

Y4.P 84/10:C 33/8/963

1072

8874
P84/10
C 33/8/963

DUTIES OF CENSUS ENUMERATORS AND ADVANCING
THE DATE OF ECONOMIC CENSUSES

GOVERNMENT

Storage



HEARING
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON
OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 3544 and H.R. 4818

BILLS TO AMEND SECTION 25 OF TITLE 13, UNITED STATES
CODE, RELATING TO THE DUTIES OF ENUMERATORS OF
THE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

H.R. 3545 and H.R. 4819

BILLS TO AMEND SECTION 131 OF TITLE 13, UNITED STATES
CODE, SO AS TO PROVIDE FOR TAKING OF THE ECONOMIC
CENSUSES 1 YEAR EARLIER, STARTING IN 1968

MARCH 19, 1963

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Post Office and Civil Service



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1963

96437

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

TOM MURRAY, Tennessee, *Chairman*

JAMES H. MORRISON, Louisiana	ROBERT J. CORBETT, Pennsylvania
THADDEUS J. DULSKI, New York	H. R. GROSS, Iowa
DAVID N. HENDERSON, North Carolina	JOEL T. BROYHILL, Virginia
ARNOLD OLSEN, Montana	AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, Michigan
MORRIS K. UDALL, Arizona	GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Nebraska
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey	GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER, New Jersey
LINDLEY BECKWORTH, Texas	ROBERT R. BARRY, New York
HARLEY O. STAGGERS, West Virginia	KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, New York
ROBERT N. C. NIX, Pennsylvania	EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois
EVERETT G. BURKHALTER, California	ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, Kansas
DON EDWARDS, California	HOMER E. ABELE, Ohio
JOE R. POOL, Texas	
ALBERT W. WATSON, South Carolina	

SUBCOMMITTEE APPOINTED To CONSIDER H.R. 3544, H.R. 3545, AND SIMILAR BILLS

ARNOLD OLSEN, Montana, *Chairman*

HARLEY O. STAGGERS, West Virginia	AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, Michigan
EVERETT G. BURKHALTER, California	GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Nebraska
DON EDWARDS, California	KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, New York
JOE R. POOL, Texas	ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, Kansas
ALBERT W. WATSON, South Carolina	HOMER E. ABELE, Ohio

CONTENTS

	Page
Statement of Hon. Richard M. Scammon, Director, Bureau of the Census, accompanied by Dr. A. Ross Eckler, Deputy Director, Dr. Conrad Taeuber, Assistant Director, Mathew E. Erickson, attorney-adviser, Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, and Edwin D. Goldfield, Chief, Statistical Reports-----	4, 20

DUTIES OF CENSUS ENUMERATORS AND ADVANCING THE DATE OF ECONOMIC CENSUSES

TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 1963

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 215, House Office Building, Hon. Arnold Olsen, of Montana (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. OLSEN. The subcommittee will please come to order.

This subcommittee was appointed by the chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for the purpose of considering the following identical bills: H.R. 3544, introduced by Chairman Murray, and H.R. 4818, introduced by Mr. Corbett; and also the identical bills H.R. 3545, introduced by Mr. Murray, and H.R. 4819, introduced by Mr. Corbett.

The subcommittee is composed of Mr. Staggers, Mr. Burkhalter, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Pool, Mr. Watson, Mr. Johansen, Mr. Cunningham, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Ellsworth, and Mr. Abele; and I have been designated chairman.

These bills were introduced at the request of the administration and are designed to give the Bureau of the Census flexibility in planning for the next decennial census and to permit a more equitable workload on the data processing facilities of the Bureau.

The Director of the Bureau of the Census, Hon. Richard M. Scammon, is here to explain fully the purpose and need for these bills, and I am sure he will be glad to answer any questions which members of the subcommittee may raise. I am informed that these bills are noncontroversial; the subcommittee has been unable to find anyone wishing to appear in opposition. Similar—but not identical—bills were reported out by this committee and passed the House during the 87th Congress. However, the bills did not come up for action in the Senate in the closing days of the 87th Congress.

We will insert into the record at this point H.R. 3544, along with the language of section 25 of title 13 of the United States Code.

(The information follows:)

[H.R. 3544, 88th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To amend section 25 of title 13, United States Code, relating to the duties of enumerators of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (c) of section 25 of title 13, United States Code (relating to certain duties of enumerators of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce), is hereby repealed.

TITLE 13, UNITED STATES CODE—CENSUS

CHAPTER 1—ADMINISTRATION

SUBCHAPTER II—OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

§ 25. Duties of supervisors, enumerators, and other employees

(a) Each supervisor shall perform the duties imposed upon him by the Secretary in the enforcement of chapter 5 of this title in accordance with the Secretary's orders and instructions.

(b) Each enumerator or other employee detailed to serve as enumerator shall be charged with the collection in his subdivision of the facts and statistics called for on such schedules as the Secretary determines shall be used by him in connection with any census or survey provided for by chapter 5 of this title.

(c) Each enumerator shall visit personally each dwelling house in his subdivision, and each family therein, and each individual living out of a family in any place of abode, and by inquiry made of the head of each family, or of the member thereof deemed most competent and trustworthy, or of such individual living out of a family, shall obtain every item of information and all particulars required for any census or survey provided for in chapter 5 of this title. In case no person is found at the usual place of abode of such family, or individual living out of a family, competent to answer the inquiries, the census employee may obtain the required information as nearly as may be practicable from the families or persons living nearest to such place of abode who may be competent to answer such inquiries.

Mr. OLSEN. First, we will take up H.R. 3544 and H.R. 4818, bills to repeal subsection (c) of section 25, title 13, and at this point I will place in the record a letter of January 16, 1963, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the Under Secretary of Commerce, Hon. Edward Gudeman, along with the statement of purpose and need prepared by his Department.

I am also placing in the record at this point a letter from the General Counsel of the Post Office Department dated September 1, 1962, stating that the Post Office Department raises no objection to this legislation and goes on to say that "it appears feasible from our point of view to provide, on a reimbursable basis, service of the type" proposed in this legislation. I was informed yesterday that this continues to be the position of the Post Office Department on this matter.

(The letters referred to follow:)

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 16, 1963.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.,

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill to amend section 25 of title 13, United States Code, relating to the duties of enumerators of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, and four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD GUDEMAN,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of this proposal is to repeal subsection (c) of section 25 of title 13, United States Code, which relates to the duties of enumerators of the Bureau of the Census. Subsection (c) of section 25 is no longer necessary to carry out the census-taking functions of the Bureau of the Census as the duties of the enumerators are established through regulations issued by the Bureau of the Census. Enumerators are no longer used in the basic data-collection procedures of any censuses other than population, unemployment, housing, and agriculture; the development of improved techniques is changing the nature of their function in those censuses and may make possible some reduction in the numbers required.

The present requirement in subsection (c) of section 25 that an enumerator must personally visit each dwelling house in his subdivision and each family therein is no longer practical and greatly increases the cost of taking a census. If the Bureau of the Census were permitted to take a census by sending the forms through the mail and having the filled-in reports returned by mail the cost of the census would be greatly reduced. At the same time, procedures involving the use of mail questionnaires and appropriate followup improve the quality of the data collected in the census.

We believe enactment of this proposal is necessary for the more efficient operation of the Bureau of the Census.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, D.C., September 1, 1962.

