June 1976
Number 76-12

statistical reporter

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

statistical reporter

Prepared Monthly by the Statistical Policy Division

CONTENTS

SUBSCRIPTIONS ($9.70 a year) should be sent to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Make checks payable to the Superintendent of Documents.

SUGGESTIONS, contributions, and inquiries may be addressed to: Statistical Reporter, Statistical Policy Division, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, D.C. 20503.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Office of Management and Budget

James T. Lynn
Director

Joseph W. Duncan
Deputy Associate Director for Statistical Policy

Suzann K. Evinger
Editor of Statistical Reporter

STATISTICAL REPORTER is prepared primarily for the interchange of information among Government employees engaged in statistical and research activities. Views expressed in contributed notes or articles do not necessarily reflect the policy or opinions of the Office of Management and Budget.

Sources and availability are shown for each publication and requests should be made to the source indicated. If "GPO" is shown, order from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

This is the official report of the Advisory Committee on the Presentation of Balance of Payments Statistics. The members of this Committee are listed below. The Interagency Committee on Balance of Payments Statistics reviewed the report, accepting nearly all of the specific recommendations made by the Advisory Committee. Office of Management and Budget actions with respect to the Advisory Committee's recommendations are indicated on page 237.

Report of the Advisory Committee on the Presentation of Balance of Payments Statistics

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Edward Bernstein
E.M.B. Limited
Washington, D.C.

James Burtle
W. R. Grace and Company
New York, New York

Rimmer de Vries
Morgan Guaranty Trust Company
New York, New York

Peter Kenen
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

Walter Salant
Brookings Institution
Washington, D.C.

Wilson Schmidt
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia

Charles F. Schwartz
International Monetary Fund
Washington, D.C.

Robert Ulin
Mobil Oil Corporation
New York, New York

Marina Whitman
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Joseph W. Duncan, Deputy Associate Director, Office of Management and Budget served as moderator. David T. Hulett, Chief, Economic Statistics Branch, Statistical Policy Division, Office of Management and Budget served as Executive Secretary.

Background and Purpose

This report conveys the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on the Presentation of Balance of Payments Statistics (Advisory Committee). It reflects the broad agreement that was reached in the course of four meetings between January and November 1975, during which members of the Committee heard and exchanged views on a wide range of questions influencing the analysis, interpretation and presentation of the balance of payments statistics.

The President, through the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), is authorized and directed to develop programs for the improved gathering, compiling, analyzing, publishing, and disseminating of statistical information.[1] The usefulness of the present tabular presentation of balance of payments statistics has been questioned by responsible people, both in and outside of Government, most recently because of changes in the international monetary environment. A decade has passed since the statistical presentation was discussed by an outside group of experts, the Review Committee for Balance of Payments Statistics (Review Committee), which issued its report to the Bureau of the Budget in 1965.[2] In order

[1] Section 103 of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, 64 Stat 834, 31 U.S.C. 18b.

[2] Review Committee for Balance of Payments Statistics, *The Balance of Payments Statistics of the United States: A Review and Appraisal,* U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965. Hereinafter cited as Review Committee *Report*.

to secure the advice of a similarly knowledgeable group of experts from the private sector, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget created the present Advisory Committee.

The basic purpose of the Advisory Committee and the scope of its inquiry were stated in its charter. The Advisory Committee was established:

"To advise the Director of the Office of Management and Budget on improvements in the presentation of the official statistics on the United States balance of payments which will make the data more useful for the analysis of the U.S. balance of payments and exchange rate developments.

"The Committee will advise the Director of the Office of Management and Budget on issues pertaining to such matters as:

- The conceptual problems in interpreting the U.S. balance of payments and exchange rate developments.
- Problems of analysis of the data as presently presented by the Department of Commerce in their press releases and tables in the *Survey of Current Business*.
- Recommendations for alternative overall measures of the U.S. balance of payments statistics which would facilitate a more useful and meaningful analysis and summary of the data.
- Recommendations for needed improvements throughout the balance of payments statistical tables to the extent this is necessary to accomplish the overall objectives."

Summary of the Report and Recommendations

The United States balance of payments is a record of this country's international transactions, which are an integral part of the national economy. Because of major changes in the world economy and in the international monetary system in the past few years—notably the widespread abandonment of par values—the form in which the balance of payments is presented has been subjected to recent question and scrutiny. The principal concern of the Advisory Committee was to determine what form of presentation of the U.S. balance of payments would facilitate the use of the data without encouraging preconceived and perhaps misleading conclusions as to their significance for the United States and other countries. The detailed data, of course, must continue to be as complete and as accurate as possible.

In general, the Advisory Committee concluded that a meaningful picture of U.S. international transactions can be obtained only from an analysis of information on several if not all of the categories of transactions, rather than by concentration on one or even several overall balances. The Committee recommends rearranging the tables on U.S. international transactions to faciliate this analysis, discontinuing the publication of some well-known balances which have become less useful for analysis in recent years, and reducing the attention paid to other balances by demoting them to memorandum items. The Committee also recommends the creation of two new tables containing additional useful information.

The principal recommendations of the Advisory Committee are as follows:

1. The first news release of the quarterly data on United States international transactions, available six weeks after the end of the quarter, should not present any balances. The Committee emphasizes that the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the Department of Commerce should continue to release the data in a timely fashion and that the release should contain all of the basic information available at that time. The recommended tabular format is presented below on page 230.

2. Table 1, entitled "U.S. Balance of Payments Summary" and published quarterly in the *Survey of Current Business* through March 1976, should be discontinued. This is the analytical table which presents the full range of net balances commonly used for analysis.

3. No new overall balance should be constructed to replace the balances to be eliminated.

4. Table 2, entitled "U.S. International Transactions," should be recast and become the new Table 1. The Committee recommends that no balances be presented in the body of this table. However, the table should include the present balance on goods and services and the balance on current account as memorandum items. In addition, there should be two memorandum items showing the net change in U.S. official reserve assets and the net change in U.S. liabilities to foreign official agencies. While these two items com-

prise the financing of the present balance on official reserve transactions, the Committee recommends that the net balance of these summary items of official transactions not be presented.

5. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee call for certain changes in the present table 2 so that it can serve as the new Table 1. The recommended new format is presented on page 228. It proposes several major changes:

(a) Transactions in U.S. official reserve assets, excluding allocations of Special Drawing Rights (SDRs), would be in a new location, between unilateral transfers and all other U.S. Government capital flows. The intent of the Advisory Committee is to emphasize that changes in reserve assets are not the passive consequence of all other international transactions, particularly under floating exchange rates even when those rates are managed by official intervention.

(b) The distinction between flows of "liquid" and "nonliquid" assets should be eliminated throughout the statistical tables. The Advisory Committee concluded that the distinction, as it has been made in the statistics, does not correspond closely to the concept it is intended to represent, since transactions in assets which appear on their face to be "nonliquid" can easily be reversed.

(c) The presentation of capital flows involving foreign assets in the United States should be reorganized substantially to separate, as far as possible, transactions with foreign official institutions from those with other foreign parties (individuals, banks, and nonbanking concerns).

(d) The title of "Errors and omissions" is changed to "Statistical discrepancy," in order to identify it clearly as a residual.

(e) A net increase in U.S. official reserve assets should be shown with a negative (−) sign indicating an outflow of capital, and an increase in U.S. liabilities to foreign official agencies should have a positive (+) sign indicating an inflow of capital to agree with the method used to indicate inflows and outflows of other capital transactions. In the present table 1, the sum of these two items, with the algebraic sign reversed, equals the official reserve transactions balance.

Adoption of these recommendations would require the following improvements in the classification of U.S. international transactions statistics that could be accomplished readily with presently available data:

- Foreign official purchases of U.S. Treasury securities should be differentiated from foreign official purchases of securities issued by other U.S. Government agencies; and
- The present category, "U.S. liquid liabilities to private foreigners," should be split into two lines, Treasury securities and other liabilities reported by U.S. banks but should not be identified as "liquid" liabilities in the future.

The proposed format does not include the new lines that might be required to report the reinvested earnings of majority owned direct investment affiliates, U.S. and foreign. The Committee believes, however, that these reinvested earnings should be included as soon as possible in the body of the tables, rather than as memorandum items, and welcomes the prospect of prompt quarterly reporting.

6. The second news release, available 10 weeks after the close of the quarter covered, should be consistent with the recommended structure of the *Survey of Current Business* Table 1 proposed above. Its format is also shown below on page 231.

7. The Department of Commerce should develop a table which shows the transactions in U.S. official reserves, foreign official assets in the United States, and U.S. or foreign drawings or repayments under mutual credit (swap) arrangements. While some official agency transactions are made for investment purposes, many such transactions are made to influence the value of a country's currency or to avoid disorderly markets.

8. The Department of Commerce should devise a table, and perhaps charts, presenting changes in exchange rates. A number of different measures could be shown, including comparisons with groups of foreign countries or bilateral comparisons with major trading partners. The details of such standard tables and charts should be left to the Department in consultation with other Federal agencies. The exchange rate data should not be appended to the proposed Table 1 but should be given a high priority in the *Survey of Current Business* article. The Committee realizes the limitations of such comparisons, which would not in themselves necessarily be related to U.S. international transactions or indicate a change in the U.S. competitive position.

9. The words "surplus" and "deficit" should be avoided insofar as possible in the text of the press releases and *Survey of Current Business* articles. These words are frequently taken to mean that the developments are "good" or "bad" respectively. Since that interpretation is often incorrect, the terms may be widely misunderstood and used in lieu of analysis.

10. The Department of Commerce should continue to publish the present data in sufficient detail to permit users to calculate for themselves any of the traditional balances which they continue to find useful except those based on the present distinction between liquid and nonliquid assets which cannot be made with available data. Thus, for example, anyone wishing to calculate the official reserve transactions balance would continue to be able to net changes in U.S. official reserve assets against changes in foreign official capital.[3]

General Discussion

Multiple uses of the data.—The Advisory Committee recognized that balance of payments statistics are used by many people, in and out of government, with diverse needs. Interpretations of the data necessarily reflect the users' insights and judgments concerning the manner in which market forces and public policies affect international transactions in goods, services, and financial assets.

Users of these statistics vary in their purposes and analytical expertise. Some users feel the need for an easily understood summary measure of the overall international position of U.S. economic transactions, while others, more thoroughly familiar with the complexities of the data and with more time to perform their analyses, tend to bypass the summary measures in favor of the underlying details. Some users value continuity in statistical presentation for comparison over long periods of time. The news media have a particularly difficult job because of limitations of space and time in which to report events to the public. While some people concentrate on the quarterly news releases and value timeliness of the information, others rely on the detail and analysis presented by the Department of Commerce in the periodic articles in the *Survey of Current Business*.

These different viewpoints were fully considered by the Advisory Committee. No member believed that any single format will satisfy every user of the data, and it may be expected that some users, or even classes of users, would find the existing presentation more convenient than that proposed in this Report. In arriving at its recommendations for improvement, the Advisory Committee had to determine, in its judgment, which improvements would best combine an accurate reflection of the realities of the present international situation with the greatest usefulness of the data to these diverse publics.

Utilization of the data in a changing environment.—The Advisory Committee was particularly concerned that the presentation of the balance of payments statistics should be relevant to the current institutional environment and reflect accurately the international transactions of the United States. A significant factor contributing to the usefulness of the data is the preservation of basic stability in the tabular presentation over time, to the extent that such stability is compatible with changes in underlying conditions. In addition, the maintenance of analytical neutrality was viewed as very important, both for its own sake and for the purpose of maintaining a high degree of credibility for Federal statistics. The statistics should be presented in a way that does not imply unnecessary judgments about economic behavior or support for any particular economic theory.[4] This implies that the presentation should not be predicated upon any judgment about the motives which underlie particular transactions or groups of transactors. Since it is not possible to infer from the data themselves whether a transaction is determined by short-run or long-run objectives, or whether an official transaction is "autonomous" or "accommodating," the official statistics should avoid the appearance of revealing more than is known.

If the statistical presentation is to be useful to the public and to Government officials, it must reflect major changes in institutional arrangements and in the world economy. Since the statistical presentation was last examined by the Review Committee of nongovernmental experts more than a decade ago, important developments have led some observers to question the extent to which the presentation of the data is consistent with the existing international monetary system.

---

[3] The Department of Commerce has made one technical improvement in these figures by identifying foreign official purchases of stock in U.S. companies for inclusion in "Other foreign official assets" and for the users' own calculation of the official reserve transactions balance.

[4] The Advisory Committee agreed with several of the criteria adopted by the earlier Review Committee. See Review Committee *Report*, pp. 124-5.

The question of an overall balance.—The main issue addressed by the Advisory Committee was whether the United States Government should continue to publish, in its balance of payments statistics, an overall balance (or balances) which purports to summarize the general condition of U.S. international transactions in a useful and objective fashion. Here, of course, the Advisory Committee was faced with many of the same issues that confronted the Review Committee a decade ago. Every member of this Committee endorses the warning issued by the earlier Committee.

> ". . . No single number can adequately describe the international position of the United States during any given period. The definition of an international surplus or deficit is an analytical problem rather than an accounting problem. The appropriate focus of analysis will change with changing circumstances and with the nature of the particular problem being analyzed. Data must therefore be compiled and presented in a form that facilitates a wide variety of analyses. Furthermore, useful analysis of the international position is rarely possible on the basis of balance of payments data alone; internal developments and policy objectives here and abroad need also to be taken into account." [5]

Several members of the Advisory Committee felt that *no* such single number is sufficiently useful today to justify its continued publication in the official tabulations. At the same time, all members agreed that *some* of the balances in the present Table 1 published quarterly in the *Survey of Current Business* do not provide summaries of the international position of the United States that are useful for accurate analysis.

