

Congress can adjourn on Thursdays, of course, as we have been all year, going for a 2-week recess around Labor Day. This is the kind of symbolism that the people see and then wonder, "What is this asking us to put in more money through increased taxes."

There is no leadership in the Executive. The Executive in this area has said he can't do anything about expenditure cuts.

Well, he can, and the reason he hasn't is that he just doesn't care to. President Eisenhower, when they first set up the space program, looked upon it as requiring a level of expenditure of \$1.8 billion projected into the future. The limitation was the number of scientists and engineers in the society, not money.

We have been hitting it at over a \$5 billion level. You can pay a person the salary of a scientist and call him a scientist, but that doesn't make him one. You can call a person an engineer and pay him the salary of an engineer, but that doesn't make him one. This program of \$5.3 billion in space is clearly an area where it could be cut back and improved and in these times certainly needs cutting back.

On the defense of Western Europe, great military leaders like President Eisenhower and others have called upon this administration to cut back on a \$2 to \$3 billion expenditure. This administration won't even discuss it, but here is an area where clearly we could cut back in defense.

Another is atomic energy. I am going down the list again. The defense budget itself, just because it has the name of Vietnam on it, doesn't mean that it isn't hiding vast waste. Our Joint Economic Subcommittee this year pointed out the manner in which Secretary of Defense McNamara had made a mockery out of the terms advertised bid and competitive bidding, and the way in which money could be spent more wisely there.

I have a bill in to cut approximately \$2 billion in agriculture. Secretary Freeman says it is a bill presented by a city Congressman. Well, I don't happen to be a city Congressman, but it is the result of years of work of the Joint Economic Committee where we have been trying to study this field of agricultural economics and my work as a member of the delegation in Geneva and in our GATT conferences. The American Farm Bureau I am happy to say has supported this approach, but, no, this administration keeps on with their agriculture program again as if things were normal. It is a bad program. It is bad for commercial agriculture. It is adding at least \$2 billion to these expenditure budgets that, note, don't need to be added.

To get into the business of the use of personnel by the administration, one never hears about productivity increases when it comes to the work of the Federal Government. It is just a continued increase of employees with very little real work done on the job of reclassifying skills and relating wage rates to skills.

Also there is the manner in which the administration rammed through without study the military manpower program based on the draft, which is about as expensive and poor a manpower program as we have.

You go down the list and you don't even have to touch the war on poverty to get at least \$10 billion, \$15 billion out of this budget.

Mr. Chairman, for the record the expenditure levels of this Federal Government in fiscal 1960 were \$77 billion. The testimony last week