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Postmaster General has asked me to reply to your letter regarding H.R. 11949 and H.R. 11999. If enacted into law, these bills would abolish the requirement of house-to-house visits by census enumerators. Your letter states:

"Testimony by Census officials at the hearings indicates that the proposed legislation would call for a much greater use of the Post Office Department services in future censuses. On page 17 of the testimony, for instance, mention is made of using the Post Office Department to update census lists of dwelling units by asking the letter carriers to check out lists for their areas or routes. Moreover, some 80 to 90 percent of the next census would be done by mail questionnaires delivered and returned by the postal service. All of these postal services would be used by Census on a reimbursable basis, it is understood."

You ask for an expression of the Department's views in the matter.

The Department has provided the Bureau of the Census with service of the nature described in your letter and in the transcript of the hearing on a reimbursable basis during the last decennial census and during the conduct of several localized special censuses.

Based on this experience, it appears feasible from our point of view to provide, on a reimbursable basis, service of the type covered by your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS J. DOYLE,
General Counsel.

MR. OLSEN. We are ready now for you, Mr. Scammon. Would you kindly proceed as you see fit? Later, we will want to question you and perhaps ask for further clarification on some of the points. Would you begin by introducing your colleagues to the members of the subcommittee?

STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD M. SCAMMON, DIRECTOR, BUREAU
OF THE CENSUS

Mr. SCAMMON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On my far left is Mr. Edwin Goldfield, Chief of Statistical Reports, Bureau of the Census. On my immediate left is Dr. Ross Eckler, Deputy Director, Bureau of the Census. On my immediate right is Dr. Conrad Taeuber, Assistant Director, Bureau of the Census; and on my far right is Mr. Mathew Erickson, attorney-adviser, Bureau of the Census.

With reference to the first of the bills which we are considering this morning, the bill dealing with the taking of the decennial census, legislation to accomplish this purpose was introduced in the last Congress and was passed in the House of Representatives but did not succeed of passage in the Senate because of the press of affairs in the closing days of the Congress.

The basic purpose of the legislation is set out in this general statement of mine, which if I may, Mr. Chairman, I will submit for the record and briefly summarize for the committee now.

Mr. OLSEN. Without objection, the statement will be placed in the record at this time.

(Statement of Richard M. Scammon, Director, Bureau of the Census, follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RICHARD M. SCAMMON, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE
CENSUS

The purpose of bills H.R. 3544 and H.R. 4818 is to repeal subsection (c) of section 25 of title 13, United States Code, the body of law pertaining to the Bureau of the Census. Subsection (c) is an impediment to the development and utilization of modern techniques of census taking, because it requires the enumerator personally to visit each dwelling place in taking the population census. This requirement dates back to the 19th century when door-to-door canvass was used for all censuses and alternative methods had not been considered and tested. As of today, changes in the living conditions of the population and developments in enumeration technique makes it appear that censuses can be taken more accurately and more economically without actual door-to-door canvass in every area.

Evaluation of the experience gained in the 1960 censuses of population and housing, and research currently in progress, indicate that significant improvements can be made in the procedures of the next decennial census that would make it possible to collect the data primarily by mail, with important reliance on the facilities of the Post Office Department, with followup by enumerators where necessary, and with intensive door-to-door canvassing in selected areas where mail procedures would not yield complete coverage. Successful use of a mail canvass followup has been repeatedly demonstrated in the censuses of business, manufactures, and mineral industries.

Under the procedures used in 1960, some 200,000 temporary field employees would be required to take the 1970 census. It is exceedingly difficult to recruit, train, and supervise such a large temporary field force; we estimate that the job might be more efficiently done with some 80,000 well-qualified temporary field employees if the requirement for the enumerator personally to visit every household is removed. The removal of the requirement would give the Bureau of the Census flexibility to use the most efficient methods which can be developed for the taking of the census.

Although the 1970 census is at some distance in the future, enactment of the legislation at this time is important because the Bureau of the Census is already engaged upon studies, including field tests, leading to the development of new procedures. These studies involve expenditures which would be more than repaid if the indicated improvements in techniques eventuate, but depend upon the assumption that the restriction imposed by subsection (c) of section 25 can

be removed. We would be reluctant to go beyond the research and development phase of this program without the removal of the restriction, and such further progress should not be delayed because the development of plans to support a mail canvass and the development of the full set of procedures require a considerable period of time.

H.R. 11949 and 11999 of the 87th Congress were bills almost identical to H.R. 3544 and 4818. The difference is that the former bills would have repealed all of section 25; H.R. 3544 and 4818 would repeal only subsection (c) of section 25. The reason for retaining subsections (a) and (b) of section 25 is the concern expressed by members of the subcommittee last year that the deletion of subsections (a) and (b) would weaken the authority of the Secretary with respect to requiring proper performance of the duties of census supervisors and enumerators. While the authority now in subsections (a) and (b) is believed to be contained in other authority held by the Secretary, a duplication of authority certainly can do no harm.

Mr. SCAMMON. Historically, Mr. Chairman, the Decennial Census of the United States has been taken by an enumerator going from door to door, apartment to apartment, farm to farm, knocking on each door inquiring who lives there, and getting from someone in that household the information which is required.

As the techniques of acquiring data have become more complex, more refined, more detailed, more intricate, it has come more and more to our attention that there may be easier, quicker, less expensive, and more accurate ways to get this information.

The principal one of these methods involves collecting a very large part of the total census in 1970 by mail, using a mail solicitation approach for at least the preliminary material that we need for the census.

Our feeling is not that this particular approach could accomplish the total purpose of the census. Our feeling is not that this approach would not need to be supplemented by individual checks, inquiries, callbacks, and the like; but our feeling is that we can provide in 1970 a more accurate and a less expensive count of the people of the United States by the adoption of the permissive legislation which is suggested.

This legislation permits the Bureau of the Census to modify the present requirement of a call at each house physically by an enumerator.

In our hearing last year we discussed this same matter, and as that discussion may be continued this morning we will try to answer the questions that you and the members of the committee may have about this suggestion for modernizing and making more realistic the requirements for the taking of the 1970 census, with the purpose in mind through this flexibility of achieving a more completely accurate census at less cost.

Mr. OLSEN. Now would you explain first to the committee why you changed the legislation this year from that we had last year?

Mr. SCAMMON. In the legislation which was proposed last year, Mr. Chairman, the thought was to repeal the total of section 25. The change which is introduced this year is to repeal only subsection c of section 25 of Title 13. That title is the basic enabling legislation for the census generally.

Last year members of the subcommittee felt that the other two sections, a and b, contained language giving to the Secretary of Commerce certain authority and controls over individual enumerators which it would be useful to maintain in the final legislation.

For that reason the present proposal has been modified to repeal only that subsection of section 25 which requires the individual face-to-face visitation of the enumerator to each household.

Mr. OLSEN. Now then, is there some difficulty in getting enumerators and supervisors? I recollect that you discussed that with us last year, and I think particularly for the new members you ought to bring that out at this time.

Mr. SCAMMON. Yes. Actually our estimate would be that if we were to take the 1970 census based on the estimate of population as we now see it for that year we would need somewhere in the neighborhood of 200,000 enumerators if it were done on a house-to-house, knock-on-every-door system.

Mr. OLSEN. How many did you have in 1960?

Mr. SCAMMON. About 175,000 to 185,000. The increase in population would account for the difference here.