Three overall balances—the net liquidity, current account and long-term capital, and official reserve transactions balances—were discussed at length by the Advisory Committee in an effort to determine whether they continue to be analytically useful. The Committee's considerations are summarized here and presented in full detail in a later section of this Report.

The net liquidity balance and the balance on current account and long-term capital suffer primarily from practical difficulties involved in attempting to measure the concepts they are intended to portray. The net liquidity balance attempts to measure transactions that can be reversed in the short run, and to distinguish between liquid and non-liquid short-term financial assets. The Committee concluded that this distinction cannot be made in practice, and that the categories used are too arbitrary to serve as a distinct classification in the statistics.

The balance on current account and long-term capital was intended to reflect more enduring trends in our international transactions, but it does not do so adequately. The Committee noted that some capital flows, especially financial transactions with foreign affiliates which are of necessity included in this balance are quite volatile. Also, the original term to maturity, the statistician's cut-off point, may not be the asset's current term to maturity when the transaction is made. Finally, long-term investment decisions may be implemented with short-term assets and *vice versa*. In general, the time horizon of investors does not necessarily coincide with the term to maturity of the asset bought or sold.

Since the Advisory Committee members generally agreed from the outset, based on these considerations, that the Department of Commerce should not continue to publish the net liquidity balance and the balance on current account and long-term capital, a great deal of analytical attention and emphasis would be put on the official reserve transactions (ORT) balance if it were retained. During the discussion, a majority of the Committee members came to hold the view the ORT balance could not withstand such scrutiny.

When the ORT balance was introduced a decade ago, its primary purpose was to reflect the extent of official intervention in foreign exchange markets to maintain the relative values of currencies within narrow limits. This was necessary to comply with the fixed exchange rate rules under the Bretton Woods Agreement. The analysis of the balance of payments statistics came to focus on changes in official reserves, on the assumption that they largely reflected such intervention. It was for this reason, among others, that the Review Committee for Balance of Payments Statistics recommended in 1965 that the main balance of payments table be organized to focus on the transactions of the monetary authorities on what is now known as the official reserve transactions balance, as the most useful starting point for balance of payments analysis.

While there is still official intervention, it became discretionary rather than mandatory in March 1973. Differences in judgment concerning the implications of this fundamental change for the meaningfulness of the present statistical presentation were the principal source of disagreement among the members of the Advisory Committee. Some members felt that the transactions of the monetary authorities are suffi-

[5] Review Committee *Report*, p. 101.

ciently significant now, or may become so, to warrant the continued use and publication of the official reserve transactions balance. Other members argued that the advent of "managed" floating exchange rates and other developments, discussed in more detail below, have ended its usefulness, and urged the Committee to recommend that its publication be discontinued.

The majority of the Committee members concluded that the ORT balance was no longer justified for three major reasons. First was the advent of generally floating exchange rates and discretionary official intervention to affect currencies' values as mentioned above. Second, much of the increase in U.S. liabilities to foreign official agencies—particularly those of the oil exporting countries—is the result of those agencies' investment decisions rather than a reflection of their exchange rate policies. Thus, a surplus or deficit on the official reserve transactions basis cannot necessarily be interpreted as indicating relative strength or weakness of the international position of the dollar. Third, while some analysts view the official reserve transactions balance as an important element affecting the U.S. money supply, this connection is not a close one in the Committee's view. The Committee reached this conclusion because foreign monetary authorities tend to use the international reserves they acquire to purchase U.S. Treasury obligations and interest-bearing bank deposits, and such transactions do not affect the U.S. monetary base or M1.

The Advisory Committee also considered whether to recommend one or a number of new overall "balances" as a substitute for the traditional balances that it found wanting. The Committee felt, however, that to do so would imply that Federal officials and the public could rely upon such new measures to reflect the net result of the many complex forces which affect U.S. international transactions. The Committee concluded that no new balance would serve this purpose in a satisfactory way, and therefore recommends that no new balance be presented.

Since the analysis of U.S. international transactions is a complex matter which requires a consideration of all of the constituent accounts, the Committee also considered whether to recommend publishing a larger number of balances.[6] Even though the Committee could not discover a new balance concept which would provide a better overall summary of international transactions in today's environment, a larger number of less adequate overall balances might be an acceptable compromise.

Some Committee members argued that to retain only one or two balances would focus too much attention on those balances and might lead to their being interpreted as an adequate summary result of U.S. international transactions. Several members felt the need to present some summary of the data, since a large table consisting of unsummarized numbers would be difficult for users to assimilate and for the Department of Commerce to describe in the news releases and *Survey* articles. In the end, however, the members of the Committee agreed that, as a general principle, any balance which is recognized as being seriously deficient should not be published, and that a multiplicity of flawed balances would tend to cause public confusion and disenchantment with the presentation of the data.

Partial balances.—Having decided to recommend elimination of the balances on net liquidity, current account and long-term capital, and official reserve transactions, the Committee turned its attention to the partial balances. The Committee recommends retention of two of these, the goods and services and current account balances, largely because of their relationship to other economic accounting systems. A similar relationship is not present with the merchandise trade balance or the balance on goods, services, and remittances, which the Committee recommends be discontinued. The Committee further recommends that the two balances to be retained be relegated to memorandum status in order to reduce the emphasis placed on these balances as summary indicators of the U.S. international transactions.

The balance on goods and services has, until recently, been conceptually equal to net exports in the U.S. national income and product accounts and is still closely related to it.[7] The Committee decided that the connection with other accounting systems is an important consideration in determining the analytical usefulness of this balance. Thus, the Committee recommends retraining this balance as a memorandum item.

The balance on current account is widely used and referred to in international comparisons of countries'

[6] The 1971 interagency discussions resulted in the addition of two new balances, the balance on current account and long-term capital and the net liquidity balance. See *Survey of Current Business,* June 1971.

[7] Because of a change in national income accounting, the U.S. Government's interest income payments to foreigners will be excluded from net exports in the GNP accounts. This will require a reconciliation with the goods and services balance in international accounts in the future. See *Survey of Current Business,* January 1976.

relative strengths or weaknesses in international transactions, notably by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). It is available on a timely and relatively comparable basis for all the leading industrial countries. In addition, this balance (plus allocations of Special Drawing Rights) is equal to net foreign investment in the U.S. national income and product accounts, and it is an element in the U.S. international investment position account published by the Department of Commerce on an annual basis. The Committee was aware of problems in distinguishing between Government grants which are above the line of the current account balance, and Government capital transactions which are below the line. In the Committee's view, however, the linkage with other data systems is important and it, therefore, recommends retaining the current account balance.

The merchandise trade balance, while available more promptly than the current account balance, was viewed by the majority of the Committee members as being too narrow a measure to single out in the summary of U.S. international transactions. It tends to emphasize excessively the distinction between goods and services, which is of little economic significance. The trade statistics published monthly by the Bureau of the Census are available for those who use such data on a current basis, and this balance should be omitted from the balance of payments tables.

The balance on goods, services, and remittances rests on the distinction between private remittances, Government and private pensions, and other transfers (which for the purposes of this balance are above the line) on the one hand, and U.S. Government grants (which are below the line) on the other. This balance thus avoids the difficult problem of segregating Government grants from Government capital transactions. Also, it is particularly relevant for analyses of the world payments situation, being regularly used for this purpose by the International Monetary Fund. The Committee concluded, however, that government and private remittances, pensions, and other transfers are relatively small and stable elements for the United States. By and large, the purposes to be served by this balance are already accomplished by the goods and services balance. The Committee did not feel that the retention of the goods, services, and remittances balance, which would be a third partial balance, was justified.

Reorganization of the table entitled, "U.S. International Transactions."—The Committee explored other ways to present the data in an analytically useful way, attempting to find an organizing principle without showing overall balances. While no need was felt for changing the classifications in the current account, it was agreed that a change in the classification in the capital account was desirable. The Committee concluded that the organization of the present Table 2 could be improved to serve as the new Table 1.

The Committee discussed the use of the term-to-maturity and liquidity concepts as major organizing principles. While the present distinction among assets based on their original term-to-maturity bears no necessary relationship to the permanence or reversibility of a transaction, it is used in other statistical measures and is at least objectively determined. Hence, the Committee recommends that this distinction be retained as a subcategory in the accounts, but that it should not be a major basis for classification.

While the distinction among financial assets based on their original term-to-maturity has some limited utility, the distinction between liquid and nonliquid assets has involved, in practice, additional judgments about the characteristics of individual assets such as their marketability characteristics. The drawing of such a sharp distinction based on the nature of the assets was viewed by the Committee as being too arbitrary in practice. As already indicated, the Committee recommends eliminating the distinction between liquid and nonliquid capital transactions throughout the accounts. We return to this matter in more detail below.

The Committee concluded that the most useful and analytically neutral classification principle involved a breakdown of the capital account by type of transactor rather than by type of asset.

The Committee considered whether it would be analytically useful to use bank or bank-reported transactions, both U.S. and foreign, as a major classification in the table, since this would tend to facilitate the analysis of the effect of banks' transactions on exchange rate movements. In addition, for some uses the bank transactions could be combined with reserve transactions in a measure which would include broadly those official actions undertaken through banks in addition to those conducted directly by official agencies. The basic weakness of this approach, however, is that the present system of collecting data from banks commingles data on banks' transactions for their own account with those conducted for their customers. While customers' accounts may not fluctuate greatly on a quarter-to-quarter basis, they tend to grow over time and are not determined solely by the banks' decisions. Largely because of this weakness in the data, the Com-

Proposed Table 1.—*Survey of Current Business*

U.S. INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS

Credits (+): debits (−) [1]

		Ref table 2 Sept *Survey* p.46
1.	Exports of goods and services [2]	1.
2.	Merchandise, adjusted, excluding military [3]	2.
3.	Transfers under U.S. military agency sales contracts	3.
4.	Travel	4.
5.	Passenger fares	5.
6.	Other transportation	6.
7.	Fees and royalties from affiliated foreigners	7.
8.	Fees and royalties from unaffiliated foreigners	8.
9.	Other private services	9.
10.	U.S. Government miscellaneous services	10.
	Receipts of income on U.S. assets abroad:	
11.	Direct investments [4] [5]	11.
12.	Other private receipts	12.
13.	U.S. Government receipts	13.
14.	Transfers of goods and services under U.S. military grant programs, net	14.
15.	Imports of goods and services	15.
16.	Merchandise, adjusted, excluding military [3]	16.
17.	Direct defense expenditures	17.
18.	Travel	18.
19.	Passenger fares	19.
20.	Other transportation	20.
21.	Fees and royalties to affiliated foreigners	21.
22.	Fees and royalties to unaffiliated foreigners	22.
23.	Private payments for other services	23.
24.	U.S. Government payments for miscellaneous services	24.
	Payments of income on foreign assets in the United States:	
25.	Direct investments [4] [5]	25.
26.	Other private payments	26.
27.	U.S. Government payments	27.
28.	U.S. military grants of goods and services, net	28.
29.	Unilateral transfers (excluding military grants of goods and services), net	29.
30.	U.S. Government grants (excluding military grants of goods and services)	30.
31.	U.S. Government pensions and other transfers	31.
32.	Private remittances and other transfers	32.
33.	U.S. assets abroad, net (increase/capital outflow (−))	58., 33., 38.
34.	U.S. official reserve assets, net	58.
35.	Gold	59.
36.	Special drawing rights	60.
37.	Reserve position in the International Monetary Fund	62.
38.	Foreign currencies	61.
39.	U.S. Government assets, other than official reserve assets, net	33.
40.	U.S. loans and other long-term assets	34.
41.	Repayments on U.S. loans [6]	36., 37.

		Ref table 2 Sept *Survey* p.46
42.	U.S. foreign currency holdings and U.S. short-term assets, net	35.
43.	U.S. private assets, net	38.
44.	Direct investments abroad [5]	39.
45.	Foreign securities	40.
	U.S. claims on unaffiliated foreigners reported by U.S. nonbanking concerns:	
46.	Long-term	44.
47.	Short-term	45., 46.
	U.S. claims reported by U.S. banks, not included elsewhere:	
48.	Long-term	41.
49.	Short-term	42., 43.
50.	Foreign assets in the United States, net (increase/capital inflow (+))	47.
51.	Foreign official assets in the United States, net:	
52.	U.S. Government securities	
53.	U.S. Treasury securities [7]	55p, 57p
54.	Other [8]	56p, 57p
55.	Other U.S. Government liabilities [9]	48p
56.	U.S. liabilities reported by U.S. banks, not included elsewhere	55p, 56p
57.	Other foreign official assets [10]	50p, 56p
58.	Other foreign assets in the United States, net:	
59.	Direct investments in the United States [5]	49.
60.	U.S. Treasury securities	48p,54p
61.	U.S. securities other than U.S. Treasury securities	48p,50p
	U.S. liabilities to unaffiliated foreigners reported by U.S. nonbanking concerns:	
62.	Long-term	51.
63.	Short-term	52.
	U.S. liabilities reported by U.S. banks, not included elsewhere:	
64.	Long-term	53.
65.	Short-term	54p
66.	Allocations of special drawing rights	63.
67.	Statistical discrepancy (sum of above items with sign reversed)	64.
	MEMORANDA	
68.	Balance on goods and services (lines 1 and 15) [11]	
69.	Balance on current account (lines 68 and 29) [11]	
	Transactions in U.S. official reserve assets and in foreign official assets in the United States:	
70.	Increase (−) in U.S. official reserve assets, net (line 34)	
71.	Increase (+) in foreign official assets in the United States (lines 52, 56, and 57)	

See page 229 for footnotes to Proposed Table 1.

mittee decided not to recommend using a bank-reported classification as a major category in the capital accounts of the new table.

