

However, over the last 6 months or so we have been making more of an effort. I have had discussions both in executive session and during the hearing on the Post Office exemption with Senator Monroney on the difficulties in his areas. And we have entered into a dialog with that particular subcommittee on improving the presentation of data as the Congress likes to see it, as the Bureau of the Budget likes to see it, and as the agencies like to see it. I think we need to work at it, and work harder than we have to date.

Chairman PROXMIRE. Is there any significant amount of this material that is not offered, not made available to the Congress? You see, there is a feeling up here on the Hill that knowledge is power.

Mr. ZWICK. Yes.

Chairman PROXMIRE. If we could get at this we would make decisions that might contradict the political preferences of the administration, any administration. I want to make this as generalized as I can.

Mr. ZWICK. I think the one set of data that has been under discussion is the "5-year projections," and I would submit to you that we have both conceptual and measurement problems to solve, not just problems of who has the data.

When we first put out instructions for the 5-year projections called for in the PPB system, we talked generally about forecasting where each agency thought its budget was going over the next 5 years. In retrospect, that yielded exactly the result we should have expected, namely, all agency budgets were taking off at fantastic rates. These were wish lists of the agencies, not necessarily relating to any decisions current, past, or future—these budgets just weren't all going to go up that fast.

Then we retreated and said "We don't want that. It isn't useful. Instead, let's put out instructions asking for the future year implications of this and past years' decisions." That seemed to be what we wanted. It seems plausible. If you consider building a destroyer, which is a long leadtime investment, you would want to know how much money you are going to have to appropriate in future years and the total expenditure implications are of the decision to go ahead.

But then what do you do about a program like elementary and secondary education? There is an appropriation of \$1.3 billion for it in fiscal 1969. Should we put a zero down for fiscal 1970? In some strict interpretation of future year implications of this year's decision you would put a zero down. But, practically, we all know that we are not going to take elementary and secondary education down to zero next year. So that if you take a strict and literal interpretation of future year implications of this year's decisions, the budget starts falling off abruptly. However, if you ask agencies what they would like over the next 5 years, all their budgets take off into the wild blue yonder. I think neither one of these approaches is particularly useful for decisionmaking purposes.

What we want is something in between, and we have a conceptual problem, Senator, of deciding what that is.

Chairman PROXMIRE. What I have in mind is something else. You are kind of, I suppose all members of the administration are, a lame duck budget director.

Mr. ZWICK. Yes.