If we use the kind of address checking and mail checking of which we are thinking we feel that this can be reduced to 80,000. This does not mean that the 80,000 may work less than the 200,000, but it means the number of individuals would be less; and if we can reduce the total number of individuals involved our feeling is that we can increase the quality of individual enumerators, because one problem with any temporary ad hoc operation like the census is when you go out to recruit 200,000 people—and this is true whether it is this administration or an administration from the other side of the aisle—the problem of locating 200,000 people quickly, immediately for a spot job is not easy. Inevitably you find some who are less qualified than others.

If, for example, we could have taken the top 40 percent of the enumerators who were used in 1960, I am sure the total enumeration by the use of those people would have been better than it was simply because the quality of the individual would have been better.

Members may recall that in some parts of the United States in 1960 it was necessary for the Bureau to advertise in the press for people to take the census. We simply could not find enough people to do it.

This was not true generally in rural areas. It was not true in smaller communities. But particularly in the larger cities at the rate which was then being paid it was just not easy to find that many people who were willing to go around and knock on every door.

Mr. OLSEN. How much does the average enumerator earn?

Mr. SCAMMON. Subject to correction of my colleagues here, in the 1960 census the average ran just under \$200.

Mr. OLSEN. For how many days' work?

Mr. SCAMMON. Well, of course, this depends somewhat on the enumerator and the area, but I would think about a month.

Dr. TAEUBER. Yes, it would run close to that. The person who stayed with both phases of the 1960 census and who earned this \$200 would have worked about a month.

Mr. POOL. I did not get that, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. TAEUBER. I am sorry. We did the job in two parts. We distributed a questionnaire to all households, a very short questionnaire, and then a longer questionnaire to one household out of every four, and we used enumerators to help complete both phases of that. The enumerator who stayed with us through both parts would have earned about \$200, would have worked about a month.

Mr. POOL. About a month?

Dr. TAEUBER. About a month; yes, sir.

Mr. OLSEN. Then all of the 175,000 enumerators did not work that long a time to earn that much?

Dr. TAEUBER. Right. About two-thirds of the enumerators earned a little under \$100.

Mr. SCAMMON. And did only the first phase of it.

Dr. TAEUBER. They stayed with us only a short time.

Mr. OLSEN. Could you estimate that time for less than \$100?

Dr. TAEUBER. It was nearly \$90, and they earned about a dollar and a half an hour, so it would be 60 hours, which would be perhaps 10 days of work. Many of them worked about 60 hours.

Mr. OLSEN. This is fine, just enough so we have an idea.

Mr. EDWARDS. What percentage of the people do not answer your written questionnaires, your mail questionnaires, and just throw them in the wastebasket?

Dr. TAEUBER. About 80 percent of the people returned the mail questionnaire.

Now some of those that were received by mail had to be followed up because they were incomplete or there were errors, so that an enumerator had to come back and finish it up. But it was only about 20 percent from whom we did not get something back to begin with.

Mr. EDWARDS. You anticipate that this will save money?

Dr. TAEUBER. Yes, sir. The fact that a large proportion of the population could fill out a complete questionnaire which requires nothing more once it is received eliminates a great deal of this going from house to house and going back and back and back when you do not find anybody at home on the first round, the second round, the third round. If you can do this by mail you are bound to save.

Mr. SCAMMON. I might add, Mr. Chairman, that one problem in the 1960 census was the increasing number of younger families without children in which both the husband and wife were working, and we found instances where these are people who are perfectly literate, perfectly willing to fill out the questionnaire, but they are just never at home. You call them up, they say we will be home tonight. Someone invites them out to a party and you go and knock and there is nobody home.

If people of this kind get a mail questionnaire they will fill it in and return it. But for many of these people it is very difficult to catch them at any given time at home, and sometimes you have to abandon talking to them personally and go to their neighbors and try to get information from them, which is not only not the best way to do it, but often leads to public relations difficulties.

There are some areas in the country where I do not think we want to use this mail approach. There are some transient areas in the big cities where the use of this kind of mailing technique would not work very well. There are some tenements, for example, where mail might be dumped in the vestibule, with people finding theirs for themselves. There are some places where you go up on the third floor and ring twice for Jones, three times for Brown, and from one week to the next you do not know who lives there.

For these areas we would like to use the door-to-door system, but a saturation door-to-door system, and the fact that we are relieved of

the necessity of visiting all homes on a callback basis means we can use extra enumerators, sharper enumerators to work this particular area.

Mr. OLSEN. How about the change in the labor force or the kind of labor force available in 1970? What do you anticipate?

Mr. SCAMMON. You mean as enumerators?

Mr. OLSEN. Yes, based on your experience in 1960.

Mr. SCAMMON. Of course we would hope that prosperity would be the rule, and the more prosperity you have the harder it is to get enumerators at the rate we have been discussing.

Mr. OLSEN. And also at the rate that the housewife is working?

Mr. SCAMMON. That is right. With the employment of women increasing as it is, my thought would be that it probably would be harder in 1970 than it was in 1960.

Naturally I would wish prosperity so we would have difficulty rather than economic distress so we would not have any.

Mr. OLSEN. There is one item that has come up for discussion time and again. We might just as well say it now because Mr. Corbett will bring it up eventually. That is the possibility of utilizing the letter carriers in the Post Office Department.

Mr. SCAMMON. We have been working for many months, even years, with our friends in the Post Office, not only on the question of use of letter carriers, but even more, because this total concept of mailing questionnaires for the census depends upon the complete cooperation of the postal people because you have got to have a pretty sure preliminary address list which has to be worked out with the postal people, and quite frankly our cooperation with them has been first rate. We have had no difficulty at all. They have been more than helpful to us. The working together of the Post Office and Census Bureau has been very encouraging, and I am sure that not only then, but even right now in the special censuses that are being taken we are having this kind of cooperation. It is a healthy kind of cooperation.

Mr. OLSEN. Well, of course I am thinking in terms of letter carriers being enumerators and their being paid additional pay for the additional hours of work that would be involved.

Mr. SCAMMON. Well, this is a problem because of course letter carriers are paid at a rate substantially higher than the rate which is available to enumerators. Whether letter carriers would be willing to work at the rate set for enumeration is another question.

Letter carriers by and large know a great deal about the district in which they work. They have to. They are delivering letters there every day. They are very useful people to have. We hope to use them in a number of ways to assist and advise. Whether they would actually be enumerators is something we will have to—

Mr. OLSEN. Even paying them at a higher rate, having better skill and better background of the area, is it not possible or probable you would get it done cheaper?

Mr. SCAMMON. If they could take a month off. The problem is that census taking is not just a moonlighting job that you can do after 8 hours a day. We have found again and again that one reason that so many housewives generally do this work so well is that they have the time during the day, and in the evenings to call back to do all this work.

Mr. OLSEN. Well, is there not a history of the letter carriers having gone into Minneapolis, I think in 1940, or some decennial census, after the census had been counted and of the letter carriers finding 20,000 additional people?

Mr. SCAMMON. We would hope that they would find extra people for us. I do not know about the Minneapolis case in 1940, but I know that in 1960 we had a number of cases where people gave us lists of persons who claimed they had not been enumerated. When we checked them we found that the great majority had been enumerated. Sometimes a man thinks he was not counted but the wife had reported him.

Mr. OLSEN. And they did this after their regular hours?

Mr. SCAMMON. If they can find extra people for us after their regular hours we are very happy.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, do you have any statistics on other censuses that have been taken by groups such as—I am familiar with one on cotton usage. The Department of Commerce sends out a census and asks about usage, how it is used, and so forth. Those are businessmen and there should be a real high return. Do you have anything on that?