The Committee decided that it was important to preserve neutrality in the statistical presentation by treating transactions made by similar transactors in a symmetrical fashion. One change which would help to achieve this goal would be to present all U.S.Government capital transactions, including both reserves and other flows, in the same part of the table rather than in different parts as they are now. In view of these considerations, the Committee recommends: (a) that the capital accounts contain major classifications for U.S. assets abroad and for foreign assets in the United States; (b) that subclassifications be constructed for those transactions which are made by governments and those made by private transactors; and (c) further distinctions—for instance those between official reserves and other governmental transactions, and between bank-reported transactions and those reported by non-banking concerns—should be based, insofar as possible, on the principle of symmetry.

The new Table 1 in the *Survey of Current Business* which incorporates all of the Advisory Committee's recommendations is on page 228.

Footnotes for Proposed Table I:

[1] Credits, + : Exports of goods and services; unilateral transfers to U.S.; capital inflows (increase in foreign assets (U.S. liabilities) or decrease in U.S. assets); decrease in U.S. official reserve assets.
Debits, – : Imports of goods and services; unilateral transfers to foreigners; capital outflows (decrease in foreign assets (U.S. liabilities) or increase in U.S. assets); increase in U.S. official reserve assets.

[2] Excludes transfers of goods and services under U.S. military grant programs (see line 14).

[3] Excludes exports of goods under U.S. military agency sales contracts identified in Census export documents, excludes imports of goods under direct defence expenditures identified in Census import documents, and reflects various other adjustments (for valuation, coverage, and timing) of Census statistics to a balance of payments basis.

[4] Consists of interest, dividends, and branch earnings.

[5] Excludes reinvested earnings of foreign incorporated affiliates of U.S. firms or of U.S. incorporated affiliates of foreign firms.

[6] Includes sales of foreign obligations to foreigners.

[7] Consists of bills, certificates, marketable bonds and notes, and nonmarketable convertible and nonconvertible bonds and notes.

[8] Consists of U.S. Treasury and Export-Import Bank obligations not included elsewhere, and of debt securities of U.S. Government corporations and agencies.

[9] Includes, primarily, U.S. Government liabilities associated with military sales contracts and other transactions arranged with or through foreign official agencies; see table 5.

[10] Consists of investment in U.S. corporate stocks and in debt securities of private corporations and State and local governments.

[11] Conceptually, the sum of lines 69 and 66 is equal to "net foreign investment" in the national income and product accounts (NIPA) of the United States. Beginning with 1973-IV, however, the foreign transactions account in NIPA excludes the shipments and financing of extraordinary military orders placed by Israel.
Line 68 differs from net exports of goods and services in the NIPA due to the omission in the NIPA net exports of shipments of extraordinary military orders placed by Israel and of U.S. Government income payments to foreigners. The latter are classified in a separate category in the foreign transactions account in NIPA.

Other Data.—The major reason underlying the continued support by some members of the Advisory Committee for the publication of the official reserve transactions balance was their belief that official intervention in the foreign exchange market for the purpose of influencing the value of countries' currencies is still of major importance. With the variety and extent of discretionary international transactions by official agencies, however, the Committee members agreed that it is extremely difficult to measure official intervention. Moreover, with the advent of generally floating exchange rates, disequilibria in foreign currency markets are now reflected largely in exchange rate changes. The Committee concluded that it is necessary to provide and to highlight other relevant data in addition to the transactions data reported in the recommended Table 1.

(a) *Data on foreign exchange rates.*—Since changes in international transactions now have a greater impact on foreign exchange rates than they did before 1973, the Committee felt that the publication of U.S. international transactions data should include more references, including tables and/or charts, to exchange rate movements as an aid to understanding current developments in these transactions. Measures to be considered for publication would include changes in exchange rates with major U.S. trading partners, changes in exchange rates weighted by the share of a foreign country in U.S. trade or in world trade, and changes in exchange rates with identified groups of foreign countries such as the Group of Ten. It should be left to the Department of Commerce, in consultation with other Federal agencies, to decide which specific comparisons should be published. Some members of the Committee felt that, if feasible, comparable tables should also be published showing exchange rates adjusted for local price movements for the same countries or groups of countries.

(b) *Official intervention in the foreign exchange market.*—As an aid to an understanding of the variety and extent of transactions in exchange markets by official agencies, the Committee recommends the development of a table that would show not only changes in official reserve agencies' transactions in reserves, but also borrowing and lending among such agencies under swap arrangements. It is recognized that even this detail includes only a portion of the exchange market activity in which monetary authorities participate directly. While these swap transactions do not appear in the official Department of Commerce tables at present, they are important to an understanding of official actions designed to influence exchange rate movements.

The news releases.—The Committee discussed the purposes to be served by the two news releases on balance of payments data. The apparent need for comprehensive measures of the U.S. international financial position was given careful consideration. The news media and some other users rely on the releases for the picture of the overall U.S. performance. This report, however, indicates that the practical difficulties of providing such a measure cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of a majority of the members.

The timing of the first news release has been determined by the availability of the data needed to prepare estimates of the official reserve transaction balance and the net liquidity balance. The second release, which includes all the data to be published in the *Survey of Current Business,* has presented the "basic" balance for the first time each quarter.

The major questions were (1) whether there would be any continued need for the first release if the Advisory Committee's recommentation to discontinue publication of the two balances highlighted there were adopted, and (2) whether a meaningful and useful leading paragraph could be prepared for the media's use. It was noted that the Department of Commerce has reorganized the news releases in recent quarters to deemphasize the balances.

The Committee concluded that the first release would continue to serve the extremely useful purpose of making data available in a timely manner. Several members expressed the need to issue as soon as possible the information on some important types of capital transactions and on merchandise trade adjusted to the balance of payments basis quarterly.

Proposed Press Release #1

SELECTED DATA ON INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

(Available 6 weeks after close of quarter)

		Line ref. Table 1 4-7-76
1.	Merchandise exports [1]	2.
2.	Merchandise imports [1]	16.
	U.S. assets abroad, net (increase/capital outflow (−)):	
3.	U.S. official reserve assets, net	34.
4.	Gold	35.
5.	Special drawing rights	36.
6.	Reserve position in the International Monetary Fund	37.
7.	Foreign currencies	38.
	U.S. private assets, net:	
8.	Foreign securities	45.
9.	Newly issued in the United States	
10.	Other bonds	
11.	Other stocks	
	Claims reported by U.S. banks:	
12.	Long-term	48.
13.	Short-term	49.
	Foreign assets in the United States, net (increase/capital inflow (+)):	
	Foreign official assets in the United States, net:	
14.	U.S. Government securities	52.
15.	U.S. Treasury securities	53.
16.	Other [2]	54.
17.	U.S. liabilities reported by U.S. banks, not included elsewhere	56.
18.	U.S. securities other than U.S. Government securities [3]	57.
	Other foreign assets in the United States, net:	
19.	U.S. Treasury securities	60.
20.	U.S. securities other than U.S. Treasury securities	61.
21.	Stocks	
22.	Eurobonds newly issued abroad by U.S. corporations [4]	
23.	Other bonds	
	U.S. liabilities reported by U.S. banks, not included elsewhere:	
24.	Long-term	64.
25.	Short-term	65.
26.	To foreign commercial banks	
27.	To international and regional organizations (excluding the International Monetary Fund	
28.	To other foreigners	
29.	Other transactions and statistical discrepancy (net payments-) [5]	

[1] Adjusted for timing, valuation, and coverage to balance of payments basis; excludes exports under U.S military grant programs and under U.S. military agency sales contracts and imports of U.S. military agencies.

[2] Consists of U.S. Treasury and Export-Import Bank obligations to foreign official reserve agencies and of debt securities of U.S. Government corporations and agencies.

[3] Consists of U.S. stocks and debt securities of private corporations and State and local governments.

[4] Securities newly issued by finance subsidiaries incorporated in the Netherlands Antilles are included to the extent that the proceeds are transferred to U.S. parent companies.

[5] These include direct investments and other transactions for which (first) quarter data are not yet available.

Since, in the Committee's view, the desire for a summary measure cannot be accommodated, the Department of Commerce will have to start the first news release with a discussion of the principal developments during the quarter, wherever they appear in the accounts. This situation may not be wholly satisfactory to every user of that release. However, since the Committee seriously questioned the usefulness of any one balance as a comprehensive indication of the developments in U.S. international transactions, it was concluded that all balances should be omitted from the first news release, even as memorandum items. The recommended format of the first news release is on page 230.

Since the second news release presents, in abbreviated form, the data to appear in the quarterly *Survey of Current Business* article, the table contained in that release should conform closely to the recommended format for Table 1. The format for the second news release table which the Advisory Committee recommends is presented below.

Detailed Discussion of Specific Balances

The Advisory Committee has already expressed the view that no single balance can be employed under present circumstances to measure the overall condition of the international transactions of the United States. It has listed some of its reasons above and elaborates on these in the next section concerned with the balances recommended for elimination. The Committee nevertheless believes that certain partial balances have

Proposed Press Release #2

SUMMARY OF U.S. INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS

(Available 10 weeks after close of quarter)

Credits (+); debits (−)

		Line ref new Table 1
1.	Exports of goods and services [1]	1.
2.	Merchandise, adjusted, excluding military [2]	2.
	Receipts of income on U.S. assets abroad:	
3.	Direct investments	11.
4.	Other private receipts	12.
5.	U.S. Government receipts	13.
6.	Other goods and services	3.-10.
7.	Imports of goods and services	15.
8.	Merchandise, adjusted, excluding military [2]	16.
	Payments of income on foreign assets in the United States:	
9.	Direct investments	25.
10.	Other private payments	26.
11.	U.S. Government payments	27.
12.	Other goods and services	17.-24.
13.	Unilateral transfers (excluding military grants of goods and services), net	29.
14.	U.S. Government grants (excluding military grants of goods and services)	30.
15.	U.S. Government pensions, private remittances, and other transfers	31., 32.
16.	U.S. assets abroad, net (increase/capital outflow (−))	33.
17.	U.S. official reserve assets, net	34.
18.	U.S. Government assets, other than official reserve assets, net	39.
19.	U.S. private assets, net	43.
20.	Direct investments abroad	44.
21.	Foreign securities	45.
22.	Claims on unaffiliated foreigners reported by U.S. nonbanking concerns	46., 47.
23.	Claims reported by U.S. banks	48., 49.
24.	Foreign assets in the United States, net (increase/capital inflow (+))	50.
25.	Foreign official assets in the United States, net	51.
26.	U.S. Government securities	52.
27.	Other U.S. Government liabilities	55.
28.	U.S. liabilities reported by U.S. banks, not included elsewhere	56.
29.	Other foreign official assets	57.
30.	Other foreign assets in the United States, net	58.
31.	Direct investments in the United States	59.
32.	U.S. Treasury securities	60.
33.	U.S. securities other than U.S. Treasury securities	61.
34.	U.S. liabilities to unaffiliated foreigners reported by U.S. nonbanking concerns	62., 63.
35.	U.S. liabilities reported by U.S. banks, not included elsewhere	64., 65.
36.	Allocations of special drawing rights	66.
37.	Statistical discrepancy (sum of above items with sign reversed)	67.
	MEMORANDA	
38.	Balance on goods and services (lines 1 and 7)	68.
39.	Balance on current account (lines 38 and 13)	69.
	Transactions in U.S. official reserve assets and in foreign official assets in the United States:	
40.	Increase (−) in U.S. official reserve assets, net (line 17)	70.
41.	Increase (+) in foreign official assets in the United States (lines 26, 28, and 29)	71.

[1] Excludes transfers of goods and services under U.S. military grant programs.

[2] Adjusted for timing, valuation, and coverage to balance of payments basis; excludes exports under U.S. military agency sales contracts and imports of U.S. military agencies.

analytical significance which justifies their retention as memorandum items in the quarterly *Survey of Current Business* article and the second news release.

BALANCES TO BE RETAINED

Balance on current account.—The balance on current account—which covers goods, services, remittances, and government grants—is used by many other countries. Furthermore, with adjustment for errors and omissions and for valuation changes, this balance is the mirror image of changes in the Nation's net financial claims on foreigners. The balance on current account has a major difficulty, however. It draws a sharp distinction between U.S. Government grants to foreigners which appear above the line, and U.S. Government capital transactions (primarily Government loans) which appear below the line. The Committee recognized that, in some cases, this distinction is more apparent than real. Many U.S. Government loans contain a grant element (e.g., a grace period, a concessional interest rate, or provision for repayment in local currency), and to some extent this balance treats a difference of degree as though it were a difference of kind. Nevertheless, there remains a legal difference between grants and loans, since loans establish an initial obligation on the foreign borrower to repay the loan at a future date and usually to pay interest. The Committee felt that this balance is not analytically useful enough to be included in the body of the table, but that its linkage to the U.S. international investment position argues strongly for showing it as a memorandum item.

