

view may have been implicit in other responses. The point is discussed in part I of this report, in the section on "Health care and improvement."

Notwithstanding objections and the inadequacies of available data, many replies give evidence of serious effort to supply pertinent estimates and interpretive comments. For numerous small programs, taken individually, the unavoidable answer is that the various types of economic effects mentioned in the question are "not measurable" or "difficult to assess." Where several interrelated small programs are the responsibility of a single major agency, multiprogram answers are provided in a few instances for question 9 and also for question 10. This approach should be used more widely in any further inquiries along these lines. Also, it might be advantageous to formulate different sets of questions for different types of programs—i.e., for large and small programs, and for programs serving different major objectives.

The replies to question 9 provide much of the substantive discussion in part I of this report. Among the more notable responses are those of the Department of Labor for manpower development and training programs and the farm labor service; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for old-age, survivors, disability, and health insurance, vocational rehabilitation, Bureau of State Services—community health direct operations, the National Institutes of Health (general answer), and the Office of Education programs for educational improvement of the handicapped, college work-study, and vocational education; the Department of Agriculture rural water and waste disposal and rural housing programs; the Department of Housing and Urban Development for rent supplements (a new program) and for the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Housing Administration; and the National Science Foundation.

The Office of Economic Opportunity statement for question 9 emphasizes national needs and problems to which antipoverty programs are directed. It does not discuss particularly the effects of the programs. Several other agency responses provide scattered data without conclusions as to the possible effects of the Government activities. A disappointing number of answers are impaired by vagueness about the economic aspects of the particular program and its setting. Evidently many of the respondents needed more explanations and instructions than were provided in the questionnaire and subsequent informal discussions with committee staff.

*Question 10. Economic classification of expenditures.*—Although the final question in the inquiry appeared simple in concept, it proved in fact to be the most complicated. It was answered in some measure by all respondents—but usually for Federal Government expenditures only. Non-Federal expenditures are not estimated even for many programs for which non-Federal participation is a condition of the Federal outlay.

The reported Federal Government amounts are not susceptible of simple summation, excepting to provide the crude order-of-magnitude totals presented in table 5 (pt. I). This is because there is insufficient uniformity in the agency responses. Extensive staff efforts to correct difficulties and eliminate major differences in the basis of the data met with limited success. Types of problems and the shortcomings that persist in the figures are indicated below.