Mr. SCAMMON. You mean on the economic censuses we take?

Mr. POOL. Yes.

Mr. SCAMMON. I think Dr. Eckler could give you a good figure on this, Mr. Pool.

Dr. ECKLER. Mr. Congressman, the reports from business establishments in various censuses represent a very high rate of cooperation. Of course the first responses on these may be 50 or 60 percent, and then we have followups which reduce that missing group quite rapidly.

Mr. POOL. That is all done by mail?

Dr. ECKLER. That is all done by mail; yes, sir. That is one of the reasons I may say why we are optimistic that the same kind of change in the population census has a payoff.

Both the rate of cooperation and the eventual degree of completeness are extremely high, and this is true even in the areas where there is not mandatory provision for reporting. There are some of these surveys on a monthly basis, and some of the annuals even, which are not mandatory, and even there we get an extremely high rate of cooperation. There is greater and greater understanding of the importance of these operations and the contribution they make to business operations.

Mr. POOL. The one that says it is mandatory, that is printed right on the questionnaire, is that right?

Dr. ECKLER. It will be stated that the return of information is required under the provisions of law.

Mr. POOL. I am talking about the ones that are now being used. They do say that?

Dr. ECKLER. They do say that.

Mr. POOL. And some of them are not mandatory, is that correct?

Dr. ECKLER. Some are not mandatory.

Mr. POOL. And do you have any idea of your difference there in your return?

Dr. ECKLER. I think it is quite small, Mr. Congressman, actually. We will have occasionally a question raised by a particular business

and they will point out "Well, if we are not required to do this by law we will pass up this particular request, we do not want to do it," and we will write them and try to get cooperation.

Now and then that will be the deciding point, but in the main there is very little difference. A very high degree of cooperation exists, and we are hoping that this will grow over the years.

Dr. TAEUBER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could supplement that.

In the cotton-growing areas of the United States we do a survey of cotton ginning every 2 weeks during the cotton-ginning season. This report is mandatory. We do this by mail.

If a report does not come in we may have to telephone the man and ask him to send us a duplicate or catch up on the one that is missing.

We used to do this entirely by enumerators, by sending an enumerator from one cotton gin to the next to pick this up. We have shifted over completely to a mail basis with telephone followup in those few cases where it is necessary. Sometimes a man forgets. A telephone call can clear this up and avoid this matter of sending an enumerator out.

Mr. OLSEN. Mrs. St. George.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to return again to the possible working of the postal employees as census takers and almost as enumerators. Do you foresee that at all, and if it is true, for instance, that a postal employee is in a sense replacing an enumerator why could he not be paid extra money for 1 month, 2 months, or whatever it might be that he was doing that kind of work? I can foresee that in a big city he would be extremely efficient, probably more than an enumerator.

Mr. SCAMMON. One problem that came up in the 1960 census, Mrs. St. George—and my colleagues who were with the Bureau then perhaps could enumerate this in more detail—was that this takes a lot of concentrated work, cannot be spread out.

The taking of the census, the whole building up of the spirit of people who are responding to the census and taking the census is something that requires perhaps 10 or 12 hours of work for a brief concentrated period.

One difficulty has been, I think, that very few of the postal employees are really interested in taking the total time off from their regular work to do this. I think most of the postal employees think of this as something about an hour a day beyond their regular work.

If this could be done and the cost involved was not exorbitantly high—which, of course, is a problem that we all face in trying to keep costs within limitations—we might be able to do this.

I just do not know because I am not familiar enough with the experience in 1960, and perhaps Dr. Taeuber or Dr. Eckler would give us additional information.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Of course, as you well know, we have heard a lot about the postal employees having to take on extra work to make both ends meet, and it would seem to me an extra \$200 would be a fairly important thing for them and they might be happy to arrange their schedule in such a way that they would do it.

I had some experience with the census in my own district—maybe they did not do it properly—but I am quite sure that very few gave more than 10 or 12 hours of concentrated work.

Mr. SCAMMON. I am not familiar with your precise area. It might be your area would be a little easier to take a census in, a middle-class area.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. It would be easier certainly than your cities, no doubt about that; and I foresee where the postal employees would be most valuable in the big cities. I do not say in the rural areas at all.

Mr. SCAMMON. Let me ask Dr. Taeuber what his experience was in arranging this in 1960.

Dr. TAEUBER. We did discuss this, and of course in principle there was no barrier to a postal employee, perhaps a substitute carrier or someone else who would arrange to take the time off to become a census enumerator.

We were not encouraged in our discussions with the Post Office Department to thinking of doing this on any mass scale.

There is a problem that in addition to the enumeration the individual must have the time to take the training. We did have a concentrated training program for all enumerators, and there is the additional problem of administrative responsibility because in the end the enumerators, the crew leaders, must be administratively responsible to the Director of the Bureau.

In terms of 1970 there is one other element. We feel that this matter of going over to a system by mail can compress the whole period of time, that we can come much closer to having all the information supplied on or about April 1 than we have been able to do under the system heretofore, and this would make for more effective publicity, more effective cooperation, would also mean that fewer people would escape being counted because they are moving. The new place to which they come has already been enumerated so they are not caught there. The enumerator has not yet caught up with them in the place from which they are leaving, so they are not caught there either. And the longer this enumeration period spreads out the more danger there is of that kind of thing, and of course people move a great deal, and particularly in the areas that give us the greatest difficulty.

Mr. OLSEN. It seems to me, Mrs. St. George, in my area, which is small towns and rural, the letter carrier would be the most highly skilled person possible to assist with taking the census in a matter of 1 month of his working supplemental to his regular work.

Mr. SCAMMON. Your area, Mr. Chairman, would be one of the least of our troubles.

Mr. OLSEN. But I will bet you that the mailmen in our area, they even know what our income is. They know what we read, they know what our character is.

Mr. SCAMMON. Mr. Olsen, the problem in your area is really a very minor one. I do not mean to denigrate your particular area. But the problem of your area—let's take some specific areas in the United States that are problem areas, perhaps areas of Members who are not of this committee. Mr. Libonati of Chicago, Mr. Rooney of New York, Mr. Pike and Mr. Grover of Nassau and Suffolk. In fact, all of Nassau and Suffolk have a problem with the literal flood of people moving out there. Our friends in California would have a dozen places where this is true, where new communities are springing up almost faster than the houses are.

These are the problem areas where it is really difficult. As to relatively settled smaller communities, rural areas like yours, Mr. Chairman, I could just hope that all of America was like this as far as taking the census was concerned. It is no real difficulty, and you are quite right. The postal carrier, the local drugstore proprietor, the doctor—there are many people who know these areas, know them well, know almost everybody there.

In fact, there are some parts of rural Midwest and my own State of Minnesota, for example, where registration of voters is not even required because everyone knows everybody else, and there is no problem.

But this is not where we have difficulties. It is in these other areas that I cited.

Mr. OLSEN. On general elections and primary elections we have voter registration, but for many kinds of school elections we do not require registration. We have a bigger turnout. But every single clerk knows every voter. No problem.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Have you had any sort of trial runs on this thing so that you have a fair idea of how it works?

Mr. SCAMMON. Yes. As a matter of fact, this is one which is being done in the town of Huntington, Suffolk County, now. April 1 is the deadline date.

This is being done at the expense of the town of Huntington for their local purposes in terms of money distributions in the State of New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Are you in all the special censuses?