The Committee recommends that, in the recast version of Table 1, the distinction between unilateral transfers and government capital other than official reserve assets be retained but that it be given only a second order of emphasis by showing government unilateral transfers and government loans in separate subcategories.

Balance on goods and services.—All unilateral transfers as well as all capital transactions, official and private, appear below the line of the balance on goods and services, another partial balance. This balance is closely related conceptually to an important component in the national income and product accounts—net exports of goods and services. It also represents the net transfer of real resources to or from foreigners. These are important arguments in favor of the retention of this balance as a memorandum item, which the Committee recommends.

The Department of Commerce, in its recent revision of the national income and product accounts, has removed the U.S. Government's interest income payments to foreigners from the net exports component of GNP. (This component is now treated as a transfer payment in the U.S. national economic accounts.) As a result, the net exports component of the GNP accounts is no longer equal to the balance on goods and services in the balance of payments accounts. In recent years, the differences have come to be substantial. In 1975, net exports in GNP were $21.3 billion, $4.8 billion larger than the balance on goods and services. This difference was due mainly to the exclusion of $4.5 billion of U.S. Government interest payments to foreigners. Although this change in GNP accounting upsets the pre-existing correspondance between net exports and the balance on goods and services, the latter is still the basis for calculating net exports of goods and services in the GNP accounts, and the reconciliation of these two figures is straightforward. The Advisory Committee recommends retention of this balance as a memorandum item.

BALANCES TO BE DISCONTINUED

Official reserve transactions balance.—The official reserve transactions (ORT) balance made its appearance in the *Survey of Current Business* pursuant to the recommendations of the Review Committee for Balance of Payments Statistics in 1965. The case for the concept was set forth at length in Chapter 9 of the Review Committee's report.[8] Briefly, the balance was intended to reflect the extent of official intervention required to maintain pegged exchange rates by setting out the international deficits or surpluses arising from all other transactions which were financed by changes in official reserves. Furthermore, unless offset by monetary policies or by special institutional arrangements, changes in official reserves comprise the chief international influence on the domestic reserves of commercial banks, and therefore on national monetary aggregates or bank lending, and on domestic economic activity.

The Review Committee was aware of several conceptual and statistical limitations in its own proposal. It pointed out, for example, that stable exchange rates are sometimes maintained by official intervention in forward markets, and that such intervention has no direct impact on official reserves. It noted, moreover, that changes in official reserves can be deferred or concealed by special intergovernmental transactions such as prepayments of long-term debt, and that changes in U.S. liabilities to foreign official institutions do not reflect those changes in U.S. liabilities to

[8] See especially Review Committee *Report*, pp. 110-111.

foreign commercial banks (including the foreign branches of U.S. banks) which are connected with changes in foreign official holdings. These transactions cannot be separately identified in U.S. statistics and are reflected in the statistics on liabilities to private foreigners.

In addition, the linkages between the ORT balance and the U.S. money supply, which are sometimes cited as the chief reason why this balance is important, are not close for the United States. The U.S. monetary base will be directly reduced by an official reserve transactions deficit (increased by a surplus) only under very limited circumstances: when a foreign central bank acquires dollars through exchange market intervention and then sells (buys) those dollars to the U.S. monetary authorities in exchange for reserve assets, or when it increases (decreases) its dollar balances with the Federal Reserve banks. However, such transactions are now infrequent and of relatively small magnitude. More commonly, an ORT deficit or surplus will be associated with an increase or decrease in foreign official agencies' holdings of U.S. Treasury obligations and interest-bearing liabilities of U.S. commercial banks. Under these circumstances, an ORT surplus or deficit will not directly alter the U.S. monetary base.

Even in those limited circumstances when an official reserve transactions deficit or surplus directly affects the U.S. monetary base, the Federal Reserve System will—to the extent necessary to achieve the overall objectives of monetary policy—offset this effect by corresponding open market transactions in domestic securities. Hence, an ORT surplus or deficit tends to be "sterilized"—either automatically, by the decisions of foreign central banks to invest their international reserves in dollar assets such as Treasury bills, or by Federal Reserve open market operations.

Apart from the possible effect of international reserve transactions on monetary aggregates via the monetary base, U.S. monetary aggregates are not directly affected to a significant extent by transactions in international reserves.

In short, the use of dollar assets as the medium in which foreign monetary authorities hold international reserves prevents any close linkage between changes in the U.S. official reserve transactions balance on the one hand, and the U.S. monetary aggregates on the other hand, even apart from deliberate offsetting action on the part of the Federal Reserve System.

Recent events have caused some people to question the analytical usefulness of the ORT balance for other reasons as well. With the advent of floating exchange rates in March 1973, changes in official reserves are no longer a good indication of exchange-market pressures on the dollar. These pressures are now absorbed in larger measure by movements in exchange rates, and less in official purchases or sales of dollars by foreign central banks. In effect, changes of dollar holdings by foreign official institutions are now more generally voluntary acts, not ways of meeting obligations under the Bretton Woods Agreement.

When exchange rates were fixed, it was also widely assumed that foreign official dollar accumulations represented an excess supply of dollars in their hands which would be sold sooner or later, depressing the value of the dollar in exchange for other currencies. While this interpretation was not invariably correct before 1973, the significantly greater degree of discretion which exists today makes the validity of such an interpretation even more doubtful. Some members of the Advisory Committee took the view that the presentation of the balance of payments statistics should be brought into conformity with this reality by discontinuing the publication of the ORT balance. They pointed out, in addition, that this balance is now deprived of its subsidiary purpose, namely to indicate the "threat" to U.S. holdings of gold reserves, since the U.S. dollar is no longer convertible into gold.

To complicate matters, there are other reasons why changes in foreign official holdings of dollars are less closely related to the measurement of official intervention than ever before. Starting in 1974, for example, a number of foreign governments borrowed huge sums in the Eurocurrency and U.S. capital markets, directly and indirectly, by way of public and quasi-public institutions. These funds were added to reserves or used for other purposes, such as payments for oil imports, that might otherwise have called for large reductions in reserves. Conversely, the ORT balance can change from quarter to quarter even when there is no pressure on the exchange value of the dollar. Some of the oil exporting countries have accumulated huge official dollar balances as income-yielding investments, not as the result of exchange market intervention. Present statistical practices do not permit segregation of these acquisitions from those that result from official actions undertaken to affect exchange rates. All such foreign official acquisition of dollars contribute to the U.S. balance of payments deficit on the ORT basis, but is is not clear what a deficit on that definition signifies.

All members of the Advisory Committee agreed on the importance of these developments and arguments. All members agreed, in addition, that the official reserve transactions balance has less importance under present circumstances than it did, with all its flaws, before August 1971, when the dollar became inconvertible, or before March 1973, when generalized floating began.

Some members, however, believed that the official reserve transactions balance continues to be useful. Several reasons were offered in support of this position. First, there is still a large amount of official intervention in foreign exchange markets. Over 50 countries continue to peg their currencies to the U.S. dollar, and they buy or sell dollars to relieve exchange market pressures on their currencies vis-a-vis the dollar instead of allowing exchange rates to absorb those pressures. Floating exchange rates are "managed" extensively, and other countries intervene sporadically by buying and selling dollars. This official intervention is measured in the ORT framework.

Changes in official reserves, moreover, continue to have some importance for domestic monetary management. If imbalances in the aggregate of other transactions are reflected in changes in U.S. official holdings of gold and foreign currencies or foreign official deposits at Federal Reserve banks as mentioned above, the balance on official reserve transactions may affect the U.S. monetary base, and thus the U.S. banking system's ability to expand or need to contract the domestic money supply.

Some members of the Committee believed that it is important to supply a stable point of reference for description and analysis of the balance of payments. Without such a point of reference (i.e., an overall balance), it is more difficult to focus reporting and discussion, in and out of Government, on international transactions as a whole. There is the danger, moreover, that the absence of any agreed-upon overall balance invites the misuse of subsidiary balances, such as the balance on current account or, worse, the merchandise trade balance.

The Advisory Committee's decision about this complex issue was further complicated by its unanimity on other matters. The recommendation to discontinue publication of the other overall balances (the balance on current account and long-term capital and the net liquidity balance) had the unfortunate consequence of lending additional emphasis, by default alone, to the ORT balance. Thus, even those who advocated continued use of the ORT balance had qualms about publishing a summary table in which it would be the only comprehensive measure of the balance of payments. On the other hand, those members who believed that the ORT balance should not be presented had qualms about a table in which there would be no overall balance, but in which partial balances (on goods and services and on current account) would continue to appear.

The arrangement proposed in this Report reflects these collective concerns and misgivings. In the end, the arguments against the continued publication of the official reserve transactions balance and the other overall balances prevailed. The objection to a table which included partial balances only was resolved by the Committee's recommendation in favor of the publication as memorandum items of the two partial balances discussed above and of changes in U.S. official reserve assets and in liabilities to foreign official agencies without striking a balance of these two lines. Publication of the special table on foreign exchange operations by official agencies, which the Committee recommends, would provide valuable information. Finally, an additional table on changes in exchange rates would indicate the impact on those rates of all transactions. Agreement on this arrangement was strengthened by consensus on an additional point: although the Advisory Committee discussed the matter at length, no strong sentiment developed in favor of any new concept of a comprehensive or overall balance.

Net liquidity balance.—The net liquidity balance seeks to look beyond the formal distinction between long-term and short-term capital to segregate certain types of assets—called "liquid"—that are subject to reversal in the short-run. However, the distinction between liquid and nonliquid instruments that must be made in practice is both fuzzy and misleading.

According to present definitions, for example, an overnight loan by a U.S. bank to a foreign bank would be counted as a *nonliquid* claim; all loans made by a U.S. bank to a foreign bank are counted as nonliquid in our statistics largely because separate data for such loans are not available (see line 42 of the present Table 2). If the same U.S. bank loaned the money to a U.S. branch of a foreign bank, and that branch deposited the proceeds with its head office abroad, the transaction would give rise to a *liquid* claim because claims on foreign affiliates are commingled with holdings of private short-term marketable securities in the statistics. In the latter case, the initial loan would not appear in the balance of payments statistics, because the U.S. branch bank is treated as a resident of the United States, but the deposit claim on the head office abroad would appear in the balance of payments as an increase of liquid claims on foreigners (see line 43 of the present Table 2).

Although both of these methods of a domestic bank lending to a foreign commercial bank would establish a foreign liability to a U.S. bank for overnight money, the "nonliquid" claim would be recorded above the line of the net liquidity balance and the "liquid" claim would be recorded below the line. Clearly, such differences in the means used by a foreign bank to borrow funds overnight do not make a material difference in the international financial position of the United States or in the effect of the transaction on exchange rates. More generally, the practical application of the liquidity concept is too subjective and relative to be used as a suitable basis for classifying and summarizing the international transactions of the United States.

There is a further analytical difficulty in the use of this balance for specific purposes. The net liquidity balance (or the gross liquidity balance) was long viewed as a measure of potential pressure on U.S. primary reserve assets (e.g., gold and SDRs); since the dollar is no longer convertible into such assets, this rationale for the measure has disappeared.

The Advisory Committee recommends strongly and unanimously that the publication of the net liquidity balance be discontinued and that the terminology associated with it be deleted entirely from the balance of payments accounts.

Balance on current account and long-term capital.—The balance on current account and long-term capital (the so-called "basic" balance) was intended to serve as an indicator of long term trends in the balance of payments by segregating volatile capital flows and placing them below the line. It does not do so adequately. On the one hand, the capital flows which are excluded from the balance may exhibit long-term trends. On the other hand, some of the capital transactions in long-term securities, and even some components of direct investment, can be quite volatile.

The usefulness of this balance depends to a large extent upon the degree to which the statistician's distinction between short-term and long-term capital flows coincides with the investor's distinction between short-term and long-term horizons. There are problems in this connection which cannot be resolved easily. First, the statistical distinction between short-term and long-term capital flows is based entirely on the original maturity of the assets bought or sold, but assets with original maturities exceeding a year (the statistician's cut-off point) may be closer to maturity when currently bought or sold than assets with shorter original maturities. This fact introduces a discrepancy between the statistic and the concept it is intended to represent, and may make this balance unsatisfactory for its original purpose.

Second, and more important, there is a conceptual difficulty. Investors who intend to transfer funds while preserving the option to reverse the transfer after a short interval may nevertheless lodge those funds in long-term assets. One can buy a long-term bond with the intention of selling it in a week or a month; at times, this may be the only way to make the transfer. Conversely, an investor may purchase short-term instruments or make short-term loans with the intention of rolling them over month after month or year after year. For example, transactions between the United States and some important countries where the markets for long-term investment securities are limited will be predominantly short-term under current definitions, reflecting the nominal maturities of the instruments used. However, many such "short-term" transactions are continuously renewed, and a substantial proportion of such funds may constitute investment flows that will not soon be reversed. In sum, there is a substitutability between long-term and short-term capital assets which is dicated by economic and institutional circumstances. That distinction cannot be captured by statistical methods.

