

sions are particularly disappointing in the case of new programs, in which it could not be expected that all possibilities for cooperation had been exploited.

Statements from the new Department of Housing and Urban Development and a few other agencies mention possible avenues for improving interprogram and interagency or intergovernmental relationships or for working with non-Federal interests. Such instances attest that this aspect of public affairs is a fit subject for public discussion, without embarrassment or penalty, and that administrators who recognize problems of coordination merit support and assistance in their efforts to achieve improvements.

The replies given are most detailed and specific in identifying agencies or groups with which cooperative or coordinating relationships have developed, and in identifying the methods or devices of coordination. A few responses—notably from new agencies—merely note legal requirements for coordination that apply to the particular programs.

The question did not ask about the substance and intensity of the relationships, nor did it call for evidence of effectiveness, because it was recognized that this kind of inquiry would elicit subjective evaluations that might best be made by independent appraisers. The first step, represented in the replies to question 7, is to identify arrangements that actually exist. This the responses do in substantial measure.

Even from the limited scope of these factual replies, it is evident that there is opportunity for improved cooperation—and perhaps a greater measure of specific coordination—in the formulation and execution of broad policies and in specific program operations in such major fields as education and training, health and hospital care, income maintenance, and public works construction. Each of these is a field in which a multiplicity of Federal Government agencies share responsibilities and concern for some part of our population, some part of our national area, or some segment of the Government's activities.

*Question 8. Laws and regulations.*—Several lists of statutory references are impressively long. In some of these replies, a comprehensive reference to the current edition of the United States Code would be a useful supplement to the lists. Many other replies cite applicable sections in the United States Code, without indicating the statutory history of the program.

The request included references to appropriation authorizations and administrative regulations, as well as basic laws. Many replies omit the appropriations, regulations, or both.

*Question 9. Economic effects.*—The first of two questions calling for data bearing on economic aspects and impacts of each program, question 9 asks for a description of economic effects with particular reference to enumerated aspects of the program and the economy.

Quite a few responses are thin in substance. Generalities abound. A recurring theme is the need for more analysis, with expressions of hope that time and money soon will permit the effort. This is obviously a commendable objective.

Another view—that economic questions are inappropriate for programs that relate to ultimate human values—becomes explicit in a well-prepared statement from the National Institutes of Health. This