Mr. SCAMMON. Oh, yes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. It is my understanding there is one being taken now in Rockland, which is my district, and it is the fastest growing county in the State of New York at the present time.

Mr. SCAMMON. It may well be, because any census of this kind, in order to have legal status, must be taken by the Federal Bureau of the Census, and we use these with the consent of the people in the town and community as a device of checking out these techniques.

They have worked very well. This, indeed, is what enables us to say we can save money with it.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Edwards.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Burkhalter and I are from these explosive districts that you referred to in California, and as you know, we have had a number of special censuses in California. I would like to inquire of you about how many special censuses were taken in California during the years between 1950 and 1960 and how much the local communities paid to the Census Bureau.

Mr. SCAMMON. I think we can give you immediately a general figure and insert in the record an exact one.

My impression is there were around 1,600 special censuses taken throughout the whole decade throughout the whole country, and in California alone there were several hundred, because my impression is that about a quarter or a third of those special censuses were taken in California.

Now as you know, Mr. Edwards, this is now declining because there is a new technique being used in the State of California by

which the State will estimate for a community its population with a right of appeal to the taking of a special census.

But if I may, let me supply for the record the details of Mr. Edwards' question, Mr. Chairman. There were a great many.

(The information follows:)

Between 1950 and 1960 the Census Bureau took 500 special censuses in California. Some communities had more than one such census during the decade. A total of approximately 15 million persons were enumerated at a cost of approximately \$2½ million.

Mr. EDWARDS. Would it not be better for all concerned if all these censuses were coordinated into one, perhaps a national census?

Mr. SCAMMON. As you know, there was a proposal made, Mr. Edwards, in the last Congress for a mid-decade census in 1965, and I believe legislation has been reintroduced on this.

Mr. OLSEN. I think there are about three of them now.

Mr. SCAMMON. In the hearings on this mid-decade census that were held under Mr. Henderson's chairmanship there was a great deal of support for just this proposal.

The administration viewpoint was against it, and not because of the money involved, as I remember the testimony, but because the administration spokesman felt that the data provided by special surveys and estimates would meet more needs than the local county data.

There is a difference of opinion on this, and quite frankly I think that a good deal of the difference of opinion depends upon the use and value that the individual is going to put the statistics to.

In your situation and that of Mr. Burkhalter in the North Hollywood area, or Mr. Udall, for example, who introduced one of the bills before, who comes from Tucson, there was an obvious need for local data to help in local situations.

The Census Bureau could, of course, take such a census. Naturally if it were going to be taken on April 1, 1965, we would like to be alerted to the fact fairly quickly because of the preparatory time needed, but this could be done.

Now whether or not the legislation that has been introduced meets that need, could be passed, would get the appropriation, of course is another matter.

Mr. EDWARDS. Thank you.

Mr. OLSEN. Any more questions?

Mr. POOL.

Mr. POOL. I want to ask you, Mr. Olsen, what does your bill provide on how to take the census?

Mr. OLSEN. My bill simply provides for a population census—population, housing, and unemployment for 1965.

Mr. POOL. By mail?

Mr. OLSEN. Yes, by mail. And of course it has to be checked by enumerators and by their system, and it gives them discretion to determine the system. But it is not as extensive as the 1960 census, and for that reason would cost less.

Now the level at which the census would be taken is something we should discuss in this committee quite extensively. But from my recollection of last year's hearings I visualize something at \$60 or \$70 million and not \$100 million, as would be the cost, or more than \$100

million would be the cost of as extensive a census as was taken in 1960.

Mr. Watson.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Scammon, while no doubt few could argue with the increased efficiency and economy in amending the law so as not to require the personal visit by the enumerator, oftentimes in the interest of efficiency and economy you can lose your accuracy.

I was not here when this bill was passed, the original law, rather; but it appears to me that the requirement that the enumerator actually visit the dwelling place was not just a mechanical means of taking the census, but rather was a means of verifying or giving validity to the census itself, and I should like to look into that a moment rather than lose sight of the accuracy of it.

Now what would be your answer to that, sir, as to the accuracy of the various methods? We cannot argue about it being cheaper to send 5-cent letter than it is to send the person. But what would be your opinion about the accuracy?

Mr. SCAMMON. I would think, Mr. Watson, that the original language on visiting every dwelling was a representation of the feeling of the best way to secure accuracy at that time.

Actually I have now been in charge of the Census Bureau for 2 years, and the thing that has impressed me most about the personnel in the Census, if my colleagues here will forgive me, is their almost merciless pursuit of accuracy, their almost relentless pursuit of accuracy. I know that my colleagues would not have recommended this unless they felt that the count that could be taken by this permissive legislation would in fact be more accurate, more correct, and more complete than the count taken by door-to-door visitation.

I would entirely agree that as you read the legislation there is a certain feeling that if you cannot get it by going from door to door how can you get it, that this has been obviously the most accurate and complete way to do it because you pin down every apartment, household, and farm, and you talk to these people and you get the information and that's that.

In fact, however, in our big metropolitan areas we have found that it does not work that way, that we do miss people, we miss transients because of the fact that this is spread out over a period of perhaps a month or two. We miss people in what we call the less advantaged areas.

We find that on the basis of the experimentation we have done, the use of a flexible system combining mail and house visitation, with house visitations increased in problem areas because you have more people and more time and more resources to saturate those areas, produces a more accurate count.

But I would agree entirely that the money aspect of it, while helpful—and I am glad to say that we can save money with this thing—this is not the primary need. The primary thing is to get the most accurate count, because we know that literally billions of dollars are disbursed in the States and areas on the basis of these data. I suppose there is nothing that is reprinted as much as a reference as the U.S. census.

We want to make it as accurate as we can. Our feeling is by this permissive legislation enabling us to use mail beginning in those

areas where it is feasible that we can increase the accuracy, because the accuracy is the prime goal.

Mr. WATSON. You really think the accuracy will be increased?

Mr. SCAMMON. Yes, sir.

Mr. WATSON. I am for economy and efficiency, but as you say, so many people rely upon this census, and I think frankly we should put accuracy No. 1.

As to the matter of new innovations, they had mail when Congress originally passed this law and they could have resorted to taking the census by mail at that time. So I do not see where that is any particular new innovation. The thing is, are you convinced that the accuracy will be improved? That is the primary interest with me.

Mr. SCAMMON. No, Mr. Watson, if this cost \$20 million more instead of saving \$20 million I would say spend it if I thought it would increase the accuracy because it seems to me that all of us depend so much on the census. Even Members of the House in terms of their own States depend on the estimates of the census when the population increases. Of course this does not involve Mr. Pool.

Mr. POOL. I beg your pardon. I have the largest, according to your own estimate.

Mr. SCAMMON. You are now ahead of Mr. Taft?

Mr. POOL. That is right, according to your estimate.

Mr. SCAMMON. I cannot question my estimate because it obviously is accurate. But I would think that our prime interest in the Census Bureau must be for this measure of accuracy of which you speak. But I think, myself, that the regard in which the work of the Bureau is held is due to the fact that it has never deviated from this point of accuracy first, and I would say we would not be recommending this legislation were it not for our own feeling it would increase accuracy.

Mr. POOL. I do not think I got the point—why is it more accurate by mail than personal contact?

Mr. SCAMMON. Because when we use the mail operation it enables us to concentrate the house-to-house visitations in those problem areas. In an area, for example, like Mr. Olsen's or Mrs. St. George's, mail or house-to-house visits will get about the same result. It is not going to make a great deal of difference. But in many parts of the country a house-to-house visit when you can only make one visit because of limits of time and personnel and money is not going to give you an accurate count.

