

goal toward which I think both you and I would like to strive. That is to reduce the prices paid in the Defense Department.

Now, they have proved through the years that they really aren't capable of buying even screws, nuts, and bolts. Time after time it has been proved that they have paid too much and each time it has, they have said, well, of course, that is the only instance, the only instance.

Now, anybody that knows anything about purchasing knows that this isn't true. This contract could be repealed, this type of contract form should be repealed by this Congress if necessary. This contract is foolish.

I hope the next time you come back, Mr. Secretary, you are made Secretary of Defense and we cut down on the price they are paying for these items.

Thank you.

Secretary BARR. Mrs. Griffiths, I have the greatest respect in the world for you and I think that the Congress and the country took a great step forward when they put a woman on the tax-writing committee, but, for goodness' sake, Mrs. Griffiths, don't wish Secretary of Defense on me. [Laughter.]

I would even prefer to be Secretary of Agriculture first. [Laughter.]

Senator PROXMIRE. Senator Javits?

Senator JAVITS. There is one thing, Mr. Zwick, that I would like to ask you. I know you gentlemen have other engagements, so I will be very brief.

I must apologize for leaving you but we had Ambassador Lodge before us in the Foreign Relations Committee, and I am sure you will agree that this was a very urgent priority for all of us.

I gather you took some exception to my feeling that this administration had not really set an order of priorities and pointed to the trend in the Federal budget outlays to demonstrate that fact.

Now, would you say that there was—that there was some deliberate decision on priorities, Mr. Zwick, and if so, what was it?

Mr. ZWICK. Yes. I think there clearly was a deliberate decision on priorities, and it is reflected in the two charts I discussed earlier, the 6-year budget chart which shows that we doubled our expenditures on major social programs—or increased them by 123 percent—when the overall budget went up 67 percent, which clearly reflects a set of priorities. That 6-year chart is very consistent with the chart which shows the changes between 1969 and 1970.

Now, I will say two other things very quickly. One, we can all have an opinion as to whether we have gone far enough, or too far; whether we have the right amount, the right mix. Obviously, this is a matter of great difficulty and of diverse opinion. The only point I was really trying to make is if you look at a special analysis which we have on "Aid to State and Local Governments," you will find that they have gone up 150 percent since 1964. They have a big \$4.2 billion increase in fiscal 1970 over 1969.

And we have also shifted dramatically from 55 percent of those aids going to urban areas in 1964 to 67 percent in the 1970 budget.

Now, it turns out that that happens to be equal to the proportion of people living in urban areas. And in addition we have Urban De-