Moreover, changes in direct investment claims which are above the line of the "basic" balance include a large amount of volatile short-term flows between parent companies and their subsidiaries, a point which is made explicitly in the detailed table on capital movements in the *Survey of Current Business* but not taken account of in the calculation of the present balance on current account and long-term capital in the present Table 1. Indeed, this is one of the important ways that the well-known "lead and lag" effects on payments for imports and exports affect the balance of payments in any given period. These clearly are not long-term effects, but are cyclical, and often volatile in their direction and magnitude. Finally, it was noted by some members that there is no conceptual basis for combining current account transactions with long-term capital transactions in the same balance than there would be for combining all short-term and long-term transactions within the capital account itself.

For these reasons, the Advisory Committee recommends that publication of this balance be discontinued.

Balance on goods, services, and remittances.—The main argument in support of the balance on goods, services, and remittances (GSR) is derived from the significant deficiency, already noted, in the balance on current account. The distinction made in the current account balance between Government grants and Government loans is weak in some cases, and grants bulk large in U.S. international transactions. While the current account balance distinguishes between these transactions which can be quite similar in fact, the GSR balance places all of these transactions together below the line. Several of the Committee members felt, however, that the difference between the balance on goods and services and the GSR balance—consisting of pensions, remittances, and some other transfers—is usually fairly small and relatively stable for the United States. Private remittances have fluctuated in some periods, for example to provide assistance during a period of natural disaster or military activities, but these events are typically well known and can be analyzed as special cases. While the GSR balance is important for countries with relatively large numbers of immigrant workers, such is not the case with the United States. For these reasons, it was felt by some members that the GSR balance represents, for the United States, only a refinement of the balance on goods and services, and the Committee recommends retaining the latter balance as a memorandum item.

Another argument in support of the GSR balance is that it highlights the amount of government transfers and loans which, together with private capital flows, would be needed, given existing exchange rate relationships to maintain equilibrium in the other items which are above the line of that balance. In addition, some analysts feel that this balance places above the line those transactions which are most closely affected by changes in income and relative prices. Finally, as mentioned above, this balance is often useful in comparing the financing problems of industrialized and developing countries, in that it separates government grants (along with loans) as a source of funding.

The majority of the Committee felt that the rationale for the GSR balance was not sufficient to justify its retention as a third partial balance. In the Committee's view, the distinction contained in the goods and services balance between transactions in goods and services on the one hand, and all capital transactions plus unilateral transfers on the other, is of greater analytical significance than the distinction made by the GSR balance. More important, the GSR balance does not provide a direct linkage to other economic accounts, as do the balances on current account and on goods and services which the Advisory Committee desires to retain.

Since this balance is not related to other economic accounts, and since, for the United States, there is a close relationship between the GSR balance and the goods and services balance, the Committee recommends that the GSR balance be eliminated in the new presentation.

Merchandise trade balance.—The Committee recommends that the merchandise trade balance should be excluded from the new tabular presentation for several reasons. Several members objected to emphasizing the distinction made by that balance between goods and services which, from the point of view of U.S. production and employment conditions, has no greater economic significance than the distinction among different industries or sectors with different employment requirements. A more significant distinction would be between payments for currently produced goods and service, on the one hand, and investment income, which is payment for the services of past output in the form of investment in foreign countries, on the other hand. A majority of the Advisory Committee felt that the balance on goods and services was more useful than the merchandise trade balance in analyzing the impact of these transactions on the economy. In addition, the trade balance does not constitute a link with other economic accounts as do the two balances the Committee recommends retaining.

The data on merchandise exports and imports will still be published, however, as will the reconciliation with the monthly Census data on merchandise trade. Given the availability of this information and the basic conceptual objections to computing the merchandise trade balance, the Committee recommends against the continued publication of this balance in the new tabular presentation.

Interagency Committee and OMB Actions on the Report

The Advisory Committee on the Presentation of Balance of Payments Statistics, comprised of nine experts from the private sector (see page 221), was commissioned more than a year ago by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to review the presentation of those statistics and to advise OMB concerning any improvements which should be instituted to make the data more useful to the public. The Advisory Committee met four times between January and November 1975, and transmitted ten recommendations to OMB in early May 1976.

These recommendations are contained in their report which is published in full in this issue.

The Advisory Committee recommended that the Government discontinue publication of the three overall balances which have been used in recent years: the official reserve transactions balance, the net liquidity balance, and the balance on current account and long-term capital. The advent of generally floating exchange rates with discretionary official intervention and the increased accumulation of dollars by oil-exporting countries have substantially limited the usefulness of the official reserve transactions balance. The statistical difficulties of distinguishing between liquid and non-liquid short-term assets, and of distinguishing between long-term and short-term capital flows, argue against continued publication of the net liquidity balance and the balance on current account and long-term capital.

The Advisory Committee recommended publication of two partial balances as memorandum items—the balance on goods and services and the current account balance—largely because these balances are widely used, relate closely to other published statistical ac-

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON BALANCE OF PAYMENTS STATISTICS

Office of Management and Budget

Joseph W. Duncan, Chairman
Deputy Associate Director for Statistical Policy

David T. Hulett
Chief, Economics Statistics Branch
Statistical Policy Division

William E. Breidenbach
Senior Budget Examiner
International Programs Division

Council of Economic Advisers

Helen Junz
Senior Staff Economist

Department of the Treasury

Walther Lederer*
Chief, Balance of Payments
Office of Assistant Secretary for International Affairs (Research)

Donald W. Curtis
Acting Chief, Balance of Payments
Office of Assistant Secretary for International Affairs (Research)

Department of Commerce

Jack Bame
Associate Director for International Economics
Bureau of Economic Analysis

Evelyn Parrish
Chief, Balance of Payments Division
Bureau of Economic Analysis

Federal Reserve Board

Samuel Pizer
Advisor
Division of International Finance

John E. Reynolds
Associate Director
Division of International Finance

Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations

Geza Feketekuty
Director of Policy Development

* Retired from Government service April 1976.

counting systems, and are less subject to misinterpretation than are the three overall balances. The Advisory Committee recommended also the publication as memorandum items of separate data on transactions in U.S. official reserve assets and in foreign official assets in the United States without striking a balance of the two.

These and other recommendations were evaluated by the Interagency Committee on Balance of Payments Statistics (see box). The Interagency Committee agreed with all of the recommendations except the deletion of the merchandise trade balance and the balance on goods, services, and remittances. The Office of Management and Budget accepted the Interagency Committee's recommendation that these two partial balances should be published as memorandum items, in addition to those items recommended by the Advisory Committee, for several reasons.

While recognizing the limitations of the merchandise trade balance (as discussed in the Advisory Committee's report), OMB concluded that the concepts underlying this balance are clear and not liable to be seriously misinterpreted by the public. The merchandise trade balance is commonly used. It is published quarterly on the balance of payments basis by the Bureau of Economic Analysis soon after the monthly trade statistics are available from the Bureau of the Census; therefore, OMB viewed that continued publication of this balance as a memorandum item in the tables which present the complete statistics is desirable.

In the case of the balance on goods, services, and remittances (GSR), OMB concurred in the Interagency Committee's view that the balance is analytically useful in international comparisons, particularly for comparison of the financial position of industrialized countries with that of developing countries. For the developing countries, the receipts of government grants are viewed as part of the financing element in their international transactions, and the GSR balance places these transactions below the line along with official and all private capital, which is not the case with the current account balance. Comparisons of these countries tend to use the GSR balance analytically in preference to the balance on goods and services. The use of the GSR balance is becoming widespread and it probably will be more commonly used for international comparisons in the future. Thus, to facilitate international comparisons, publication of the GSR balance for the United States is useful, and OMB concluded that it would be inadvisable for the GSR balance to be omitted from the U.S. official statistics at this time.

The format of the new Table 1 which the Office of Management and Budget has approved is based on the Advisory Committee's recommendations and those of the Interagency Committee on Balance of Payments Statistics. The body of the Table will be as shown above on page 228. The memorandum items, however, will be somewhat different. The new memorandum items for Table 1 are presented below. The second news release will contain corresponding items.

MEMORANDA

68. Balance on merchandise trade (lines 2 and 16)
69. Balance on goods and services (lines 1 and 15)
70. Balance on goods, services, and remittances (lines 69, 31 and 32)
71. Balance on current account (lines 69 and 29)

Transactions in U.S. official reserve assets and in foreign official assets in the United States:

72. Increase (–) in U.S. official reserve assets, net (line 34)
73. Increase (+) in foreign official assets in the United States (lines 52, 56, and 57)

CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS

THE ANNUAL HOUSING SURVEY

The Bureau of the Census has recently published the reports from the first national Annual Housing Survey which was conducted in late 1973. The survey is designed to provide a current and ongoing series of data on selected housing and demographic characteristics. It is conducted by the Bureau of the Census for the Department of Housing and Urban Development in response to a need for frequent and up-to-date information on the Nation's housing, which is considered a prime indicator of the Nation's economic health.

With regular annual surveys, it will be possible to measure changes in the housing inventory resulting from losses and new construction and to follow trends in the number and types of housing, the level of rents and the price of housing, the frequency of mechanical and utility breakdowns and other indicators of the physical condition of residential structures. In addition, the survey collects data on the characteristics of respondents who moved during the last year and on the characteristics of both their previous and current residences.

Data were collected for a sample of housing units located in the counties and independent cities comprising the 461 sample areas used in current surveys of the Census Bureau. Sample units in these areas were selected from the 1970 decennial census records and supplemented with a sample of new construction permits in order to include housing units added since 1970. A total of approximately 60,000 housing units were enumerated in the 1973 survey. In order to provide more detailed and reliable information for rural areas, the sample was expanded for the 1974 survey to include an additional 16,000 units located in these areas.

The results of the first Annual Housing Survey showed that in October 1973 there were 76 million housing units in the United States, an increase of roughly 5.8 million units over the 70.2 million (adjusted for the estimated undercount of 1.5 million housing units) in the 1970 census. Approximately 8 million new housing units were constructed during the 3½-year period between the 1970 census and the 1973 Annual Housing Survey—an annual average of 2.3 million new units. To some extent, new construction was offset by losses from the housing inventory through demolitions, disasters and other means, such as changes to nonresidential use.

The median value of single-family owner-occupied units increased 41% from the median value of $17,100 in 1970 to $24,100 in 1973, while the median income of homeowners increased 19% from $9,700 to $11,500. Gross rents also increased significantly over the 3½-year period; the median monthly rent of $108 in 1970 increased 23% to $133 in 1973. The median income of renters increased 14% from $6,300 to $7,200 during the same period. The 1973 figures are subject to sampling variability as discussed in the report.

The Bureau of the Census has made major efforts to produce reliable indicators of housing quality since housing data were first collected in the 1940 census. Traditionally, Federal and local housing agencies have used condition of the structure and lack of complete private plumbing facilities to identify substandard housing. Housing analysts have recognized that the concept of inadequate or poor housing encompases more than structural condition and plumbing facilities, and that a broader concept should include measures of neighborhood quality and evaluations of basic support systems such as water and sewage disposal.

The Annual Housing Survey is a first attempt to present statistics describing these broader concepts of quality. The new items include such diverse indicators as breakdowns in heating and plumbing equipment; signs of water leakage in the basement and roof, physical condition of interior ceilings and floors, and the occupants' opinions of conditions in their neighborhood and of available neighborhood services.

The 1973 Annual Housing Survey showed that 3.6% of the occupied housing units in the Nation lacked complete private plumbing facilities compared to 5.5% in 1970. Only 2.8% of the Nation's households experienced a breakdown in their water supply, 3.3% had a breakdown in their flush toilet, while

1.2% had a breakdown in their sewage disposal system.

The neighborhood conditions most frequently mentioned as "being present to an objectionable extent," were street noise and heavy traffic—by 46% and 29%, respectively. Public transportation was the neighborhood service most frequently cited—by 32% of the households—as being inadequate. Despite these problems, 80% of all households in the Nation rated their neighborhoods as good or excellent places to live.

Reports for the Annual Housing Survey are being issued in four parts. Part A, *General Housing Characteristics,* shows data on such items as tenure, race, vacancy status, units in structure, income, and household composition. Selected counts and characteristics for new construction units and units removed from the inventory since April 1970 are also shown. Part B, *Indicators of Housing and Neighborhood Quality,* presents data on both the new and traditional indicators of housing quality. Part C, *Financial Characteristics of the Housing Inventory,* presents cross-tabulations of various housing and demographic characteristics by value, rent, and income. Part D, *Housing Characteristics of Recent Movers,* shows data for households who moved into their present unit during the previous 12 months, such as reason for move, household composition and income. It also presents cross-tabulations of present unit by previous unit covering such topics as tenure, location, and units in structure. In all four parts, data are shown for the United States, the four geographic regions, the total of all SMSAs (standard metropolitan statistical areas), by inside and outside central cities, and the total of areas outside SMSAs.

For the 1973 survey, Parts A, B, C, and D have already been released, as well as the supplemental reports. A supplemental report, entitled *Financial Characteristics by Indicators of Housing and Neighborhood Quality,* will be released in late spring of this year for the 1973 survey. In addition to the detailed published information, a limited amount of unpublished data are available, and photocopies of this information can be provided at the cost of reproduction. A public use computer tape with restricted geographic identification is also available for data users.

The final reports for the 1974 survey are due for publication in the summer of 1976.

Copies of the reports for the 1973 National Survey (Part A, 164 pp. at $3.20; Part B, 130 pp. at $2.75; Part C, 171 pp. at $4.25; Part D, 146 pp. at $2.90) may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. (ELMO BEACH and TONI KNOLL, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, telephone (301) 763-2881.)

