properly programed, they of course have estimates of what they are

going to spend, and that is all we are asking.

We recognize that these things are subject to change. But we can at least deal with what the present plans are, so if the plans are changed—and they need changing, because of course some programs probably are not desirable any longer, and, need to be phased out, others probably need acceleration—we can examine why.

Chairman Proxmire. Mrs. Griffiths?

Representative Griffiths. What I would like the budget to do is to show under names exactly how much money goes to a certain program.

For instance, I understand how we say foreign aid amounts to maybe \$3 billion a year—the real truth is it is about \$11 billion.

Did you give any consideration to this? Did you give any consideration to the idea that the President should point out specifically the amount of money that is going into a State, if not into a congressional district, on various programs, and what the effect and what the return

on this expenditure is?

Mr. Kennedy. We did not go into the specifics of any programs. We did feel that there should be a functional breakdown—so that would include picking up from the various departments like amounts in the aid or other programs, so that you have the total.

Now, to some extent that is done in the budget now. But that is a

problem that needs careful consideration.

Representative Griffiths. For instance, one of the reasons probably that foreign aid is not actually listed as foreign aid, and the exact amount shown, is that it would become increasingly difficult to get that amount through. You could watch in the House this year while NATO—some of the things for NATO was taken over by the Defense Department that has not heretofore been. Now, the Defense Department can get anything through—which is really very unfortunate. We even call the Education Act the National Defense Education Act.

You had to name it that to pass the bill.

So that it would be really a great help—and while it might come as a surprise to the general public and even the Congress exactly where this money is going—it seems to me this is the only fair way to do it.

Mr. Kennedy. Well, you come across, of course, very difficult definitions of what is defense or what is aid or other matters. You have food for peace—is that foreign aid or is that something else? And the only thing that we did in this was recognize your problem, and suggest that there should be a functional breakdown.

Now, when you get into the question of definitions, that is a nevernever land, as you know. And that is really for the Congress, in working with the executive branch of the Government, to come out with some helpful definitions and realistic appraisal of legislation in this matter.

Representative Griffiths. Now-

Mr. Kennedy. I do not think you can do it by a simple definition

of the concepts.

Representative Griffiths. Don't you think it would be quite helpful if you could show how much of this money goes into one state, under any program? We cannot find that out ourselves. We have great difficulty.