jections did not look far enough into the future to provide an adequate basis for congressional and public judgments.[1]

Responses received in the inquiry into human resources programs suggest that when the departments and agencies are asked to provide data that may be helpful for evaluating their programs and activities broadly in the general economic and social contexts in which they operate, their responses are considerably inhibited by a combination of factors. Among these factors appear to be the constraints engendered by the traditional budgetary presentation, a resulting unfamiliarity with analytical concepts outside the specific technical boundaries of the program, and a common disposition to avoid contributions to value-judgments which may prove controversial. Agencies with staffs experienced in program analysis generally responded most fully and explicitly, especially to the economic questions.

Questions 1, 2, and 3.—Replies to the questions about the objectives, operation, and history of the programs are generally unambiguous. Differences of approach are mainly in the extent of detail presented.

Program objectives or purposes are stated in almost every instance in terms of the specific aims or goals of the particular program or activity. This is the focus that was intended in the question, and this set of replies facilitates both the differentiation of separate programs and a recognition of cases in which purposes or objectives are nearly identical or closely intertwined. In a few instances, a broader context is indicated by references to basic goals of the administrative agency or an interrelated group of programs.

Question 4. Level of operations.—Most of the replies provide a table in the form that was suggested and define the units used in the several entries that indicate the level of operations or performance. For some programs, item (a), magnitude of the program, was measured by the number of applicants or participants reported also for item (b). Alternative measurements would have been appropriate in some instances—e.g., the number of training schools or units for the full-time training and education program of the Department of Defense, or the number of applicants for the Farm Labor Service of the Department of Labor.

Financial indicators were used as measures of (*a*) and (*b*) in a few instances where numbers of cases or some other physical unit would have been more informative and would have avoided duplication of the answer given in (*c*), Federal finances.

Some respondents encountered difficulties with (*c*), Federal finances, because their programs are financed by appropriations that cover other programs and activities as well. These respondents were invited (if they inquired) either to estimate the amount of obligational authority available for the particular program or to report instead the amounts of obligations or expenditures specifically for the program, with footnote explanations. Not all respondents adopted this approach, and the status of the reported amounts is not made clear in every case.

For purposes of economic review, grants and loans need to be differentiated from each other and from direct Federal expenditures. The treatment of these several types of outlays varies considerably.

[1] Joint Economic Committee, "The Federal Budget as an Economic Document," report of the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics (S. Rept. 396, August 1963), pp. 2, 8–11; "The Federal Budget as an Economic Document," hearings before the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, Apr. 23, 24, 25, and 30, 1963, pp. 55–62. See also a report of the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy, "Federal Expenditure Policies for Economic Growth and Stability" (Committee print, Jan. 23, 1958), pp. 6, 7, 13, 14.