I am perfectly willing to accept all of your recommendations, I am going to have to agree with Mr. Battin that the final decision has to be made here and in the Congress because if we allow you alone to decide where the cuts are going to be made I know they are going to be made from a selfish standpoint.

If we allow the labor unions alone to make them, they are going to be made from a selfish standpoint. If we allow the farmers alone to make them, they are going to be made from a selfish standpoint, or, whatever the group, it is certainly not going to recommend any cuts where it is going to get hurt particularly.

In other words, I found out years ago when I had been in Congress a short time that everybody in the country is for economy except on his and "his'n," and so while I might be willing to accept your recommendations to be evaluated, I do agree that I wouldn't want you to have the final say about it because I think I know what would happen. I do think, however, when you come in here and talk about cuts you ought to have been prepared to have brought back with you that list that you sent out in the earlier part of the year and go over it again and review what has happened in the interim.

It is easy to talk about a great big cut and a little hard to do something about it. You know how it goes—when you get to talking about a cut, and then you have 50 Governors and 50 States, the mayors and boards, councils of every city, the county judges and the fiscal courts of all counties, and 85 percent of the people in the country, by telephone, letter, telegraph and personal visit, constantly haranguing each Member of Congress for more and more and more money. It is very seldom you get a letter that wants less.

Once in a while you do, but most of them want more. I have often felt that maybe Congress has done a right responsible job in not answering all the requests, because if we had met every demand for money made on us, while there may be some existing bad financial condition, we would by this time have been over the brink. So when you do come in—while it would have been nice if you could have had your specific suggestions today—I don't merely want to consider your suggestions alone. I want to get everybody's and weigh each one.

I didn't ask you a question. I preached a sermon. Thank you.

Mr. WINTER. I think in the time ahead, too, we must recognize that there will be perhaps after Vietnam—I don't know when—more and more requests from the States for some form of revenue sharing and that is going to have to have a great deal of study.

I don't know what the ultimate outcome of that will be. We have just been through a very tedious procedure in Illinois trying to raise taxes, and I can tell you it is very difficult. It is difficult on the Federal level.

The CHAIRMAN. That is one thing you don't have to remind us of, Mr. Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman. I want to thank these witnesses for appearing and giving this committee the benefit of their studies and evaluations. I think one of our basic problems here is a fundamental difference in economic philosophy between the new economics, as practiced by this administration, and the economics of people like myself. The administration has been following the theory of moving the economy forward through increasing aggregate demand, through creating Federal deficits, if necessary. This is what I call the new economics.