MONEY INCOME IN 1974 OF FAMILIES AND PERSONS

A report entitled "Money Income in 1974 of Families and Persons in the United States" has recently been published by the Bureau of the Census. This report includes data on family money income distributions cross-classified by various social, demographic, and economic characteristics of the family head, and other characteristics such as residence, size of family, number of children under 18 years old, class of worker, employment status and occupation, and sources of income received. Similar data are also shown for males and females classified by the amount of their own income and by various personal characteristics. This report is an updated version of the 1973 report.

The report focuses on changes in median family income form 1947 to 1974. In current dollars, median family income increased about 325% between 1947 and 1974—from $3,030 to $12,840. Much of this increase, however, was eroded by price increases, especially in recent years. After adjusting for inflation, median family income in constant 1974 dollars increased about 92% during the 27-year span—from $6,690 to $12,840. Long-term trends in real family income are also shown for the four major regions (Northeast, North Central, South, and West) of the United States.

The report also shows that median family income, in terms of 1974 purchasing power, increased only 1.2%—from $12,690 to $12,840—in the 5 years between 1969 and 1974. From 1973 to 1974, the median family income declined by 4% in real terms, however, there were several groups which did not experience a decline in real median income:

Families in which the head worked year round full time. They had a median income of $16,070 in 1974.

Families headed by a female. They had a median income of $6,410 in 1974.

Families in which there were no earners—those living solely on public aid, retirement, or Social Security programs, for example. They had a median income of $4,840 in 1974.

Copies of this report, "Money Income in 1974 of Families and Persons in the United States," *Current Population Reports,* Series P-60, No. 101, (176 pages, $3.30) may be purchased from the Superintendent of

Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.) GORDON W. GREEN, JR., BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE telephone (301) 763-5071.)

MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY OF COLLEGE STUDENTS: OCTOBER 1974

The Bureau of the Census has recently issued a report presenting data from the October 1974 Current Population Survey on major field of study of college students cross-classified by characteristics of the student such as age, sex, race, year in which enrolled, type of college and family income.

As in 1972, business was the most popular major field of study; about 16% of all college students were enrolled in this field in October 1974. Enrollment in the education field showed an increase of 15% between 1972 and 1974, and enrollment in biological sciences increased by 27% during this period. On the other hand, the number of social science majors decreased by 19% between 1972 to 1974.

Women increased from 38 to 44 % of college students between 1966 and 1974. The proportion of students in each major field who were women varied a great deal in 1974, from a low of 7% of engineering majors to a high of 73% of students majoring in education.

Copies of the report, "Major Field of Study of College Students: October 1974," *Current Population Reports,* Series P-20, No. 289 (38 pp., $1.10) may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402, or from Commerce Department District Offices. (MARK S. LITTMAN, POPULATION DIVISION, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, telephone (301) 763-5050.)

POPULATION ESTIMATES OF METROPOLITAN AREAS, 1973 AND 1974 AND COMPONENTS OF CHANGE SINCE 1970

In an apparent reversal of the historic trend of rapid metropolitan growth in the United States, metropolitan areas as a whole are estimated to have grown less rapidly than nonmetropolitan areas, increasing only 3.4% between 1970 and mid-1974, according to a report on metropolitan areas recently released by the Bureau of the Census.

The 15 largest standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSAs)—those with 2 million or more people each as of 1970—as a group experienced no growth between 1970 and 1974. More than 1.7 million more persons are estimated to have moved out of these areas than moved in during the first 4 years of this decade, with the New York SMSA alone accounting for a net migration loss of half a million.

The report also presents, for the first time, population estimates for the 13 recently designated standard consolidated statistical areas (SCSAs)—two or more contiguous SMSAs (one of which has a population of at least 1,000,000) having a high level of intercommuting and generally sharing a continuous urban mass.

Tables of the report present estimates of the population of SMSAs and their constituent counties for July 1, 1973 and 1974, and components of change between 1970 and 1974; estimates of SCSAs and components of change; SMSAs and SCSAs by rank size in 1974; estimates of SMSAs by population size class; and estimates of metropolitan and nonmetropolitan population by State, July 1973 and 1974.

Copies of the report, "Estimates of the Population of Metropolitan Areas, 1973 and 1974, and Components of Change Since 1970," *Current Population Reports,* Series P-25, No. 618 (35 pp., 75 cents) are available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. (MARIANNE MANN ROBERTS, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, telephone (301) 763-5313.)

COUNTY POPULATION ESTIMATES: JULY 1, 1973 AND 1974

The Bureau of the Census recently released a report entitled "Estimates of the Population of Counties: July 1, 1973 and 1974." The report presents population estimates for July 1, 1973, and provisional estimates for July 1, 1974, for all counties in the United States, by State, for parishes in Louisiana, and for census divisions in Alaska.

This report is an aggregation of the county population estimates presented in individual State reports published under the auspices of the Federal-State Cooperative Program for Local Population Estimates. These estimates were previously published in *Current Population Reports,* Series P-26, Nos. 94-117 and 119-138 plus Series P-25 reports, Nos. 596, 597, 599, 602, 604, and 609.

The methods used to develop the estimates were the Regression (ratio-correlation) method, Component

Method II, the Administrative Records method, and the Housing Unit method.

The report contains two appendixes—one which lists the State agencies in the Federal-State Cooperative Program and the other which shows the beta coefficients, variable names, and measures of significance associated with the multiple regression equations used by the various States in preparing annual county population estimates by the Regression (ratio-correlation) method.

Copies of the report, "Estimates of the Population of Counties: July 1, 1973 and 1974," *Current Population Reports,* Series P-25, No. 620 (75 pp., $1.75) may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. (FREDERICK J. CAVANAUGH, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE telephone (301) 763-7722.)

POVERTY POPULATION: 1974

The Bureau of the Census has released its detailed report on the poverty population in "Characteristics of the Population Below the Poverty Level: 1974." This report contains 48 detailed tables and an analytical text presenting information on social and economic characteristics of the population below the proverty level.

The tables presented in this report are similar to those found in previous Series P-60 *Current Population Reports* on the low-income population for the years 1969 to 1973. Several historical tables provide a picture of the changing population above and below the low-income level since 1959.

The report shows that there were 24.3 million persons below the poverty level in 1974 comprising 12% of the population. This figure was 1.3 million or 5.6% higher than the 1973 figure.

Whites below the poverty level increased by 1.1 million, or 8%, between 1973 and 1974; the number of blacks in this category did not change significantly. About 9% of the white and 31% of the black populations were living below the poverty line in 1974.

About 2.6 million persons of Spanish origin—approximately 23% of their total—were below the low-income level in 1974. The size of the sample was too small, however, to reliably determine whether a change occurred since the previous year.

The number of poor persons under 65 increased by 7% from 1973 to 1974, whereas the change in the number 65 or older was not statistically significant. The report pointed out that 1974 was the first year since 1970, when substantial increases in Social Security benefits were enacted, that the number of elderly poor did not decline.

Copies of the report, "Characteristics of the Population Below the Poverty Level: 1974," *Current Population Reports,* Series P-60, No. 102 (168 pages $3.20) may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. (RENEE MILLER, POPULATION DIVISION, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, telephone (301) 763-5790.)

SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAMS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD, 1975

The Office of Research and Statistics in the Social Security Administration has released *Social Security Programs Throughout the World, 1975,* a 255-page report published biennially. The new edition highlights the principal features of social security systems in 128 countries.

The data are based on laws, implementing decrees, and regulations in force at the beginning of 1975. Comprehensive source materials summarized in the report were provided by the International Social Security Association, its member institutions, the International Labor Organization, the Inter-American Committee on Social Security, the Organization of American States, and the European Economic Community. The report focuses on old-age, invalidity, and survivor programs, sickness and maternity programs, work-injury programs, unemployment benefit programs, and family allowances. In addition to describing these basis programs, the new report summarizes recent trends, patterns and developments.

Single copies of *Social Security Programs Throughout the World, 1975* (Research Report No. 48, HEW Publication No. (SSA) 76-11805) are available from the Publications Staff, Office of Research and Statistics, Social Security Administration, Room 1120 University North Building, 1875 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., Washington, D.C. 20009 (telephone (202) 382-3261). The report is on public sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 for $4.15. Order by GPO Stock Number 017-070-00279-0. (ROBERT E. ROBINSON, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, telephone (202) 382-3261).

SIX NEW SOCIAL SECURITY BULLETIN REPORTS

The Office of Research and Statistics in the Social Security Administration has announced the availability of six new reports.

Born To Be Poor: Birthplace and Number of Brothers and Sisters As Factors in Adult Poverty.—Household heads who grew up as members of large families and/or as natives of small towns or rural areas tend to have less education and are more likely to be poor than those coming from small families and/or large cities. Data in this article supporting these conclusions have been drawn from two independent sources—a special Social Security Administration supplement to the April 1968 Current Population Survey and findings from the Retirement History Study conduct by the Social Security Administration.

Social Security in the Coming Decade: Questions for a Mature System.—The Robert M. Ball Lecture Series, established in 1973 as a tribute to the former Commissioner of Social Security, was designed to present the ideas of distinguished leaders in the field of social policy to the Social Security Administration staff and their guests. The second lecutre was given by an author-researcher widely known for her work in the areas of labor, manpower, social insurance, and income maintenance. Professor Kreps summarizes the 40-year history of the U.S. social security program, discusses demograghic shifts in today's society, and questions public understanding of the program. She deals with income transfer between generations, the declining proportion of workers to retirees, and delayed retirement age.

The Economic Cost of Illness Revisited.—This article updates the 1972 benchmark study of the cost of illness. For the 16 major diagnostic categories of illness, costs are presented in terms of the direct costs for prevention, detection, treatment, morbidity losses due to disability, and mortality losses resulting from premature death. In 1972, the estimated total cost of illness was $189 billion: $75 billion for direct costs, $42 billion for morbidity, and $71 billion for mortality. Diseases of the circulatory system were the most costly, representing about one-fifty of all costs of illness.

Private Health Insurance in 1974: A Review of Coverage, Enrollment, and Financial Experience.—In 1974, more than three-fourths of the civilian population had substantial economic protection through private health insurance against the costs of hospital and surgical care. Smaller proportions were covered for other health care costs, usually after payment of deductibles and coinsurance. Consumers got back 87% of their premium dollars in the form of benefits. Because of premium lag, the industry had a net underwriting loss of $359.7 million of 1.3% of premium income. Most consumers bought health insurance from insurance companies; Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans served two-fifths of the insured population for hospital-associated care. Another 6% received health care through independent prepayment and self-insured plans.

Social Welfare Expenditures, 1950-75.—This study takes both a short-term and a long-term look at trends in social welfare expenditures under public programs. For fiscal year 1975, inflation and the recession were the key to developments. Inflation ate up more than half the 20% ($47 billion) increase—the largest in the history of the series—partly as the result of anti-recession measures. After adjustment for population and price changes, the real increase in per capita constant dollars was 7.1%—not large by recent measures but still significant when compared with the average annual increase of 5.9% recorded since 1950.

National Health Expenditures, Fiscal Year 1975.—According to preliminary estimates, the Nation's health expenditures reached $118.5 billion in 1975, or $547 per person. Total health spending showed a 14% rise, significantly higher than the increase in 1974 when price controls in the health industry were in effect for most of the year. Expenditures, as a share of the GNP, rose to 8.3%. Public spending grew two and one-half times as fast as private spending in 1975, mainly because of the continuing expension of Medicare and Medicaid. Third parties financed two-thirds of all personal health care spending, with the Government share 40% and that of private insurance 27%.

Single copies of the above publications are available for official use from the Publications Staff, Office of Research and Statistics, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Room 1120, 1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009. (ROBERT E. ROBINSON, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, telephone (202) 382-3439.)

NEW COMPENDIUM OF HEALTH CARE OUTLAYS

Trends in the Nation's health spending have attracted widespread interest and concern owing to rapid growth in such outlays in recent years. To provide the bases for further analysis and interpretation, all available data on health expenditures through fiscal year 1974 or calendar year 1973 are presented in the *Compendium of National Health Expenditures Data,* a 121-page statistical report released in March 1976 by the Office of Research and Statistics, Social Security Administration.

Previously published data have been reviewed for comparability and revised where necessary. In addition, new estimates have been developed for many of the earlier years to make the *Compendium* as complete as possible. No attempt at analysis is made here.

This report may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock Number 017-070-00276-5) for $2.30. (ROBERT E. ROBINSON, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, telephone (202) 382-3261.)

28th INTERGOVERNMENTAL STATISTICAL SEMINAR

The 28th Intergovernmental Seminar on Accessing Federal Statistical Resources was conducted by the Bureau of the Census March 22-25, 1976—sessions on Monday-Wednesday were at the Bureau, and on Thursday at Main Commerce for presentations by staff members of Office of Management and Budget, and the U.S. Departments of Transportation; Health, Education, and Welfare, Commerce; Treasury; Labor; and Housing and Urban Development. In attendance were 37 participants—9 from Federal, 12 from State, 11 from local, and 2 from regional units of government; and 3 from universities. To date, 751 participants representing 522 organizations have attended this series of seminars.

These intergovernmental seminars, designed primarily to serve the data user needs of State and local government, also include participants from the Census Bureau and other Federal agencies. Participating in this seminar were three Community Services Specialists (from the Census Bureau and the Denver and Seattle Regional Offices); four Department of Commerce staff members from the Office of Field Operations; one each from the Federal Energy Administration and the Social Security Administration; and two from Indiana Census Users Program, Indianapolis.

