

Chairman PROXMIRE. And as such you are in a very good position to give us information that may be a budget director under a new President would be very reluctant to give us. What I am getting at is not any specific information on a particular program. It is a little late for that now in this administration.

What I have in mind is if you could, give us an idea of what questions we might ask the various agencies when they come before the Appropriations Committee, to get from them their PPB analysis in as great detail or in as useful detail as we could possibly get it, I think that this might greatly improve the congressional performance on appropriations, and eliminate some of the strictly political decisions that we make in appropriations, and bring in a much more objective approach.

Mr. ZWICK. I think we have made available to the Congress more data than is generally realized.

Chairman PROXMIRE. I think so, too, but we are so ignorant up here. We don't really know enough about that. We have to generalize all our approaches. We don't have specialized staff. We don't have the kind of thing you have there. We would like to be informed so that we can get this.

Mr. ZWICK. The only point I would make, Senator, is that I think the problems are more a lack of attention—and I will take my share of blame for that lack of attention—and the conceptual problem. The problem is that we don't quite know how to do it, rather than any real attempt by the administration to be secretive. I think this is a much smaller factor than the other two. We just haven't worked hard enough on engineering this operation, nor do we know how to do some of these things, because, as I say, the sensitive items obviously are future year projections, which quite clearly could be misinterpreted. And, quite clearly—and I think as a matter of good public policy—a President, any President, should maintain as much flexibility as he possibly can on future decisions.

Chairman PROXMIRE. You see you couldn't be expected to make any arguments today, in this kind of a presentation, based on PPB; but when you and the other Administration people come before the Appropriations Committee, you should then make arguments on the basis of PPB or cost benefit. But you don't. You do maybe in the Interior area, where for years and years they have had a cost-benefit system well established but there hasn't been any change elsewhere that I have noticed in the last year or two, and again unless we ask the question I suppose we can't expect people to give us the ammunition to shoot them down. But if we ask the questions, they will have to answer. So if you can, give us the kind of approach that we ought to make here, I think we can make some relevance in appropriation processing in the future.

Mr. ZWICK. Let me just argue that I thought we were doing some of this in the summer review. We said we had to cut \$3.5 billion. We set priorities and tried to state what those priorities are, and I do think if the questioning had proceeded down that route today rather than the routes it did take, we would have gotten into some of this.

Chairman PROXMIRE. Senator Javits touched on that toward the end.

Mr. ZWICK. Yes, surely. It is the analysis that underlies the decisions as to how we are going to make our \$3.5 billion reduction. Analysis is