

Mr. MORRIS. We have no data, sir, that we can offer on this.

Representative CURTIS. Well, isn't this important—to be able to make policy. Let me take the other side of the coin, because I am concerned about our domestic producers, and I want to be sure that they have a fair shake on this thing. In order to make a policy decision of what they need—do they need 50 percent? Because certainly the Defense Department ought to have the data available to those of us who have to make policy in this other area of what it is costing.

If you are cost conscious you ought to be able to say—"Look, but for these things, and but for the small business set-aside we would—if these were not there we would be spending x hundreds of millions of dollars less." Then we are in the position of weighing the two.

Mr. MORRIS. The judgment was made that this was a desirable policy to apply in the interest of the adverse balance of payments. We know as a result many foreign bidders have ceased bidding. We thus have no way of knowing what the bids would be in many cases today and thus cannot develop precise figures.

Chairman PROXMIRE. It seems to me that Secretary McNamara told us a couple of years ago at that time he estimated the cost of the "Buy American" policy by the Defense Department, the 50 percent, was something like \$67 million a year. It may have been Secretary Ignatius.

Mr. MORRIS. I have inquired, sir, and we have no figures I can offer you at this time. (See p. 86, "Hearings, 1966?")

Representative CURTIS. This I think is unfortunate.

Let me get this in context for the record.

This is not to criticize the U.S. Government vis-a-vis other governments—as frequently as reported to the American people—because the "Buy France," the "Buy Britain," the "Buy German" imposed by these societies is considerably more restrictive than "Buy American," I would observe.

But I am concerned in trying to get to the bottom of what it is costing us, the Government, to get the weapons and the services to provide our defense. And even though a policy decision may have been made, I think it is important for the Defense Department to have the figures in this area so that this policy can be reviewed.

Now, I ask that it be done. The Bureau of the Budget—I asked them several years ago. The Bureau of the Budget has not even reconciled the various "Buy American" applications of the various departments of the Federal Government. The Defense is 50 percent, GSA is 6 percent. There is no rationality on the thing at all. And this embargo that the Defense Department has on a wide range of goods has not been rationalized.

Well, I will leave the subject there for further development.

STATUS OF IPE INVENTORY

Chairman PROXMIRE. I just have a couple of very brief items.

Last May, when General Hedlund's predecessor, Admiral Lyle, appeared, he indicated that we were only a small part of the way along on getting inventory information on this Government-owned contractor-held and used equipment. He said the following, and I quote:

We are also conducting a one-time equipment inventory reconciliation program. The program will provide adequate and compatible central inventory records of