Seminar participants usually have very diverse backgrounds and levels of experience in using census data. In order to provide a more flexible agenda, both elementary and advanced sessions were offered in the three sets of concurrent sessions. The participants' evaluations of the seminar, and the feedback on data user needs, are most helpful in planning this ongoing program of user-oriented seminars.

The 29th intergovernmental seminar is tentatively scheduled to be held in Washington, D.C., in September 1976. Interested data users from local, State, and Federal governmental agencies are invited to write or call for further information. (MATHILDA R. BOWMAN, DATA USER SERVICES DIVISION, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, telephone (301) 763-5512.)

MEETING OF COORDINATING BOARD OF COINS

The Coordinating Board of the Committee for the Improvement of National Statistics (COINS), a technical Committee of the Inter-American Statistical Institute (IASI), held a meeting May 11-13, 1976 in Washington, D.C.

The purpose of the meeting was to review the implementation of the recommendations of the XII Session of COINS held in Lima, Peru, in November 1975; consider observations presented by several countries concerning the future of the Committee; and take decisions regarding the work for the XIII Session scheduled to take place in the second half of 1977.

Participating in the meeting of the Coordinating Board were: Joseph W. Duncan (United States), chairman; Juan Manuel Caballero (Panama); Amaro da Costa Monteiro (Brazil); Carmen McFarlane (Jamaica); Rene Sanchez Bolanos (Costa Rica); from the IASI Secretariat, Tulo H. Montenegro, secretary general, and Ana Casis, assistant secretary general.

The next meeting of the Coordinating Board will be held in Costa Rica in March 1977. (TULO H. MONTENEGRO, INTER-AMERICAN STATISTICAL INSTITUTE, telephone (202) 331-1010.)

ANNUAL SESSION OF IASI EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee of the Inter-American Statistical Institute (IASI), a technical organization coordinated with the Organization of American States (OAS), held its XXXVIII Session, April 19-23, 1976 in Washington, D.C.

The purpose of the Session was to examine the work program of the Department of Statistics of the General Secretariat of the OAS as well as the General

Secretariat of IASI, submitted to the pertinent bodies of the inter-American System.

The Committee also discussed various other administrative and technical matters, particularly those related to the committee on Improvement of National Statistics (COINS).

Participating in the Executive Committee Session were Ruben Gleason Galicia (Mexico), president; Walter E. Duffet (Canada), Maria Esther J. Suarez (Argentina), Charles G. Alleyne (Barbados), and Rúdolf W.F. Wuensche (Brazil), vice presidents. The chairman of the Coordinating Board of COINS, Joseph W. Duncan, Deputy Associate Director for Statistical Policy of the United States Office of Management and Budget, also attended the session to discuss matters on COINS. The Secretary General of the OAS, is an ex officio member of the Executive Committee of IASI.

Others who participated included Calvert L. Dedrick, who represented the International Statistical Institute, with which IASI is affiliated, and from the IASI Secretariat: Tulo H. Montenegro, secretary general, Ana Casis, assistant secretary general, and Raul Conde. (TULO H. MONTENEGRO, INTER-AMERICAN STATISTICAL INSTITUTE, telephone (202) 331-1010.)

WORLD ENERGY SUPPLIES, 1950-1974

The Statistical Office of the United Nations has recently issued *World Energy Supplies, 1950-1974.*

This study is the nineteenth in an internationally comparable series on energy, summarizing world energy trends over 25 years. It also contains 1975 preliminary production data for the primary fossil fuels. The study has updated and revised, where necessary, the historical data of Series J, Nos. 2-18. It contains historical quantitative annual data drawn from a computer-processed data file on the production, imports, exports and gross consumption of solid fuels, petroleum and its secondary energy and non-energy refined products, gases (both natural and manufactured) and electricity (differentiated by thermal, hydro, geothermal and nuclear) for approximately 200 countries and areas, on a *per capita* basis with sub-regional, regional and global totals. A compendium of general energy, regional and national data sources, totaling 45 pages, is also included. Separate data on bunkers for foreign-bound ships and aircraft are also shown, as well as end-of-year capacity figures for industrial and public electric generating plants and crude petroleum refineries. Data on the production of enriched uranium are also shown.

In addition, four special tables in matrix form show the flows of trade in crude petroleum, electricity, natural gas and solid fuels between regions and between principal exporting and importing countries. This publication is a useful reference for economic energy forecasting.

Copies of *World Energy Supplies, 1950-1974* (Statistical Papers, Series J. No. 19, lxxv + 825 pp., UN Sales No. E.76.XVII.5; clothbound, $38.00, paperbound $30.00) may be purchased from the Sales Section, United Nations, New York, New York 10017. Government agencies should request the discount to which they are entitled as it is not automatically given. When ordering, please use the sales number and prices given above.

GUIDE TO ILLINOIS STATISTICS

The Illinois State Library has recently issued *Guide to Statistics In Illinois State Documents* as an aid to locating data contained in publications issued by agencies of the State of Illinois. This volume reflects the State Library holdings in early 1975. Updates will appear from time to time in *Illinois Libraries,* an official periodical of the State Library. Single copies are available without charge from Mary Redmond, Illinois State Library, Centennial Building, Springfield, Illinois 62756. (MARY REDMOND, ILLINOIS STATE LIBRARY, STATE OF ILLINOIS)

NEW REPORTING PLANS AND FORMS

The following listing gives brief descriptions of a selected group of new reporting plans and forms approved between April 16 and May 17, 1976 by the Office of Management and Budget under the provisions of the Federal Reports Act. The description refers to surveys and data collection programs which are just being started or are soon to be started so results are not yet available.

Department of Agriculture

Forest Service

Evaluation of Video Tape Displays for Simulating Urban Forest Environments (singletime).—The Forest Service will conduct a survey of University of Massachusetts students using video tape displays to evaluate the attractiveness of forest stands. Some specific objectives are to determine: (1) the merits of video tape displays in making evaluations of stand attractiveness, (2) estimates of measurable stand characteristics, (3) whether stand characteristics account for differences in evaluations of stand attractiveness, and (4) whether specific forest features influence evaluations of stand attractiveness. (For further information: E. L. SCHAFER, FOREST SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, telephone (703) 235-1071.)

Statistical Reporting Service

Texas Peach Tree Survey (singletime).—The Statistical Reporting Service will conduct an enumeration of Texas peach orchards to obtain a count of trees by age groups. The survey will provide a base point for future estimates and a new sampling frame. (For further information: DON FEDEWA, STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, telephone (202) 447-7720.)

Tennessee Farm Classification Survey (singletime).—The Statistical Reporting Service will conduct a survey of Rural Electrification Administration (REA) cooperative members in Tennessee to determine whether they qualify as farm operators. Two basic premises being tested are: (1) are REA cooperatives reliable list sources for names of farmers, and (2) can cooperative personnel segregate farmers from nonfarmers and provide control data. The results of this survey will have bearing on procedures used by the agency in compiling a master list of farms in the United States. (For further information: HENRY J. POWER, STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, telephone (202) 447-7909.)

Popcorn Processor Survey (semiannually).—This survey will obtain basic information relating to popcorn supplies and prices from popcorn processors, and will be published twice a year. These data will be used by popcorn growers, processors, grocery merchandisers and consumers to gauge acreage, potential production and actual out-turn to rationally assess popcorn availability and price. (For further information: JAMES H. TIPPETT, STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, telephone (202) 447-4857.)

Fruit Processing Survey (annually).—This survey collects production, utilization and price data for noncitrus fruit crops. These data, collected shortly after harvest, serve as the primary input in setting crop utilization estimates, a check on the level of the official estimate, and the degree of cross-state movement. (For further information: DON FEDEWA, STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, telephone (202) 447-7720.)

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

National day care supply study—day care center director telephone survey (singletime).—This nationwide telephone survey of 3,000 day care centers is part of the National Day Care Study which is a major longitudinal study to assess cost effectiveness in day care centers in relation to staff/child ratios, levels of caregivers' professionalism, and other characteristics of the centers' programs and staff. The major study is being conducted in 64 day care centers in three large metropolitan areas. The telephone survey provides data for a statistical profile of the day care industry on a state-by-state basis. The data will be used to (1) provide a statistical basis for generalizing the cost effectiveness findings of the National Day Care Study to other cities and regions, (2) estimate the degree of compliance of existing centers with Federal day care center requirements and the cost which would be incurred to bring the existing centers into compliance with alternative Federal regulations, (3) assist State governments in developing State regulations and policies for day care centers, and (4) assist Congress and DHEW in developing an equitable formula for distributing Federal day care funds among States. (For further information: ALLEN SMITH, OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, telephone (202) 755-8774.)

Department of Housing and Urban Development

National lead-based paint study (singletime).—This is a survey to determine the level of lead-based paint hazards in public housing subsidized by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and in properties repossessed by HUD due to default on mortgage payments. A sample will include approximately 3,300 of 1.2 million properties. Tabulations will indicate the number of dwelling units with one or more surfaces with specified degrees of lead and the size of surface by lead content cross-classified by type of structure, type of room, and whether public housing. (For further information: IRWIN BILLICK, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, telephone (202) 426-1520.)

PROGRESS TOWARD PRESIDENT'S GOALS—OMB INVENTORY OF FEDERAL REPORTS*

Department or Agency	REPETITIVE REPORTS			SINGLE-TIME REPORTS		
	October 31, 1975	April 30, 1976	June 30, 1976	October 31, 1975	April 30, 1976	June 30, 1976
Agriculture	794	752		55	48	
Commerce	574	577		88	80	
Defense	225	224		14	12	
Health, Education and Welfare	958	970		250	260	
Housing and Urban Development	299	262		22	24	
Interior	328	324		26	25	
Justice	166	167		12	13	
Labor	267	256		36	22	
State	31	32		2	2	
Transportation	284	277		47	50	
Treasury	138	124		4	5	
Agency for International Development	28	28				
Energy Research and Development Administration	31	31		1		
Environmental Protection Agency	56	59		22	12	
Executive Office of the President	14	1		2	1	
Farm Credit Administration	1					
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	12	12				
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	5	2				
Federal Reserve System	39	35		1	2	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	1	1		1	1	
National Foundation on Arts and Humanities	20	20		3	5	
General Services Administration	68	66			2	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	23	23		3		
National Mediation Board	3	3				

PROGRESS TOWARD PRESIDENT'S GOALS—OMB INVENTORY OF FEDERAL REPORTS* (CONTINUED)

Department or Agency	REPETITIVE REPORTS October 31, 1975	REPETITIVE REPORTS April 30, 1976	REPETITIVE REPORTS June 30, 1976	SINGLE-TIME REPORTS October 31, 1975	SINGLE-TIME REPORTS April 30, 1976	SINGLE-TIME REPORTS June 30, 1976
National Science Foundation	58	54		16	8	
ACTION	36	29		10	6	
Railroad Retirement Board	122	123				
Renegotiation Board	4	4				
Selective Service System	24	14				
Small Business Administration	20	21		3	1	
Smithsonian Institution	11	10		1		
Tennessee Valley Authority	22	22		4	6	
U.S. Civil Service Commission	151	132		7	5	
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights					3	
U.S. Information Agency	9	9				
U.S. International Trade Commission	6	7		21	11	
Veterans Administration	297	273		14	12	
National Gallery of Art	3	2				
Interim Compliance Panel	2					
National Credit Union Administration	6	6				
Overseas Private Investment Corporation	1	2				
Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention	1					
American Revolution Bicentennial Administration	5	6		1		
Committee on Products and Services of Blind and Severely Handicapped	4	4		1	1	
Community Services Administration		11			1	
InterAmerican Foundation	2	2				
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation	1	1				
U.S. Postal Service	3					
National Academy of Sciences				7	3	
National Center for Productivity					1	
Administrative Conference of the United States					1	
Commission on Review of National Policy Toward Gambling					1	
TOTALS	5,153	4,962		674	624	

*Our readers will recall that in April's feature article, "President's Reporting Reduction Program," we stated that we would include this table each month through the period June 30, 1976. This is the progress report for April showing the agencies' progress toward achieving the President's goal of reducing public reporting to Federal agencies.

OTHER REPORTING PLANS AND FORMS

Shown below, by agency is a list of *new* forms approved between April 16 and May 17, 1976 excluding those described above. Questions or requests for additional information about any of the forms listed below should be addressed in writing to Marsha Traynham, Statistical Policy Division, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, D.C. 20503. Your comments on the usefulness of this feature will be welcomed.

