

area of management efficiency. Second, let me go directly to the general charges of waste. They are obviously easy to make. The Congressional Quarterly study in particular is one that both Secretary Clifford and I commented on last fall when you asked for our comments on them. I find a great number of items in which I certainly cannot concur. It is not only waste we are dealing with, but an issue of national security.

Senator PROXMIRE. That is why I asked Mr. Okun about the Congressional Quarterly. I would wholeheartedly agree that the Congressional Quarterly recommendations which I support are a matter of defense strategy in part, although they said that half of their recommendation was to reduce military personnel which they say was wasted so badly. They point out, for example, that we have 20 officers in Vietnam for every command post; that we have the greatest ratio of logistical supply to supply troops in the history of mankind by far in Vietnam. But I am asking you about whether or not the defense budget is scrutinized as carefully as, for example, dollar for dollar, as the OEO budget and HUD budget, and so forth.

Mr. ZWICK. This is a replay on our discussion last September. Defense is a big department. We obviously do not get into as great detail in that Department as we do in some other departments. This varies from department to department.

The analogy—the counterexample I gave you last September—was the Post Office. At that time the Postmaster General was about to close down certain fourth-class post offices because of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act employment rollback provision.

I do not try to second guess the Postmaster General as to how to reduce personnel. Similarly, I do not try to second guess the Joint Chiefs of Staff as to the need for support personnel in Vietnam. Obviously, that is related to providing essential equipment to the people in the field, and we have to think a little bit about effectiveness in support of our people.

I cannot say to you that we give equal, evenhanded treatment to all agencies. But I think it is a mistake to say that we treat Defense in one fashion and all other agencies in another fashion.

Senator PROXMIRE. I will be back. My time is up.

Chairman PATMAN. Mr. Rumsfeld?

Representative RUMSFELD. Mr. Zwick, I would like to turn the conversation from a discussion of simply the quantitative approach which seems to be the focus of much of the material before us, and ask some questions about the qualitative aspects of some of this.

I notice in one of your budget documents, the smaller one,¹ on pages 66 and 67, that you have a budget outlay by function and subfunction.

Mr. ZWICK. Yes.

Representative RUMSFELD. Now, obviously these subfunctions cut across different departments and agencies. Some programs that are tabulated there with dollar figures for fiscal years 1959 through 1970 are in one department, some in another, within the same function. Is that correct?

Mr. ZWICK. That is correct.

¹ "The Budget in Brief, Fiscal Year 1970," available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.