

Now what would \$1 billion cut from the \$5.3 billion space program involve, if you didn't cut the Apollo program? Would this be possible, or the supporting elements? You have the Apollo program at about \$3.8 billion, something like that.

Mr. SCHULTZE. Yes.

Chairman PROXMIRE. Then you have \$1.5 billion for other programs.

Mr. SCHULTZE. That is right.

Chairman PROXMIRE. Suppose you cut everything else, just left the moon shot program with another half billion dollars to provide for whatever you have to support it, and eliminated the unmanned probing of Mars for the time being. Could you do that?

Mr. SCHULTZE. There are two parts to the answer, without being able to put numbers on them. A large part of what is in the non-Apollo program is the development and technology for maintaining manned space flight. By that I mean the development of the things which go into maintaining manned space flight after Apollo. Hence, the implication of your question, I think, is that if you reduced these other programs by \$1 billion, you might as well then take out of that Apollo program the \$400 million we have in there for post-Apollo programs, because you wouldn't be able to support them.

So the obvious point is that what this really says is you are shutting your program down after Apollo, because that one and a half—

Chairman PROXMIRE. You can begin again.

Mr. SCHULTZE. I realize that. I am not arguing the merits of it but I am giving the implications of it.

Chairman PROXMIRE. Shutting down after Apollo.

Mr. SCHULTZE. That would be the implication of it. You wouldn't have the technology or the equipment or anything else to move ahead after Apollo—or to keep our manned space capabilities alive.

Chairman PROXMIRE. Now one last area. This is nondefense public works. As I understand it, my staff tells me that the budget provides for the Federal Highway Administration \$4.8 billion, the Corps of Engineers \$1.05 billion, Bureau of Reclamation \$217 million, GSA \$133 million, Bonneville Power \$119 million—all nondefense public works.

I understand you have made some cuts. You did make some cuts in arriving at these figures.

Mr. SCHULTZE. Yes, sir.

Chairman PROXMIRE. Your \$3 billion cut involved some of this. You cut the roads program, for example, which I think is very good under the circumstances.

What happens if you have a much more drastic cut? Say you cut \$3 billion or \$4 billion of this. You cut back the highway program very sharply, and reduce or virtually eliminate the Corps of Engineers civil functions. In other words, cut all the pork barrel out for the time being. Stop building Federal buildings and post office buildings for the next year, as long as we have Vietnam going on and the kind of economic situation we have. This is a substitute for the 6-percent surtax.

Mr. SCHULTZE. I can break my answer into two parts. First, you have got to think about new starts. In 1967, there are 58 new starts for the Corps of Engineers, 25 that we requested, and 33 that the Congress added. In the 1968 budget, there are nine, from 58 down to nine.