

What you think is "as much as we could" may be different from what others think and we may think that inflation and high interest rates are more serious even than the rhetoric in your statement and if it is, then "as much as we could" is either not an accurate phrase or one that is the very bone of contention here.

Mr. SCHULTZE. Mr. Curtis, there are two parts to that. With respect to the public works program, for example, the Congress in the appropriations bill this year did have a chance to cut those nine new starts out. They didn't. They added starts.

Mr. CURTIS. Now I am going to say something about this because I have listened to the rhetoric of the President and the rhetoric here about blaming Congress for these things.

As soon as we had a chance to look back at the budget we urged the President to pull it back and submit a rescission bill and not ask the Congress for all these things.

The President has not done that. He has continued to ask the Congress for it and in many of his messages and his speeches, he has whetted the appetites of the people for these very programs so that then, when Congress may not go along, he still can talk this way.

Furthermore, the President can veto appropriations bills.

Mr. SCHULTZE. He did, Saturday.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, he did and I was glad he did, although I was very interested in why he picked a pigeon like that one, but he can veto an appropriation bill. They have been vetoed before and they can come back here to Congress.

But instead of that the President tries to create the impression among the people that it is Congress who is responsible for higher spending. I tell you it is the President who has been whetting the appetites of the people for all of these things that have created the pressures on the Congress and I say this as one who votes against these bills as you probably know and has to bear the brunt of going back home to my people who say, "Well, aren't you interested in our welfare," and I say, "Yes, I am and that is why I have voted against them."

But I can't get enough of my colleagues to go along. This President hasn't turned the White House lights off symbolically as he once did. He is going to his farm down in Texas every weekend. That is the symbol today.

Mr. SCHULTZE. Just a minute, Mr. Curtis. There is absolutely no reason for that with respect to what we are talking about here today.

Mr. CURTIS. There certainly is.

Mr. SCHULTZE. If the President occasionally after working 19 hours a day, 7 days a week, decides to go to Texas once, Mr. Curtis, I think it is a pretty ill thing, then, when that is thrown out in the heat of any tax debate as something to do with legislation; we shall all economize.

Mr. CURTIS. You can have your opinion, but I point to your statements here and the various statements by the President blaming the Congress for these things. I was speaking symbolically when I commented that President Johnson seems to have given up turning the lights off in the White House at night.

You try to take it as a personal attack. I am talking symbolically.

Mr. SCHULTZE. I am sorry. Excuse me. It was a symbolic nonpersonal attack.