

without change; a few provided revisions early in 1966 to conform to the amended questions. Most departments and agencies submitted their responses in late January 1966, or during the next several weeks. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—with the greatest range of pertinent programs—was unable to complete its responses until August 1, 1966. This Department declined for most of its programs to reply at all to questions 5 and 6. These questions asked about the probable magnitude of the program in 1970 and prospective changes in program orientation.

These differences in the time of preparation of replies help to explain why there are variations between programs in the periods for which data are supplied. The reluctance of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with its predominant role in administering human resources programs, explains the major deficiency of the report as a basis for charting prospective developments.

#### INCONSISTENCIES AND OMISSIONS

Through meetings of committee staff with agency staff and numerous informal discussions, some reduction was achieved in the inevitable differences in respondents' interpretation of the questions, the degree of detail supplied, and completeness of replies. That these efforts were not wholly successful is evident from the varied materials in part III.

It should be emphasized, however, that the committee staff sought to avoid stereotyped uniformity in the replies, and likewise to avoid suggesting the content of the statements. Since this was an exploratory approach to an uncharted field, the agencies were encouraged to exercise initiative and apply their own special insights in determining what material might be relevant to the broad objective. Words and phrases used in the questionnaire were explained on request (for example, "expenditures" as used in question 10 might be "obligations" if this concept were appropriate to the particular program, but in the questionnaire the word was used generically and not restrictively). Insofar as possible, agency staffs were advised to use whatever concepts and classifications seemed to them appropriate to the individual programs and to add enough explanations, qualifying statements, supporting details, and special comments to enable a reader of the response to understand the special point of view it might express.

A few examples may be given to indicate types and sources of inconsistencies and omissions.

(1) Some agencies failed to include administrative costs as part of their program expenditures. An effort has been made to identify these cases.

(2) There was a tendency to take literally the preliminary list of relevant programs, despite repeated assurances that it was tentative and illustrative and was "not intended to be limiting, either as to the extent of the governmental activities and services to be covered or the lines to be drawn between programs." In a few instances, supplementary requests were made informally for statements covering additional programs, but these were not always effective. Pressures of other work may have compelled respondents to forgo more extensive consideration of the relationship of additional programs to investment