We prefer, rather, a surtax. We have been in favor of this for a year. It puts the tax burden where it properly belongs—on those who have benefited from the inflation. We think it should have been passed at the time it was asked for. Our criticism before the House Ways and Means Committee was that we did not think it was enough. There is enough money in the United States today, and without substantially hurting anybody, because we are living in a pretty affluent society, after all. There is enough money to take care of most of this need which we have, at least to the point that we do not have to do quite so much deficit financing.

We would support the removal of the gold cover.

In terms of incentives for the land retirement, I am not sure what they need to be. I am not sure anybody has made a study which indicates what these incentives should be. But what we would say is that the incentive should be adequate to get the land retired, and it may be that the present incentives are sufficient. I have my doubts that they are, because of the added costs, taxes, and the like. Even idle land has taxes, and there has been a substantial increase in taxes of about 70 percent or so, and this would indicate to me that it would take a little more incentive than we have at the present time.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you.

Mr. McDonald?

Mr. McDonald. We will furnish, Senator Jordan, for the record, our membership of our States.

(The following list was subsequently received from the National Farmers Union:)

National Farmers Union-Paid family membership, 1967

11.092	Ohio	3, 138
1.921	Oklahoma	50, 010
1, 996	Oregon-Washington	1,150
406	Pennsylvania	803
3.491	Rocky Mountain	9,662
		14,612
- /	l	118
		6,482
		1,656
		638
		7, 958
	1	212, 388
	1, 921 1, 996 406 3, 491 7, 142 426 841 27, 018 12, 695 7, 085 571 441	441

Mr. McDonald. In regard to spending and where to cut, frankly, I am not an expert on these matters and I do not know if we have resolutions to cover this or not.

But, in regard to some of these adventures, such as going to the moon, would it not be possible to cut off a few billion there? It is \$5 billion, as I remember.

It would appear that the war effort and some of these things we have

been talking about today are more important.

I agree with Mr. Graham. I do not know where you would cut agriculture even more than it has been cut. There is a super airplane which is supposed to carry thousands of people they have been working on, for I do not know how many years, and I am not sure it will fly yet, and hundreds of millions, I believe, Mr. Chairman, have been squandered on that project.