Mr. CURTIS. The point is whether you agree with my criticism, this is surely a controllable item and any administration that is embarked upon an austerity program should certainly have been looking into this particular area.

Mr. SCHULTZE. All I am saying, Mr. Curtis, of that whole list, if you look at it, veterans pensions, public assistance grants, public service cost——

Mr. CURTIS. I looked at them in detail. I will get to them.

Mr. SCHULTZE. What I am saying is that almost all of these expenditures are uncontrollable. You have to classify them one place or the other.

Since they are basically uncontrollable we put them in that category. I can't deny that on the margin in certain of them you can manipulate, but there is a very small amount of room to do that under existing law.

Mr. CURTIS. We will let the record speak for itself. I have a bill in, by the way, to remove the price support on wheat and small grains and I think you probably could save about $2 billion, not in the immediate fiscal year, but a sizable sum like that. Actually the Secretary of Agriculture increased both the wheat and feed grain allotments before planting time for this year's crop and has produced——

Mr. SCHULTZE. The wheat was decreased, Mr. Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS. I said the amount of grain allotments before planting was increased.

Mr. SCHULTZE. I don't understand that. I'm sorry. That one I don't understand because I do recall the decision which would decrease wheat.

Mr. CURTIS. Wheat and corn production—I have the Agriculture Department's figures here—would be at an alltime high according to the USDA. August crop estimate, 1.5 billion bushels of wheat, 4.7 billion bushels of corn. This is an administrative decisions.

Mr. SCHULTZE. That is a crop figure, yes, sir. What I am saying is that this summer the Secretary of Agriculture in setting the advance acreage decreased the wheat allotment. The yield went up in wheat.

Mr. CURTIS. This is what I once described as the New Frontier waltz, two steps forward in the dark and then one step backward under the spotlights. The net result is one step forward, and this is not expenditure control. If you are doing this kind of a dance it is easy to see how you can go from a $77 billion expenditure level to $144 billion, if this is the definition of expenditure restraint.

Mr. SCHULTZE. Mr. Curtis, again what I said before was that basically under present law these payments are uncontrollable. You can, on the margin, change them a little bit, and particularly in the price support area—I can't deny that—but they are classified as relatively uncontrollable, which they are.

Mr. CURTIS. The answer is, and it is a very obvious one, is that we need someone in the administration who thinks they are controllable and will do something about them in this area and in other areas.

Mr. SCHULTZE. For the whole set of farm programs, over the past 5 years we have done precisely that. If you look at CCC price support programs, even there the expenditures this year will be $400 million less than they were in 1965.

Mr. CURTIS. I am quite familiar with it. On the payroll, you have that in an area that can't be reduced.