

It is a fact, is it not, that in the 10-year period we are talking about, 1953 to date, Federal Government employees group has not increased at all?

They are precisely where they were in numbers 10 years ago?

Mr. CLAGUE. Yes.

They do not change much, about 2.25 million.

Of course, I should say, Mr. Congressman, Federal expenditures help support some of the State and local government employment, because of our various kinds of Federal grants in aid.

Representative REUSS. Surely.

Mr. CLAGUE. So some of your Federal budget relates to the State and local government, but the strictly Federal employment remains fairly constant, as you can see, from year to year.

Representative REUSS. Congressman Curtis and myself happened to have been in Congress for approximately that time, from 1953 to 1962.

Are we not justified in being rather proud of the fact that in that period the employees of the Federal Government have been able to do a vastly expanded job—have been able to show vastly increased productivity—and have not increased at all in numbers?

Mr. CLAGUE. Well, I think on behalf of the Federal employees I would like to say I think we do have increasing productivity. It is pretty hard to measure.

I believe some attempts are now going to be made to measure our productivity to see if we cannot find some way of crediting our performance against our numbers of personnel.

But we have not had any such system so far.

Representative REUSS. And inasmuch as the line of Federal employees is substantially uniform both during the period of the Republican Eisenhower administration and during the period of the Democratic Kennedy administration, I am not in error, am I, in saying that the honors can be shared between Republicans and Democrats?

Mr. CLAGUE. Well, sir, we have got the figures right along.

You can just take the figures either off the chart or the actual figures.

Representative REUSS. They seem to bear that out.

Mr. CLAGUE. They are about the same all the way.

Representative REUSS. I notice that the one little divergence from this record occurred in early 1960 when there was quite a pronounced upward hump.

Can you tell me what caused that bulge in Federal employees?

Mr. CLAGUE. That was taking the 1960 census.

Representative REUSS. Those were patronage employees, were they, very largely?

Miss BANCROFT. Largely.

Representative CURTIS. They were taking the census.

Representative REUSS. Not regular civil service.

Mr. CLAGUE. Those were the 175,000, or so, special agents that had to be taken on.

Representative REUSS. And the only other little pimple on the line occurs at the end of 1961, and that is a downward bump.

Can you explain that?