

knows how some of us feel about these expenditures, he should and would come in and revise his figures.

We have been asking this for months. The Joint Economic Committee, all 20 members, including 12 Democrats, said in our March joint statement that \$5 billion should be cut out of nondefense expenditure areas at that time. It isn't too late to start cutting. It wasn't too late for you to come in and ask for a tax increase so I am saying it isn't too late for the President not only to cut back, not just in rhetoric, but also come in and share the information with the Members of Congress.

One of the areas you mentioned that was in this uncontrollable area was agriculture.

Mr. SCHULTZE. Just the price support part of it.

Mr. CURTIS. That is pretty good. Regarding the price support program, you said, "We are now faced with an estimated increase of \$900 million for programs in which payments to individuals or groups are set by law and are, therefore, relatively uncontrollable."

Mr. SCHULTZE. Relatively.

Mr. CURTIS. I emphasize "therefore, relatively uncontrollable." "Of this amount, \$400 million is for higher farm price support payments by the Commodity Credit Corporation."

Secretary Freeman by a purely administrative decision on March 31 raised the price support for soybeans from \$2.25 to \$2.50 per bushel. It is clear that this is what caused the soybean acreage to jump and was responsible for the almost 1 million bushel crop just estimated by USDA, the largest on record.

This is within the "relatively uncontrollable" area of expenditure, is it not?

Mr. SCHULTZE. On the March actions you are quite correct that in the price support area you can, to some limited extent, depending on how the law is set up, change those prices. You will recall, for example, at the same time the Secretary reduced the wheat acreage in order to get this down.

Mr. CURTIS. I was coming to that.

Mr. SCHULTZE. May I point out this is the precise reason we used the term "relatively uncontrollable expenditures." There are areas in here in which the basic part of the program is indeed uncontrollable under existing law.

Admittedly, you can manipulate it on the side, but in terms of classifying programs one place or the other this is where we put it and advisedly used the term "relatively uncontrollable."

There is a little one could do, but not very much.

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly you didn't have to increase the \$2.25 to \$2.50, and you probably would have saved \$100 million.

Mr. SCHULTZE. No, sir; not on soybeans.

Mr. CURTIS. Well, Mr. Freeman again by administrative decision permitted the plowup of this year's planted cotton acreage when it looked like it was going to make a good crop, paid Government cotton plants, and then in this land planted soybeans so that our surplus of soybeans would be and has been larger, meaning more cost to the Government, or takeoff time of CCC.

Mr. SCHULTZE. Just about offset by the decrease in cotton, in fact more than offset because cotton is down.