What do you think of a proposal that would—unlike Congressman Bolling's proposal which would permit the President to raise or lower taxes—permit the President to raise but not to lower tax rates—subject to a congressional veto—because I believe we have learned the theory and the political popularity of cutting taxes? I think if a President would want us to cut taxes, I think that the procedures of the Congress are such that we could move quickly. [Laughter.]

Secretary BARR. That has been amply demonstrated. The record supports your statements, Mr. Moorhead, and I have stated publicly that when we first went forward with Walter Heller's variable tax proposal—I think it was 1962 or 1963—we made one mistake. We should have followed the line that you did. In other words—what you are suggesting, Mr. Moorhead—to give the President the authority to raise taxes. He can take the heat if he has to, and when economic conditions dictate that he must. Rest assured that the Congress will cooperate completely and promptly when the suggestion to reduce taxes is laid before them.

I think it is a very practical political solution.

Representative MOORHEAD. Also, I think it is a dangerous congressional delegation of political power to provide the President with discretionery power to cut taxes.

A President could use this power judiciously before reelection time and almost assure his reelection.

Secretary BARR. Mr. Moorhead, I am sure no Presidents are going to be unscrupulous or vicious, but I have heard the argument made, you know, in a little different context, that he gets the delicious pleasure of reducing them while others get the onerous chore of increasing them.

You are quite correct. It is a good idea.

Representative MOORHEAD. As I see it, we are not eroding the congressional prerogative in the tax field with this plan.

Secretary BARR. No. I support your position on the bill. I think it is an excellent idea and it is practical.

Representative MOORHEAD. Mr. Zwick, I was also puzzled by the New York Times editorial that is now a part of the record at Senator Javits' request, and I was particularly puzzled by the figure of \$9 billion for highways for fiscal 1970. Is that a correct figure?

Mr. ZWICK. No, sir. The regular highway trust fund program in fiscal 1970 is set at about the same level as in fiscal 1969—\$4.8 billion of obligations. As of now, spending is going to go up because of the way we held down spending in fiscal 1969, but the obligation level—and that is really the best index of program level for the highway program—has been held constant, year to year, for the regular Interstate A–B–C program.

Now, in addition, we have added some new programs to the trust fund. We have taken the existing safety program and highway beauty program and put them into the trust fund. There are also new programs, such as TOPICS which go up. But if you take out the new programs and look at the Interstate and A–B–C program, which is the basic highway program, we held in the 1970 budget about the same program level as we did for 1969, and I am sure we are going to hear some concern that it didn't go up enough. I don't know where the \$9