During April approximately 68 forms reached their expiration dates and are no longer approved for use.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Referral Slip #3 Reconciliation Form for Vacant and Deleted Units, 1976 Census of Travis County, Texas
Telephone Verification Records for a Pretest for the 1980 Decennial Census
Population and Housing Census Forms—National Content Test (1980 Census Pretest)
(Part of 1980 Decennial Census of Population and Housing) Housing Unit Coverage Listing Book, 1976 Census of Travis County, Texas
External User Questionnaire on Weather Data Needs

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Support Requirements Progress and Status Reporting
Weight and Balance Control System for Missiles
Prompt Management System Report
Product Quality Program Requirement for Fleet Ballistic Missile Weapon System Contractors
Quality Minority Recruitment Study
Spare Parts and Maintenance Support of Space and Missile Systems
Fleet Ballistic Missile Weapon System Trouble and Failure Report Program
Line of Balance Technology
Policies and Procedures for Alteration of FBM Weapon System Equipment

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Research on the Effects of Demonstration Compensatory Education Projects
A Study for Establishing Consumer Protection Strategy
Network Evaluation Questionnaire
Human Health Consequences of Polybrominated Biphenyls (PBBS) Contamination of Farms in Michigan
Study of Demographic Factors in Epilepsy
Assistance to Vietnamese and Cambodian Refugees
Survey of Registered Nurses Employed by the PHS (June 30, 1974—July 1, 1975)
Evaluation of Delaware Services Integration Program
Head Start Transition Evaluation Battery

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Coinsured Mortgage Record Change
Application for Coinsurance Benefits

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bituminous Coal and Lignite Mined Land Survey
Recreational Resource Capacity

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Tables on Pricing of Private Passenger Automobile Insurance

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Report on Occupational Employment
Supplementary Data System

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Importation of Recreational Boats and Products Subject to U.S. Customs Regulations and U.S. Coast Guard Regulation Declaration Form
Concorde Community Response-Nationwide and Local
Profile and Anthropometric Data Relating to the Interstate Truck and Bus Driver Populations in United States

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Importation of Motor Vehicles and Motor Vehicle Engines Subject to Federal Air Pollution Control Regulations

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Application for Indemnification Under the Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Act
European Vision of America Exhibition Audience Survey

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Questionnaire on Quality of Life

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Business Supported Research and Development in Maine Industry

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Survey of Pay Rates of $36,000 or More in Public Corporations and Authorities

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Importers Questionnaire (Other Than Japan) (Polymethyl Methacrylate Resins)
Importers Questionnaire (Japan) (Polymethyl Methacrylate Resins)
Questionnaire for Manufacturers, Contractors, and Converters of Infants' Bootie Sets
Questionnaire for Purchasers of Infants' Bootie Sets
Importers' Questionnaire—Certain Above Ground Swimming Pools
Questionnaire for Importers of Infants' Bootie Sets
Purchasers' Questionnaire (Hollow Ceramic Brick)
Producers' Questionnaire (Hollow Ceramic Brick)

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

FTC Trade Regulation Rulemaking Questionnaire

PERSONNEL NOTES

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of the Census: ORVIN L. WILHITE has been designated Chief, Agriculture Division. HENRY H. SMITH has been designated Chief, and EUGENE M. CAGLE has been designated Assistant Chief, Public Information Office. ROBERT CROWTHER has been designated Assistant Chief (Census Programs) and JOHN DODDS has been designated Chief, Enterprise Statistics Branch, Economic Surveys Division. ROBERT W. MARX has been designated Assistant Division Chief of Geographic Areas, Geography Division. J. THOMAS BREEN has accepted an assignment with the Economic and Agriculture Censuses Staff to assist in the planning for the 1978 Census of Agriculture.

Bureau of Economic Analysis: DONALD P. ELDRIDGE, formerly of the Federal Energy Administration, has joined BEA as an economist in the National Income and Wealth Division.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

National Center for Health Statistics: JOSEPH L. CAVANAUGH, formerly program development specialist with the National Institute on Drug Abuse, has been appointed technical assistance coordinator with the Division of the Cooperative Health Statistics System. BEULAH K. CYPRESS, formerly project officer, National Center for Education Statistics, is now Chief, Family Planning Statistics Branch, Division of Health Resources Utilization Statistics. THOMAS F. DRURY, formerly research analyst with the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., is now statistician (health) with the Utilization and Expenditure Statistics Branch, Division of Health Interview Statistics. GEORGE P. FAILLA, formerly administrative officer for the Office of Research and Statistics, Social Security Administration, has recently been appointed Associate Director for Management. JULIA DELL OLIVER has recently joined the Division of Health Interview Statistics, Medical Economics Section, as survey statistician. GERALD G. WHEELER, formerly Director, Office of Technical Publications with the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Center for Disease Control, has joined the staff of the Division of the Cooperative Health Statistics System, Technical Assistance Branch, as technical assistance coordinator.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Division of Research and Statistics: JOHN PAULUS, formerly a Senior Economist in the Banking Section, has been promoted to Chief of that Section. STEVEN M. ROBERTS, Senior Economist in the Banking Section, has been transferred as a Senior Economist to the Government Finance Section. RAYMOND E. LOMBRA, Economist in the Government Finance Section, has been transferred as an Economist to the Banking Section.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Bureau of Manpower Information Systems: D. H. MCELHONE, formerly with the U.S. Army Security Agency, has been named Chief of the newly formed Planning and Methods Section within the Manpower Statistics Division. This new section will apply statistical theory to Federal Civil Service analyses. FRANK PONTI has joined the staff from the Philadelphia Regional Office of the Commission.

SCHEDULE OF RELEASE DATES FOR PRINCIPAL FEDERAL ECONOMIC INDICATORS

July 1976

Release dates scheduled by agencies responsible for the principal economic indicators of the Federal Government are given below. *These are target dates* that will be met in the majority of cases. *Occasionally agencies may be able to release data a day or so earlier or may be forced by unavoidable compilation problems to release a report one or more days later.*

A similar schedule will be shown here each month covering release dates for the following month. The indicators are identified by the title of the releases in which they are included; the source agency; the release identification number where applicable; and the *Business Conditions Digest* series numbers for all BCD series included, shown in parentheses. Release date information for additional series can be found in publications of the sponsoring agencies.

(Any inquiries about these series should be directed to the issuing agency.)

Date		*Subject*	*Data For*
July	1	Construction Expenditures (Press release), Census, C-30 (69)	May
	1	Money Stock Measures, Federal Reserve Board (FRB), H.6 (85, 102, 103)	Week Ending June 23
	1	Factors Affecting Bank Reserves and Condition Statement of Federal Reserve Banks, FRB, H.4.1 (93)	Week Ending June 30
	2	Manufacturers' Export Sales and Orders, Census, M4-A (506)	May
	2	The Employment Situation (Press release), Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) (1, 21, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 740, 841-848)	June
	6	Open Market Money Rates and Bond Prices, FRB, G.13	July 3
	7	Monthly Wholesale Trade (Press release), Census, BW	May
	7	Consumer Credit, FRB, G.19 (66, 113)	May
	7	Condition Report of Large Commercial Banks, FRB, H.4.2 (72)	Week Ending June 30
	8	Money Stock Measures, FRB, H.6 (85, 102, 103)	Week Ending June 30
	8	Factors Affecting Bank Reserves and Condition Statement of Federal Reserve Banks, FRB, H.4.1 (93)	Week Ending July 7
	9	Wholesale Price Index (Press release), BLS, (55, 58, 750, 751, 752)	June
	9	Advance Monthly Retail Sales (Press release), Census (54)	June
	14	Manufacturing and Trade: Inventories and Sales, Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) (31, 56, 71, 851)	May
	14	Condition Report of Large Commercial Banks, FRB, H.4.2 (72)	Week Ending July 7
	15	Money Stock Measures, FRB, H.6 (85, 102, 103)	Week Ending July 7
	15	Factors Affecting Bank Reserves and Condition Statement of Federal Reserve Banks, FRB, H.4.1 (93)	Week Ending July 14
	15	Personal Income, BEA (52, 53)	June

Date		Subject	Data For
July	15	Industrial Production and Related Data, FRB, G.12.3 (47, 853)	June
	16	Yields on FHA Insured New Home 30-Year Mortgages, HUD (118)	July 1
	19	Housing Starts (Press release) Census, C-20 (28, 29)	June
	20	Gross National Product (Preliminary), BEA (200, 205)	2 Q '76
	20	Capacity Utilization in Manufacturing, FRB, E.5 (850)	2 Q '76
	21	Consumer Price Index (Press release), BLS (781, 782, 783, 784)	June
	21	Real Earnings (Press release), BLS (741, 859)	June
	21	Condition Report of Large Commercial Banks, FRB, H.4.2 (72)	Week Ending July 14
	22	Money Stock Measures, FRB, H.6 (85, 102, 103)	Week Ending July 14
	22	Factors Affecting Bank Reserves and Condition Statement of Federal Reserve Banks, FRB, H.4.1 (93)	Week Ending July 21
	22	Advance Report on Durable Goods, Manufacturers' Shipments and Orders (Press release), Census, M3-1, (6, 24, 25, 96, 647, 648)	June
	23	Major Collective Bargaining Settlements (Press release), BLS (748)	1st 6 months '76
	26	Average Yields of Long-Term Bonds, Treasury Bulletin (115, 116)	July
	26	Productivity and Costs in Private Economy (Press release), BLS	2 Q '76
	27	Export and Import Merchandise Trade, Census, FT-900 (500, 502, 512)	June
	27	Housing Vacancies (Press release), Census, H-111 (857)	2 Q '76
	28	Merchandise Trade Balance, Balance of Payments Basis, BEA, (536, 537)	2 Q '76
	28	Advance Business Conditions Digest, BEA, (12, 33, 69, 813, 817)	May
		(5, 10, 17, 45, 59, 62, 810, 811, 814, 815, 816, 820, 825, 830, 853, 860)	June
	28	Labor Turnover in Manufacturing (Press release), BLS (2, 3)	June
	28	Condition Report of Large Commercial Banks, FRB, H.4.2 (72)	Week Ending June 21
	29	Money Stock Measures, FRB, H.6 (85, 102, 103)	Week Ending June 21
	29	Factors Affecting Bank Reserves and Condition Statement of Federal Reserve Banks, FRB, H.4.1 (93)	Week Ending June 28
	29	Work Stoppages (Press release), BLS	1st 6 months '76
	29	Defense Indicators, BEA (625)	June
	30	Agricultural Prices, Agriculture	Mid-July

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.
Price 85 cents (single copy). Subscription Price: $9.70 domestic postpaid; $3.30 additional for foreign mailing.

AGENCY REPRESENTATIVES FOR DISTRIBUTION AND NEWS ITEMS

Agency	Representative	Telephone
Agriculture:	Richard Small Statistical Reporting Service	447-6201
Commerce:	John Wearmouth (distribution only) Office of Publications	967-4233
	Alternate: Tim Coss	967-4233
Census:	Harold Nisselson	763-2462
	Larry Hartke (news items)	763-7454
BEA:	Ago Ambre	523-0777
	Ann Winkler (personnel notes)	523-0890
Defense:	Rose Glubin, OSD Comptroller	OX7-0476
HEW:	Richard Simonson, Office of Sec	245-6230
PHS:	Gooloo Wunderlich, OAS for Health	443-2660
	Louise Kirby, NCHS (news items)	443-1202
	James Baird, Food and Drug	443-6285
OE:	O. Jean Brandes	245-8812
SSA:	John J. Carroll, Asst Comsnr for Research & Statistics (news items)	382-3966
	Robert Robinson, ORS (distribution)	382-3261
HUD:	Douglas C. Brooks	235-1548
	Alternate: Robert E. Ryan	235-1526
IASI:	Susana Moncayo	381-8285
Interior:	William L. Kendig (distribution) Office of Management Consulting	343-2195
	Arthur Berger, Bureau of Mines (news items)	343-8511
Labor:	Joan Hall (distribution only) Office of the Secretary	961-2001

Agency	Representative	Telephone
Labor		
BLS:	Henry Lowenstern	523-1327
	Constance McEwen (news items)	523-1660
ETA:	Howard Rosen, Office of Manpower Research	376-7335
	Bernard Rein	376-7258
	Robert Yerger, Office of Research and Development	376-6456
Transportation:	Doris Groff Velona	426-4138
FHA:	Thomas Hyland, Public Affairs (news items)	426-0662
FAA:	Patricia Beardsley	426-3323
Treasury:	Jack Flood, Jr., Printing Procurement (distribution only)	964-5381
IRS:	Robert Wilson (news items)	964-6615
FEA:	Pamela H. Kacser	961-7686
Fed Reserve:	Robert M. Fisher, R & S	452-2871
NASA:	W.A. Greene	755-8439
NSF:	Charles E. Falk, Div. of Science Resources Studies	282-7706
	Mary M. Boyden	282-7714
U.S. Civil Serv. Comm.	Philip Schneider	632-6808
USPS:	James R. Duffett, Special Stat. Projects Division	245-4182
VA:	Howard J. Sharon, Director of Reports and Statistics Service	DU9-2423

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER FORM

ENTER MY SUBSCRIPTION TO **STATISTICAL REPORTER** (SRE) @ $9.70. Add $3.30 for foreign mailing. No additional postage is required for mailing within the United States, its possessions, Canada, Mexico, and all Central and South American Countries except Argentina, Brazil, British Honduras, French Guiana, Guyana, and Surinam. For shipment to all other foreign countries include additional postage as quoted for each periodical or subscription service.

Send Subscription to:

NAME—FIRST, LAST

COMPANY NAME OR ADDITIONAL ADDRESS LINE

STREET ADDRESS

CITY | STATE | ZIP CODE

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE

☐ Remittance Enclosed (Make checks payable to Superintendent of Documents)

☐ Charge to my Deposit Account No. ____________

MAIL ORDER FORM TO:

Superintendent of Documents
Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
Penalty for Private Use, $300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

FIRST CLASS POSTAGE

SRE SERIA300SD R
SERIALS DEPT
XEROX/UNIV MICROFILMS
300 N ZEEB RD
ANN ARBOR MI 48106

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT·OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
STATISTICAL POLICY DIVISION