thing and take the $6 billion reduction as Congress wants to take it, not as the administration wants to take it.

Without such action, we conclude the Congress concurs in our cuts, because there is no other way that we can live with that law. So the first issue, and I think the one that Congressman Bolling was speaking to, was the issue of who is responsible in the end for appropriating money.

The second part of your question though, asks whether there is a significant difference. To the extent that we reserve money, but it is available to be spent at a later date, there is a difference. The highway cutback is a very good example. Those highway moneys have already been provided. Essentially, what we are doing under the highway program is slowing obligations. Then, as the year goes on, we will increase the funds going to the States. So at the end of fiscal 1969, we will have exactly the same obligations for highways in 1969 as the January budget anticipated, but we will have saved $200 million of expenditures just by slipping the timing of obligations. So those funds are available at a future date.

Now, to the extent that Congress cuts an appropriation, those funds don't exist, and they won't be spent in 1969. They won't be spent in 1970 or 1971 or at any future date.

To the extent that we hold back no-year funds, these funds can be obligated in 1970, 1971 or at some future date. However, as you know, the tax bill did include a $10–$8–$6 billion cutback provision and so to the extent congressional cuts do not result in a $10 billion decrease in budget authority, we will not only have to reserve some other funds, but we will have to rescind the difference between $10 billion and the results of congressional and other action. And that part that is rescinded works in exactly the same way as the congressional cut. So, for the requirement to reduce budget authority by $10 billion, it really doesn't make any difference whether Congress does it or the executive does it except on the issue of who is responsible for appropriations.

Senator JAVITS. Now, Mr. Zwick, it would be very useful information if the $3.5 billion or whatever are your Presidential holdbacks could be charted for us as to what will be available and for how long.

Mr. ZWICK. That is going to be very difficult. The first question, I think, Senator, is whether or not we are going to have to do anything on the $10 billion. The summer review anticipates that the cut in budget authority resulting from congressional action and other changes will be $8.1 billion. If these estimates came out exactly as we have them there, we would have to hold back an additional $1.9 billion of budget authority, which would be rescinded. All the rest of the funds held back because of the cutback would be available in the future.

Now, I think there is some confusion on this point. Although it looks as if Congress is going to cut more than the $10-billion-budget authority, there have been some back door financing increases. The big ones are for CCC and the highway programs, and there are some others. So that while Congress is going to probably cut appropriations by more than $10 billion, and on that basis we wouldn't need to rescind anything, these increases in the back door sources for budget authority amount to roughly $2.4 billion. This means that there is a