

The Department of Housing and Urban Development negative expenditures are dominated by program receipts—\$975 million of receipts in FHA and \$526 million in FNMA. Against these are charged operating and other outlays of \$767 million for FHA and \$144 million for FNMA. The Public Housing Administration reported a similar, though relatively small, amount of receipts and reimbursements in excess of “other” expenditures. The college housing program had administrative and interest costs of more than \$50 million.

TVA negative expenditures represent receipts from sales of electric power, used in part to finance goods and services purchased for the power development program.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported \$176 million of “other” expenditures, all in the Office of Education. These outlays were contributions to student loan funds, either as capital or to cover loan cancellations, and grants to institutions of higher education for conducting institutes and paying allowances to trainees.

The Department of Defense reported “other” expenditures of \$159 million debt payment for the family housing program. These payments were directed to the reduction of indebtedness assumed in acquiring Capehart, Wherry, and surplus commodity housing and for related expenses.

The Small Business Administration had “other” expenditures of \$72 million for interest, administration, and other costs.

For the Civil Service Commission, \$28 million of similar expenditures represents net outlays from the Federal employees’ group life insurance trust fund, after offsetting \$196 million of receipts against \$224 million of life insurance expenditures. The receipts were a combination of employee contributions, Federal agency contributions, and interest earnings. The expenditures were premium payments and administrative expenses.

Comparison with “social welfare” series.—The total of \$43.6 billion, representing roughly the magnitude of Federal Government expenditures in the fiscal year 1965 for human resources programs reported in the current survey, is higher than the 1964–65 total of \$38.8 billion of Federal expenditures for “social welfare” programs reported in table 2, above. As it emerges from the replies to the Joint Economic Committee inquiry, the area of programs nominated as “human resources” programs is, then, more extensive than the area defined as “social welfare” in the annual compilations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This was expected, though the degree of difference was not measured in advance. The “human resources” area encompasses programs that are peripheral to or clearly outside the series on “social welfare” or “health, education, and welfare” as defined by the Social Security Administration Office of Research and Statistics. Moreover, the “human resources” total derived from part III of this report is a summation of agency responses, with no effort to superimpose definite, predetermined boundaries on the area to be covered. A definition can best be formulated after deliberate review of the responses. It is quite possible that analysis of the materials in part III, in the light of potential analytical and policy uses of the data, will yield concepts and definitions which would exclude some programs now included in the \$43.6 billion and would add others that the respondents omitted. This kind of analysis remains for the future.