

In several statements, each is shown separately; in others, they are lumped together.

Differentiation of trust funds from administrative budget funds is less important for economic analysis, but it is essential when the replies are compared with budget estimates. Not all the answers make the distinction explicitly. Insofar as possible, committee staff has indicated that trust funds are used for financing particular programs, and has also identified business-type enterprises of the Federal Government. However, the editorial notes on this point are usually appended to the answers to question 10, on the economic classification of expenditures.

Because of the many variations in the basis for reporting the Federal financial data and in agency interpretations of the questionnaire terminology, committee staff concluded that the data given in separate answers could not be added together to yield a meaningful sum. Moreover, the amount of editorial review and agency consultations that would have been required to make the data homogeneous could not be undertaken with the staff and time available. As is evident in table 5 and the related text in part I, summation of even the seemingly simpler amounts reported in question 10 for a single fiscal year, 1965, involves substantial uncertainties and yields only order-of-magnitude totals. Combination of the amounts shown in question 4 for different programs should be undertaken with great caution and, in each instance, should be guided by a detailed examination of related data in the budget appendix.

A surprising number of agencies reported that they have no information about matching or additional expenditures made by State or local governments or other participants in the programs. Less surprising was their lack of definite information about the numbers of non-Federal personnel employed in their programs, since this is only occasionally a factor in applications for Federal grants, loans, administrative cooperation, or other assistance.

*Question 5. Estimated magnitude of program in 1970.*—One of the major gaps in the survey, and therefore a major omission from the report, results from a decision by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to omit estimates of the probable level or magnitude of performance of nearly all its programs in 1970. Among major constituents of the Department, only the Social Security Administration provided data on this point—perhaps because the projections were already published in congressional hearings and in the annual report of the trustees of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance trust funds. The Children's Bureau, a unit within the Welfare Administration, also replied to these questions.

The absence of responses from the Public Health Service was underscored by a pointed observation, in the introduction for the Bureau of State Services—Community Health:

The statistical tools which have made it possible for us to gage the future needs more accurately, and the medical advances which have made so much possible in the way of prevention and treatment, have made the broadening of the base of action not only desirable but necessary.

Question 6(c) was designed to yield information about future needs and possibilities and their significance—information that might enlighten congressional and public judgments about the broadening of Federal Government programs.