By saving your funds in the areas where you can use mail and double teaming and even triple teaming your operation and making five or six or seven calls back instead of one or two or three, and make them in 1 week instead of 1 month, we feel that we can count in some of these metropolitan areas considerably more accurate than we have in the past.

Mr. POOL. In other words, you are going to ask for the same amount of money proportionately that you did for 1960 for 1970?

Mr. SCAMMON. No, it would probably be a bit less.

Mr. POOL. It would be?

Mr. SCAMMON. Yes, it would be less. I would not want to say exactly how much less, but probably in the order of \$10 or \$15 million less. I am afraid, Mr. Pool, the total amount will be larger because of proportionate cost increases and the fact that the number of people will be larger, but proportionately to these it would be less.

Dr. TAEUBER. Mr. Chairman, could I supplement that? There are two points I would like to add.

One is before we rely on mail we have to have a complete list of the addresses at which people are living or might live, including the vacant units in this area.

Now there are a number of different ways of doing this. But the fact that we expect to have this in advance of the census gives us a control which we have not been able to get when we have to start by saying to the enumerator, "You go out into this area and visit every place." The matter of checking back on whether he actually follows these instructions, particularly in the difficult areas, is one of our problems, and by developing a list in advance, as we expect to do, we have another control even where we have to use an enumerator in these difficult areas.

And the other point I would like to add——

Mr. OLSEN. Well, now you are into the other bill. You are into the other bill for this morning, are you not?

Dr. TAEUBER. No, sir.

Mr. OLSEN. Of preparing for the census?

Dr. TAEUBER. No, sir.

Mr. OLSEN. I am anticipating. You go ahead.

Dr. TAEUBER. The other point is in the system as we have used it heretofore an enumerator knocks on the door. With luck he finds someone at home. He asks the questions of that person for every person in the household.

Now again and again this puts the person who answers the door, the housewife—if we find anyone at home it is likely to be the housewife—puts her in the position of having to answer questions about people in the household. If it is her husband she probably knows the answer. If it is a lodger, as it is in many cases, she may not know the answer, and either she guesses or she says, "I do not know, come back some other time and get this information when the lodger or the person who is staying there for some length of time will be in," which we avoid by being able to send a questionnaire, having them fill it out, perhaps looking up records, perhaps talking to each other about it, and getting the information from the person who really has it, which is the person himself.

This is another element of accuracy that we see as possible under this system.

Mr. POOL. I have one other, Mr. Chairman. Do you have any estimates on how many people you did not get in these problem areas in the 1960 census?

Dr. TAEUBER. We have done some rechecking. We are still trying to evaluate our rechecks. It will be for the United States as a whole on the order perhaps of 2, 2½ million, maybe more.

Mr. POOL. Out of that 2½ million would you say most of them are in the problem areas?

Dr. TAEUBER. Most of them are in the problem areas; yes, sir.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Abele?

Mr. ABELE. Nothing.

Mr. OLSEN. Any other questions?

Mr. GOLDFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add another footnote to the footnote, if I may, and that is that we are not sold on this new method yet.

The reason we are interested in having the legislation changed is to permit us to experiment with these new methods with the thought that we could use them if they prove out.

Now we have been talking this morning as though they are already proved out. All we can say thus far is that our experimentation to date has been very promising.

We would not intend to use these innovations unless we can prove beyond a doubt that they are more efficient and more accurate than the methods that they would replace, and we would expect if this legislation is passed making it feasible for us to continue with our experimentation that we would spend years to come before making up our minds about how to take the 1970 census.

There might be developments yet unforeseen that would eventuate before 1970 that would make our methods even more efficient or economical.

Mr. OLSEN. Let me interrupt you. Then your effort at requesting this legislation is to find the most accurate way of taking the census, and this legislation will enable you to experiment further in your search for the most accurate method of taking the census?

Mr. GOLDFIELD. Yes, our feeling is that the experimentation will be rather extensive, will cost a fair amount of money, and we would not want to undertake it unless we knew the law was flexible enough to enable us to apply the results of the experimentation.

Incidentally, with respect to the use of the Post Office, which is certainly going to be more prominent no matter what method we use, there is a very good summary of how the Post Office Department would be used in the letter that your subcommittee sent to Postmaster Day after the last hearings that you held on this subject. Just a brief paragraph—perhaps I could read it—would summarize the way which it is intended that the Post Office would play a part.

Mr. OLSEN. Please read what you will, and then we will put the whole letter in the record.

Mr. GOLDFIELD. It reads as follows:

Testimony by Census officials at the hearings indicates that the proposed legislation would call for a much greater use of the Post Office Department services in future censuses. On page 17 of the testimony, for instance, mention is made of using the Post Office Department to update census lists of dwelling units by asking the letter carriers to check out lists for their areas or routes. Moreover, some 80 to 90 percent of the next census would be done by mail questionnaire delivered and returned by the postal service. All of these postal services would be used by Census on a reimbursable basis it is understood.

Mr. OLSEN. Without objection, the whole letter will be placed in the record at this point.

(The letter follows:)

HON. J. EDWARD DAY,
Postmaster General
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL DAY: I am enclosing a transcript of the hearings held before a special subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on August 31 last relating to H.R. 11949 and H.R. 11999. These identical bills (copies enclosed) call for repealing section 25 of United States Code, title 13, the basic census law, and if passed, would do away with house-to-house visits by census enumerator during the Decennial Census.

Testimony by Census officials at the hearings indicates that the proposed legislation would call for a much greater use of the Post Office Department services in future censuses. On page 17 of the testimony, for instance, mention is made of using the Post Office Department to update census lists of dwelling units by asking the letter carriers to check out lists for their areas or routes. Moreover, some 80 to 90 percent of the next census would be done by mail questionnaire delivered and returned by the postal service. All of these postal services would be used by Census on a reimbursable basis it is understood.

The purpose of this letter is to request an expression of your views on the proposals put forth by the Census Bureau. You will note that on page 29 of the transcript, Representative Johansen, Republican of Michigan, specifically requests that a statement of your views be obtained.

Since the bills under discussion will come up for action at the next meeting of our full committee, I shall appreciate your views on this matter as soon as possible.

With warm personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

DAVID N. HENDERSON, *Chairman.*

Mr. OLSEN. Are there any other questions on that bill?

If there are none, we will go on to H.R. 3545 and H.R. 4819, identical bills to provide for taking of the economic censuses 1 year earlier, starting in 1968.

At this point I will place in the record H.R. 3545, along with the language of section 131 of title 13 of the United States Code, and also a letter of January 16, 1963, from the Under Secretary of Commerce, Hon. Edward Gudeman, along with the statement of purpose and need prepared by his Department.

(The material referred to follows:)

[H.R. 3545, 88th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To amend section 131 of title 13, United States Code, so as to provide for taking of the economic censuses one year earlier starting in 1968

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 131 of title 13, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

§ 131. Collection and publication; five-year periods

"The Secretary shall take, compile, and publish censuses of manufactures, of mineral industries, and of other businesses, including the distributive trades, service establishments, and transportation (exclusive of means of transportation for which statistics are required by law to be filed with, and are compiled and published by, a designated regulatory body), in the year 1964, then in the year 1968, and every fifth year thereafter, and each such census shall relate to the year immediately preceding the taking thereof."

