From a fiscal viewpoint, Congress should defer consideration of the proposed tax increase until it has first acted upon—and appreciably cut—the funds requested in the 1968 Budget. The accumulated increases of non-defense spending in recent years are so great as to require critically sober appraisal of both current and proposed levels. Furthermore, evidence indicates that the people prefer to meet any necessary defense increase by postponing or reducing non-defense spending not by reducing their personal spending through a tax rise.

From an economic viewpoint, the impact of a further tax claim on the country's resources in a period of already slowing growth should be avoided. The mild economic stimulation sought by the President through a budget deficit could as well be achieved by a lower spending level without a tax increase.

The level of federal spending and taxing is being paid thoughtful and increasing public attention. Such constructive and encouraging response to federal fiscal policy should be aided; but the variations of figures in the "three-budgets" complex prevents really adequate public understanding. In order that the people may know the full burden of federal finances, and more intelligently appraise them, a single consolidated budgetary concept and method of presentation should be sought.

Table A.—"The Great Society," summary of program costs
[Millions of dollars]

Program identity	1963	1966	1967 estimate	1968 estimate	Percent change 1963-68
I. Welfare-orientedII. Health III. EducationIV. Manpower training and employment oppor-	3, 853. 2	5, 673. 6	6, 950. 1	7, 913. 7	+105. 4
	509. 0	958. 5	1, 491. 3	1, 724. 3	+238. 8
	602. 3	3, 214. 0	3, 673. 8	4, 115. 7	+583. 3
tunities V. Community development and renewal VI. Area and regional economic development VII. Miscellaneous	160. 9 422. 8 225. 5 320. 8	454. 5 758. 8 331. 6 468. 2	755. 1 1, 453. 8 451. 5 506. 7	829. 6 1, 583. 2 513. 9 557. 3	$\begin{array}{r} +415.6 \\ +274.5 \\ +127.9 \\ +73.7 \end{array}$
Program costs, total ¹	6, 080. 9	11, 859. 2	15, 282. 3	17, 237. 7	+183. 5
	6, 138. 9	13, 005. 5	14, 306. 0	17, 409. 2	+183. 6
	4, 982. 2	9, 234. 9	11, 331. 9	12, 582. 0	+152. 5

¹ These figures are not the equivalent of budget expenditures; they are the "gross" levels of resources called for by program scope.

Table B.—"The Great Society," summary of administrative budget expenditures
[Millions of dollars]

Program identity	1963	1966	1967 estimated	1968 estimated	Percent change 1963-68
I. Welfare-oriented II. Health IV. Manpower training and employment opportunities. V. Community development and renewal VI. Area and regional economic development VII. Miscellaneous	3, 359. 1 380. 1 542. 8 156. 1 236. 2 101. 5 206. 4	5, 387. 3 606. 9 1, 861. 4 489. 1 445. 7 74. 7 369. 8	6, 402. 1 830. 4 2, 252. 3 617. 2 606. 9 219. 3 403. 7	6, 967. 9 1, 168. 1 1, 759. 2 699. 4 1, 043. 6 473. 5 470. 3	+107.4 $+207.3$ $+224.1$ $+348.0$ $+341.8$ $+366.5$ $+127.9$
Administrative budget expenditures, TOTAL 1 For comparison: New spending authority Total program costs	4, 982. 2 6, 138. 9 6, 080. 9	9, 234. 9 13, 055. 5 11, 859. 2	11, 331. 9 14, 306. 0 15, 282. 3	12, 582. 0 17, 409. 2 17, 237. 7	+152.5 +183.6 +183.5

¹ As explained in the text, these figures include many "net" components, and do not reflect the total cost level of programs.