lawmakers have introduced legislation which would nullify many of the changes.

Mrs. Eddie Hertzberg, coordinator of the Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association, listed 34 city day care centers which receive federal aid. All but 10 of them, she said, have federal aid for all of their enrolled children.

Private day care in the Minneapolis area, Mrs. Hertzberg said, costs from \$25 to \$38 a week.

#### PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, all too often, in our eagerness to address the major issues encompassed in a legislative proposal, we overlook some important side issues which may have serious unintended consequences. I am pleased that the distinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) was able to foresee the possibility of such a situation in regard to S. 1136, a bill passed by this body yesterday.

This bill, which would extend the authorities of various health programs from June 30, 1973, until June 30, 1974, is far-reaching legislation, affecting as it does most health-care institutions and personnel across this entire Nation. As such, the detrimental effect of unintended consequences would be very great indeed.

In view of recent judicial rulings, it is conceivable that the allocation of Federal assistance to health-related activities involved in S. 1136 would be conditioned on the recipient institution requiring doctors and other health-care personnel to participate in abortions and sterilization procedures. Senator CHURCH's amendment simply provides that Federal assistance contained in S. 1136 could not be conditioned on any requirement and that personnel will not be penalized for refusing to participate in abortions and sterilization procedures.

#### WOMEN EQUALITY GROUPS FIGHTING CREDIT BARRIERS

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, earlier this month, I joined with Senator WILLIAMS in cosponsoring S. 867, a bill to eliminate discrimination in the extension of credit to women.

I am certain, that this issue will engender considerable debate, some heated and some enlightened. However, I am equally certain that, when all of the evidence is in and the arguments have been presented, there will be but one conclusion that can be reached: Women and men similarly situated should have equal access to consumer credit channels.

From time to time, we have all been advised of examples of "improvements" adopted by credit-extending institutions in their treatment of women. We are presumably expected to digest these trends and become complacently satisfied with the progress that has been made. In short, I suppose we are expected to recite that over-used cliché—"You've come a long way, baby!"—and be done with it. I cannot accept that attitude.

It is simply for this reason that I have joined with my colleague from New Jersey in urging the Congress to approve S. 867. We have, indeed, gone a considerable distance in overcoming discriminatory barriers to women in their efforts to secure equal status with men in credit transactions. We have not yet gone the full distance however. We must not relax our vigilant efforts one iota until we have succeeded in eliminating any and all considerations of the sex of the applicant in the process of securing consumer credit.

In yesterday's edition of the New York Times, Ms. Marilyn Bender published an excellent review of the problems women face in their efforts to secure credit. Also contained in this article is a summary of the efforts that have been taking place, the actions that have been taken, and the proposals that are being considered—all directed at eliminating sex discrimination in the extension of consumer credit.

I highly recommend this article for the consideration of my colleagues and ask that it be printed in its entirety in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article