TITLE 13, UNITED STATES CODE—CENSUS

CHAPTER 5—CENSUSES

SUBCHAPTER I—MANUFACTURES, MINERAL INDUSTRIES, AND OTHER BUSINESSES

§ 131. Collection and publication; five-year periods

The Secretary shall take, compile, and publish censuses of manufactures, of mineral industries, and of other businesses, including the distributive trades, service establishments, and transportation (exclusive of means of transportation for which statistics are required by law to be filed with, and are compiled and published by, a designated regulatory body), in the year 1954 and every fifth year thereafter, and each such census shall relate to the year immediately preceding the taking thereof: *Provided*, That the censuses of manufactures, of mineral industries, and of other businesses, including the distributive trades and service establishments, directed to be taken in the year 1954 relating to the year 1953 shall be taken instead in the year 1955 relating to year 1954.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1963.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill to amend section 131 of title 13, United States Code, so as to provide for taking of the economic censuses one year earlier starting in 1968, and four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD GUDEMAN,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of the proposed amendment to section 131 of title 13, United States Code, is to provide for the taking 1 year earlier starting in 1968 of the censuses of manufactures, of mineral industries, and of other businesses, including the distributive trades, service establishments, and certain forms of transportation. Under present law the censuses would be taken in 1969.

The amendment is desirable because new developments in census procedures, particularly those involving the application of electronic computers, have changed the circumstances as to optimum timing of the various censuses. By changing the date of the economic censuses to a year earlier it will be possible to complete the work of those censuses in time to transfer electronic computers, key personnel, and space to the censuses of agriculture, population, and housing, and thereby promote greater economy and efficiency in the use of available resources.

The Department recommends early approval of this legislation by the Congress.

MR. OLSEN. Mr. Scammon, you will remember that when you appeared before us last year concerning this bill, Mr. Johansen referred to it as a bill "for the relief of overworked computers" and I imagine that the purpose remains essentially the same. What would you like to tell us about this bill?

MR. SCAMMON. I think, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Udall then added "and for other purposes." Probably this would apply.

MR. CHAIRMAN, again there is a brief statement here which we might insert, if this is agreeable, for the record. I would make a very brief summary of it.

We undertake these economic censuses, manufactures, mineral industries, distributive trades, transportation, and so forth, in the years ending in four and nine of each decade. In these years we take a census of business activity for the previous year.

In 1964, for example, we will be taking an economic census covering the business activities of the year 1963.

Our proposal is that in 1964 the timing be left untouched, but hereafter it be taken every 5 years in the years ending in three and eight rather than four and nine.

The bill, as you have indicated, Mr. Chairman, is comparable to one introduced in the last Congress. The purpose of the bill is to enable us in the Bureau of the Census to better rationalize and organize the distribution of our time, particularly our computer time in the mechanical sense and the use of our computer personnel, programmers, managers, and supervisors, and the like.

Our estimate is that we can probably save upward of 10,000 computer hours by rearranging in this measure the actual distribution of the workload so that it does not come in such a peak and trough arrangement, and is leveled out over the period of a decade.

This is basically a bill for the relief of computers and computer personnel designed to enable us in the Bureau to more rationally employ these mechanical resources to save the time of the computers and the time of the people, and through that, money, in the organization of the data collected in these economic censuses.

The effect would be to move up the next census following the present one by 1 year, and then, of course, thereafter, to take each of the years ending three and eight rather than four and nine.

Mr. OLSEN. At this point, if there is no objection, we will place in the record your whole statement, and I want you to submit a statement for the record of the computer workload in machine-hours for each year from 1964 forward to 1970, just as you did a year ago.

(The complete statement of Mr. Scammon follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RICHARD M. SCAMMON, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

The purpose of H.R. 3545 and H.R. 4819 is to amend section 131 of title 13, United States Code, to provide for the taking 1 year earlier, starting in 1968, of the quinquennial censuses of manufactures, mineral industries, and other businesses, including the distributive trades, service establishments, and certain forms of transportation. Under the present law, these censuses are taken in years ending in four and nine with the data collected covering the preceding calendar year. Under the amendment, the censuses scheduled to be taken in 1964 covering 1963 would be unchanged, but the schedule thereafter would be advanced 1 year.

At one time all of the censuses were taken simultaneously in the year ending in zero. When the Bureau of the Census became a permanent agency, one of the chief resulting advantages was that it became possible to disperse some of the censuses, or groups of related censuses, through the decade so as to level the workload and permit better utilization of personnel, space, and equipment—and to permit some of the censuses to be taken more frequently than decennially, as deemed necessary. The schedule that was worked out was an efficient one in terms of the techniques and resources then available. However, improved procedures, especially those made possible by the application of electronic computers to census processing, have altered the optimum timing of the major periodic censuses. The change in timing of the economic censuses as provided by this legislation would apportion computer utilization requirements during a 10-year cycle more evenly than the present schedule, and would do more than any other single change to reduce the peaks in requirements that are now experienced. By changing the date of the economic censuses to a year earlier, it will be possible to complete the work of those censuses in time to transfer electronic computers, key personnel, and space to the censuses of agriculture, population, and housing, and thereby promote greater economy and efficiency in the use of available resources. If this change were approved the processing peak for the next major aggregation of censuses, covering the years 1967 to 1970, would be reduced by about 10,000 computer hours, or nearly the output of two Univac 1105 systems working around the clock all year.

Early enactment of this legislation is desirable because the Bureau of the Census must plan the buildup of its resources for major censuses well in advance and must develop well in advance its schedule of other undertakings so as to dovetail with the censuses. Adequate leadtime is especially needed in the case of the acquisition of large-scale electronic data-processing equipment, where typically a span of several years occurs in a well-ordered program of study, specification, construction, installation, and proving in.

Projected workload and capacity for Bureau of the Census electronic data processing systems—fiscal years 1963-70

[All figures are in terms of equivalent hours of Univac 1105 computer time]

Fiscal year	Existing capacity	Deficit to be provided for	Total	Major censuses	Requirements		
					Current programs	Work for others	Expected new applications
1963	24,700	2,250	26,950	8,750	15,000	3,200	-----
1964	15,600	14,850	30,450	7,450	16,000	3,000	4,000
1965	13,200	28,350	41,550	16,500	17,200	1,850	6,000
1966	13,200	23,550	36,750	7,750	18,500	1,500	9,000
1967	13,200	19,600	32,800	900	19,400	1,500	11,000
1968	9,600	32,300	41,900	8,000	20,400	1,500	12,000
1969	9,600	38,900	48,500	13,500	21,500	1,500	12,000
1970	9,600	35,800	45,400	9,200	22,700	1,500	12,000

Mr. OLSEN. Are you still having trouble recruiting personnel to operate computers and machines that feed computers?

Mr. SCAMMON. This is a continuing problem, Mr. Chairman, though I do not think it is as acute as it was 2 or 3 years ago in the Bureau.

Any new skill such as the operation of a computer begins as a scarce skill and then becomes less scarce as people are trained to do the work, and I would say that we are having less difficulty now than we did 2 or 3 years ago.

Pay scales in Government are usually not as challenging or rewarding as those in private industry, though the recent pay increases have been helpful in this respect, and there have been special arrangements made over the years to provide extra compensation for a scarce skill of this category.

I would say that with some of the other inducements to stay in Government service we are not faced now with as great a problem of grading, to use a blunt word, as we had perhaps 2, 3, 4 years ago in this particular category. I think we are doing fairly well.

Mr. OLSEN. Would you discuss with the committee your training programs?

