Government should do an in-house operation or when it is more feasible to contract it to the private sector.

Mr. KENNEDY. We did not get into that. We did not get into the administration of the Budget Bureau.

Representative CURTIS. We have another subcommittee of this committee which is looking into this. And to me it is a very critical and important thing, because it does get into this cost accounting aspect, and covers substantial billions of dollars of expenditure every year.

The other detail, again, is something that this other subcommittee is looking into—namely, the various revolving funds which we have—I think there are over 200 of them, and they total probably over $12 billion a year.

Of course, those are budgeting devices in themselves, the revolving funds.

Did you get into that kind of fund in depth at all?

Mr. KENNEDY. Not as to whether a revolving fund should be set up, or whether it should be done in another way. That is a substantive matter. But we did go into how they should be reported in the budget from the receipt or expenditure standpoint.

Representative CURTIS. It was a net figure, wasn't it, that you recommended?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is right.

Representative CURTIS. This, again, of course, would be a capital asset.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, sir.

Chairman PROXMIRE. Any further questions?

I want to thank you gentlemen very, very much for an excellent job, and for a most helpful day.

On Thursday our witnesses will be Maurice Stans, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, William Capron, former Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and Herbert Stein, fiscal economist, The Brookings Institution. Once again, thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at 12:05 p.m., the committee was recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Thursday, November 2, 1967.)