Mr. KENNEDY. Well, we didn't go into the specifics of individual departments and what they should do. But on the top of page 18 we say:

The Commission endorses the growing use in recent years of the important Planning-Programming-Budgeting Systems (PPBS) approach to budget preparation and review, which is specifically designed to improve the mechanics of choice among alternative programs and approaches to meeting public needs and purposes. On the other hand, PPBS concerns itself with total costs and benefits to the entire Nation, not merely the revenues and expenditures of the U.S. Treasury. Since the incidence of many social costs and benefits is on the private sector, rather than the Treasury, such costs are not candidates for inclusion in the overall budget totals. Thus, while PPBS analyses should be used to aid in the allocative process, the budget necessarily represents a financial plan for the Government, and the budget totals can hardly reflect total social costs and benefits.

We were looking at the total budget.

Chairman PROXMIRE. I am thinking in terms now, of course, of the simplest document in its bare bones. I am thinking in terms of the greater detail that would inform Congress as to how we can make our expenditure decision more wisely. And this, of course, will require documentation behind your bare bones budget.

If you are familiar with the recommendations that we made in 1963, that we follow on to some extent the present system of the budget in brief, and then gradually elaborate it—but try and do a much better job than we do at the present time of tying the whole thing in. So you can take the budget in brief, and if you want to follow a single specific area through, you can go through to the various more elaborate justifications.

Mr. KENNEDY. We agree with that in principle—that is important. We have even suggested that the Bureau of the Budget go through the tables, and some of them they could eliminate, and some of them they can change and add to, and make them consistent with the concepts that we have recommended in this report.

CHAIRMAN PROXMIRE. In recent days, Mr. Kennedy, the Appropriations Committee has been confronted—both in the House and Senate—with an entirely new problem. The economic situation requires reduction in the present fiscal year of expenditures. Not necessarily appropriations—except as appropriations affect expenditures—but, of course, this varies. President Johnson told me that if we eliminate the foreign aid program entirely, it would only cut expenditures by $600 or $700 million. Other programs with less leadtime, if you cut appropriations, you would cut expenditures more completely.

But for this reason, I wondered if this budget would give us a more helpful insight on the timing and effect of appropriation increases or decreases on expenditures.

In your statement this morning, you come down hard for an expenditure account surplus. I am wondering if you not only would give us this account, but give us this account in terms of a specific and definite period of time. We are interested in a policy that would enable us to reduce expenditures between now and June 30, 1968, for example.

Mr. KENNEDY. We start out, of course, in our proposed summary with appropriations, and we have those appropriations proposed for action by the Congress in the year in which the budget comes out. And then there are the appropriations that require no further action by the Congress.

So you have the basis there for the appropriations side of the budget program.