Mr. SCAMMON. We have several training programs, Mr. Chairman. Some involve bringing in outside people for new training work, some involve training our own people.

I think Dr. Eckler could give you more detail on these.

Mr. OLSEN. As quickly as we can get it.

Dr. ECKLER. Yes, Mr. Chairman. The major area that involves a supply problem is in the programmer area which still is an area of critical shortage in our operations. We attempt to provide formal training or retraining for about 80 to 100 programmers each year. That seems to be about the number that we have to enter into training, and we typically will have a class of 20 or 25 people whom we recruit from various places in the Bureau.

At one time we were able to pull into these classes some of the people who were released from the conventional types of equipment, some of the ones we thought had promise for taking over on the electronic side. That supply has been pretty well exhausted and we have to recruit them from various areas, particularly young people with no experience in this, but with promise for learning the new techniques.

We have about 6 or so weeks of classroom work involving lectures and practice exercises. After that these programmers—

Mr. OLSEN. Could I interrupt here and ask you if you get them with any particular kind of school background.

Dr. ECKLER. Quite a wide range, Mr. Chairman. It is rather surprising that we do not have to limit ourselves to any particular background.

Mr. OLSEN. They need an extensive education?

Dr. ECKLER. Not too extensive. A general college background is usually required, but I think even some exceptional high school graduates could successfully come into this. Now if they have some further experience it is useful, but—

Mr. OLSEN. What I am getting at is do they have to have a background of physics or mathematics?

Dr. ECKLER. No, indeed. I might note that when I first came to the Bureau my secretary, a very good secretary, was in that field of work. Later on she took a test. They decided that she had possibilities of being trained as a programmer, and now she is one of the excellent programmers and has moved up in the grade scale considerably above what would have been possible for her if she had stayed in secretarial work.

Mr. OLSEN. They do not have to know how to build the computer?

Dr. ECKLER. They do not have to know how to build the computers, do not have to know physics or anything else of that sort, but they have to be alert people and appear to require special aptitudes which are rather scarce in the general population.

Mr. SCAMMON. I think if we limited it to people who knew how to build a computer we would all be out of business.

Dr. ECKLER. After the first 6 weeks or so of classroom training we weed out quite a few. We find they do not have the possibilities we expected, and they drop out.

Then we have about 6 months of work with them closely supervised on increasingly complex jobs, and at the end of that time they are able to do some of the simpler jobs on their own, and they gradually get greater skills. At the end of a year they are at a pretty good rate of production.

Of course we find a relatively small number will prove to be the exceptional people on whom so much depends, and one of the problems is to identify these really highly superior people who can envision a whole program and think through the steps. We are always looking for those.

We do not find programmers readymade. We produce them, and expend great effort in attempting to keep up with need as we go along.

Mr. OLSEN. Thank you. I have one other general question, and that concerns the impact of automation on these workers or on all the Federal workers with the use of these machines.

I do not know much about it, but I have heard about the scanners that gather the information and put it on punchcards and put it into computers without human eyes or hands. Now is this going to put some folks out of work? And if so, is there a plan to move those people into other gainful employment?

Mr. SCAMMON. Actually, Mr. Chairman, I hope that members of the committee will have an opportunity to see all of this equipment

when they come out to the Census Bureau in a week's time to view the installations there.

I do not think that in the long run this puts people out of work, though it may in specific instances replace individuals with a machine at a given time.

What it actually does is to enable us to do much more quickly, much more accurately, and at much greater depth, the collection of data.

In 1890 or 1880—I have forgotten which one—one census was just beginning as the final volume of the previous one was being published, and then you did really have little in terms of detail.

Right now we have immense quantities of data published for almost every metropolitan area and every city of America, every county of America, analyzed, reanalyzed, tabbed, cross-tabbed every which way. Great detail. Material that was completely impossible, say, in the first census when you did not even list people by name, but only by the heads of families in the United States.

What this has given us an opportunity to do, I think, is to increase the speed, the detail, and the accuracy of the work. Obviously if we used computers with the census requirements of 1790 we would need far fewer people to do it. What we have done, though, with the use of computers is not so much to replace people, but to enable people to move up out of the drudgery of punching cards into the more imaginative work of developing programs for the maximum utilization of the data.

Dr. ECKLER. Mr. Chairman, if I might supplement, it happens in a great many of our programs that the impact of the new equipment is to make it unnecessary to recruit the large numbers of temporary people that we have had. In the 1960 censuses, for example, the number of card punchers was very, very substantially reduced because of the new equipment that you will be seeing, we hope, next week.

Mr. OLSEN. Well, that figure of job opportunities was a figure like 2,000?

Dr. ECKLER. About 2,000, and rather than recruiting just the 2,000, and training that number—as a matter of fact, the turnover in that staff has always been very high—we probably would have had to train 4,000 in order to have a staff of 2,000, and then at the end of a couple of years they would have all been dropped off. Instead of recruiting that very large number for a short time, we were able to do the work with these machines using a considerable number of other people with other skills, as the Director has pointed out.

This is a rather spectacular case of reduction in temporary employment, the numbers that otherwise we would have recruited.

But there have been large numbers who used to be on the conventional punchcard equipment who have moved over into the electronic systems; and as a matter of fact, we frequently have shortages in the conventional equipment area. When we are trying to find people with certain skills there it is difficult. There are never enough of them.

Mr. OLSEN. Does anyone have any questions?

Mrs. St. George?

Mrs. St. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this legislation, but I wanted to ask the Director how does the business

community react to this change. Are they favorable to it overall?

Mr. SCAMMON. We have had no objection from the business community, though quite frankly the primary purpose of the change was to permit us to use the equipment more efficiently.

When the bill was introduced last year, the Bureau of the Budget and the Bureau of the Census contacted business people to see if they had any objection. They had none.

The Federal Statistics Users' Conference has been contacted. They had no objections.

By and large, the reaction we have gotten is if we can get the data a year sooner than we otherwise would have gotten it they would be in favor.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thought that would be the reaction.

Mr. ABELE. I was wondering if the armed services have made any appreciable contribution to your staff, maybe your programing.

Mr. SCAMMON. I think Dr. Eckler might be able to answer in detail.

Dr. ECKLER. We have had some exchange of facilities with machines at the Pentagon, and at also the David Taylor Model Basin. The Air Force has a piece of equipment like ours at Rome, N.Y., and we got some time on that equipment.

We do attempt to keep in touch through our specialists with the alternative equipment in other agencies. Usually their priorities are pretty high and their utilization is pretty high, so that it is not easy to find time or people. But we are alert to that and do it where we can.

Mr. OLSEN. Are there any other questions?

Mr. SCAMMON. I might say, Mr. Chairman, before we close, that we would like officially to confirm the estimate of the Census Bureau that Mr. Pool now has the largest constituency in the United States by some 19,000 lead over Mr. Taft, having moved forward from a minority of 127,000 at the time of the 1960 census.

Mr. POOL. Thank you.

Mr. SCAMMON. I do not know that I would envy Mr. Pool representing that many people.

Mr. OLSEN. Thank you, Mr. Scammon, and all your staff. I want to say I am certainly looking forward to our visit with the Census Bureau next week, and particularly I want to see these automatic optical scanners and how they punch out a card and the card feeds the computer. I want to see that.

Mr. SCAMMON. We will guarantee you, Mr. Chairman, that nobody will come out of the machine just as a number.

Mr. OLSEN. Thank you.

The subcommittee is now adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 11:15 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned.)